

## DRAFT

### Finding of No Significant Impact for the Implementation of Master Planning Actions at Sierra Army Depot, CA

**1. Introduction.** Sierra Army Depot (SIAD) in California conducted an Environmental Assessment (EA) of the potential environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic effects associated with implementing Real Property Master Plan planning actions in its Storage and Warehouse districts pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (Title 40 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500–1508) for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Title 42 of the *United States Code* § 4321 *et seq.*) and 32 CFR Part 651 (*Environmental Analysis of Army Actions*). Regulations in 32 CFR Part 651 provide Army guidance and procedures for complying with NEPA and establish policy, procedures, and responsibilities for assessing environmental effects of proposed Army actions.

**2. Proposed Action.** The proposed action is to implement the Real Property Master Plan planning projects within SIAD's Storage and Warehouse districts. The purpose of the proposed action is to manage SIAD's real property assets in a thoughtful, deliberative, and sustainable manner consistent with the requirements and guidance in Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction 4165.70, *Real Property Management*, and DoD Unified Facilities Criteria 2-100-01, *Installation Master Planning*. The proposed action is needed to address SIAD's real property deficiencies, shortcomings, and suboptimal conditions and to provide safe, flexible, and efficient facilities to meet current and future installation mission requirements efficiently and cost effectively. The EA evaluates the implementation of Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) and the planning for the SIAD Storage and Warehouse District Area Development Plans (ADPs) over the next 7 years. The proposed action focuses on implementing the RPMP requirements identified in the ADPs, which include renovations to six buildings; construction of 11 buildings; installation of seven pre-engineered buildings; construction of a paint facility; renovations and upgrades to warehouses and buildings for heating, water, sewer, lighting, and fire suppression; six transportation projects; demolition projects; and construction of over 300 acres of hardstand storage.

**3. Alternatives Considered.** SIAD identified two alternatives in the EA: the proposed action, which is the Army's Preferred Alternative, and the No Action Alternative. The proposed action is described above. The two alternatives were determined through an evaluation process used by the planning team, with the three intensity levels and three investment levels that were scored against each other to identify the set of projects that best aligned with the planning goals and objectives, providing the Preferred Alternative for the Warehouse District ADP. CEQ regulations require analysis of a No Action Alternative. Not implementing the planning projects is the No Action Alternative.

**4. Factors Considered in the Finding of No Significant Impact.** The EA, which is attached and incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI), examines the potential effects of the proposed action – implementation of the RPMP and the No Action Alternative on the following resource areas of concern: aesthetic and visual resources; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology and soils; hazardous and toxic materials; land use; noise; socioeconomics (including environmental justice and protection of children); traffic and transportation; utilities; and water resources (including wetlands).

Based on the analysis in the EA, SIAD has determined that implementing the proposed action would not result in significant adverse effects to any environmental, cultural, or socioeconomic resources.

Short-term and/or long-term, negligible-to-moderate adverse effects on air quality, biological resources, geology and soils, hazardous and toxic materials, noise, transportation, utilities, and water resources would be expected from construction and renovation activity. Short-term, minor beneficial effects on the local economy would be expected from construction and renovation expenditures and employment. Long-term, minor-to-moderate beneficial effects on transportation from traffic circulation improvements would be expected. No or negligible effects would be expected on aesthetics and visual resources, cultural resources, land use, and noise.

**5. Public Review and Comment.** The EA and draft FNSI will be available to the public for review and comment for 30 days, beginning upon publication of a notice of availability in the *Reno Gazette* and online at *The Lassen County Times*. Copies of the EA and FNSI will be available for review and comment at the Washoe County Library in downtown Reno, NV; and Lassen Library District in Susanville, CA, and online at <https://www.sierra.army.mil/>. Submit comments on the EA and FNSI by U.S. Mail to Mr. Scott Olsen Environmental Chief / NEPA Manager, Sierra Army Depot, 74 Currant Street, Herlong, CA 96113-5000 or by email to: [scott.k.olsen2.civ@army.mil](mailto:scott.k.olsen2.civ@army.mil). Comments on the EA and FNSI are to be submitted to Mr. Olsen no later than the end of the 30-day review period.

**6. Conclusions.** Based on the environmental analysis in the EA, the Army has determined that implementing the proposed action would have no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative adverse effects on the quality of human life or the natural environment at SIAD.

---

AMY M. CORY  
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army  
Commanding  
Sierra Army Depot, CA

---

Date