

DRAFT
Finding of No Significant Impact
for the Area Development Plan for
Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa

1. Introduction. 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*), Iowa Army Ammunition Plant (IAAAP), Iowa, conducted an Environmental Assessment (EA) of the potential environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with implementing an Area Development Plan (ADP). 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 Army proposes to implement an ADP at IAAAP. The ADP includes a series of projects that involve the improvement, removal, replacement, or support of the following aging facilities:

- Yard and Line Facilities
- Buildings and Infrastructure (storage, bridges, dam)
- Processing and Production Facilities
- Boiler Systems
- Natural Gas System
- Water and Wastewater Systems
- Electrical Distribution System
- Security Systems and Facilities

The proposed action would require a long-range strategy that prioritizes logistics accessibility and operational efficiency over operational “developable” areas while imposing minimum impacts on the environment. Implementation would take place over time in a phased manner. Approximately 27 improvement/modernization projects have been identified that would enhance the long-term growth opportunities at IAAAP by improving upon the efficiency and flexibility of its facilities and infrastructure for future adaptation and scaling. Mission compatibility, short- and long-term real property needs, and cost efficiency and financial stewardship screening criteria were considered when analyzing possible project scenarios.

3. Alternatives Considered. IAAAP identified four alternatives: a scenario focused on adhering to strict financial constraints, a scenario focused on optimizing the primary LAP mission for medium and large caliber ammunition, a scenario focused on maximizing future growth potential, and a scenario that balances reuse of existing real property assets and development of new facilities to achieve financial, optimization, and growth goals (which is the preferred alternative). The EA examines in detail the Preferred Alternative and the No Action Alternative. The proposed action is to implement the IAAAP ADP. Not implementing the IAAAP ADP 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 implementing the proposed action and the no action alternative on the following resource areas of environmental and socioeconomic concern: land use; aesthetic and visual resources; air quality; noise; geology, topography, and soils; water resources (including

1 wetlands); biological resources; cultural resources; socioeconomics (including environmental
2 justice and protection of children); transportation; utilities and infrastructure; and hazardous
3 materials and waste.

4 The Army would expect a combination of short-term and long-term negligible to minor adverse
5 effects to result from implementing the proposed action. Short-term and long-term minor
6 adverse effects on aesthetics and visual resources, air quality, noise, soils, surface waters,
7 biological resources, utilities and infrastructure, transportation, and hazardous materials
8 and waste would be expected from disturbance during demolition, construction, and
9 improvement projects. Short-term minor beneficial effects on the local economy would be
10 expected from construction and renovation expenditures and employment. Long-term
11 negligible-to-minor beneficial effects on aesthetics and visual resources and infrastructure
12 and utilities would be expected from replacing aging structures and systems. Implementing
13 the proposed action would not result in any adverse cumulative environmental effects.
14 Mitigation measures will be implemented based on the permit requirements for each project
15 as the proposed action is implemented.

16 **5. Public Review and Comment.** The EA and draft FNSI are available for public review and
17 comment for 30 days, beginning with publication of a Notice of Availability in *The Hawk Eye*
18 newspaper on May 7, 2020, with the comment period ending on June 5, 2020. Copies of the EA
19 and FNSI are available for review and comment online at [www.amc.army.mil/Resources/](http://www.amc.army.mil/Resources/Environmental)
20 Environmental. The Army invites interested parties to submit comments on the EA and draft FNSI
21 to Mr. Randy Doyle, Environmental Coordinator, Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, 17575 DMC Hwy
22 79, Middletown, IA 52638, or by e-mail to randy.a.doyle.civ@mail.mil. Comments on the EA and
23 FNSI must be submitted to Mr. Doyle no later than June 6, 2020.

24 **6. Conclusions.** Based on the environmental analysis in the EA, the Army has determined
25 that implementing the proposed action would have no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative
26 adverse effects on the quality of human life or the natural environment at IAAAP. Therefore, the
27 Army will not be required to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement before implementing
28 the proposed action.

29 _____
30 ERIC J. SCHILLING
31 LTC, U.S. Army
32 Commander
33 Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Middletown, IA

Date