

**DRAFT**  
**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FNSI)**  
**UTAH ARMY NATIONAL GUARD**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE REVISED INTEGRATED NATURAL**  
**RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR CAMP WILLIAMS**  
**SALT LAKE AND UTAH COUNTIES, UTAH**

**1. Introduction**

The Utah Army National Guard (UTARNG) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify and evaluate potential environmental effects from the proposed implementation of a revised Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) at Army Garrison Camp Williams (AGCW). This EA has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 United States Code [USC] 4321 et seq.), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500-1508), 32 CFR Part 651, and the 2011 *Army National Guard (ARNG) NEPA Handbook, Guidance on Preparing Environmental Documentation for ARNG Actions in Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*. As set forth in Department of Defense (DoD) Directive 5105.77, *National Guard Bureau (NGB)*, the NGB is a joint activity of the DoD and as such must comply with the NEPA.

**2. Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives**

**Proposed Action.** The Sikes Act of 1997, as amended (Sikes Act; 16 USC 670a *et seq.*, as amended) requires federal military installations and state-owned National Guard facilities with significant natural resources to develop a long-range INRMP. INRMPs help installation commanders manage natural resources more effectively to ensure that installation lands remain available and in good condition to support the military mission. The INRMP is the primary guidance document and tool for managing natural resources at AGCW, and the Proposed Action includes the implementation of the natural resources management measures as presented in the revised INRMP for AGCW. The revised INRMP also consists of natural resources management goals and objectives for the future. Projects and activities in the revised INRMP are the individual component actions required to achieve an objective. The goals, objectives, projects, and activities are fully described in the revised INRMP and EA.

The revised INRMP is a revision and reorganization of the 2009 INRMP and is the result of a review for operation and effect completed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), and UTARNG. Both the UTARNG Environmental Resources Management (ERM) office and military trainers participated in the review. The review for operation and effect determined that substantive INRMP revisions would be required to incorporate new program management changes evolving military mission and natural resources management philosophy, which are likely to produce notably different biophysical effects at AGCW.

The **purpose** of the Proposed Action is to implement the revised INRMP, which provides for effective, long-term management of AGCW's natural resources, while also supporting the military mission. The revised INRMP ensures the integration of sustainable land use, responsible stewardship, adaptive stewardship practices, environmental and public concerns, environmental compliance, and maintenance of a quality training environment.

The Proposed Action is **needed** to meet the requirements of the Sikes Act and thereby ensure the UTARNG's natural resources management program is implemented in a way that provides for sustainable, healthy ecosystems; complies with applicable environmental laws and regulations; and provides for no net loss in the capability of military installation lands to support the military mission.

**Alternatives Considered.** The UTARNG evaluated two alternatives: 1) the Preferred Alternative and 2) the No Action Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would implement the Proposed Action, as described above. The management goals, objectives, and projects included in the revised INRMP have been updated in consultation with resource agencies, NGB, and UTARNG staff. This process used updated information on existing natural resources, current conditions, and management issues at AGCW. Proposed activities were reviewed for compliance with existing laws, regulations, Executive Orders, and Army policy. After a thorough examination of potential natural resources goals, objectives, and projects, the UTARNG determined that implementation of the Preferred Alternative was the only reasonable alternative. In summary, the revised INRMP would include the following new information:

- Increased focus on managing natural resources through an ecosystem-based management approach
- Incorporation of the most recent natural resources science, data, and management considerations
- Incorporation of current regulatory framework
- Inclusion of comprehensive and detailed actions for native vegetation growth and enhancement
- Inclusion of comprehensive and detailed actions for wildlife conservation and monitoring
- Additional threatened and endangered species data review and maintenance
- Greater minimization of soil erosion impacts
- Inclusion of comprehensive and detailed actions for water resources conservation and enhancement, including improved and new riparian areas
- Inclusion of current data and recommendation in fire management and planning
- Inclusion of current data and recommendations for the reduction of noxious weeds and their associated adverse impacts
- Inclusion of agricultural outleasing and Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) goals and objectives.

The No Action Alternative would continue with operations as currently conducted under the 2009 INRMP and do not implement the Proposed Action. Unlike the revised INRMP, the 2009 INRMP does not incorporate the most recent natural resources science, data, and management considerations, nor does it include the most current regulatory framework. While the No Action Alternative would not satisfy the purpose of or need for the Proposed Action, this alternative is carried forward to provide a comparative baseline against which to analyze the effects of the Proposed Action, as required in CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1502.14). The No Action Alternative reflects the *status quo* and serves as a benchmark against which the effects of the Proposed Action can be evaluated.

### **3. Environmental Analysis**

The potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Action are fully described in the EA. The EA identifies the environmental resources that could be affected by the Proposed Action, and determines the significance of the impacts, if any, to each of these resources. Resources analyzed in the EA include land use and cover; air quality; noise; topography, geology, and soils; water resources; biological resources; cultural resources; socioeconomics; Environmental Justice; infrastructure; and hazardous and toxic materials and waste. Based on the EA's analysis, the UTARNG determined that there would be no significant adverse impact, either individually or cumulatively, to the local environment or quality of life as a result of implementing the Preferred Alternative.

#### **4. Mitigation**

As the Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in any potentially significant adverse impacts, no project-specific mitigation measures are needed to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Per established protocols, procedures, and requirements, the UTARNG would implement best management practices (BMPs) and would satisfy all applicable regulatory requirements in association with the Proposed Action. BMPs are incorporated as components of the Preferred Alternative and include regulatory compliance measures and installation-specific policy and plans that the UTARNG regularly implements as part of their activities, as appropriate.

#### **5. Regulations**

The Proposed Action would not violate NEPA, the CEQ Regulations, 32 CFR Part 651, or other federal, state, or local environmental regulations.

#### **6. Commitment to Implementation**

The NGB and the UTARNG affirm their commitment to implement this EA in accordance with NEPA. Implementation is dependent on funding. The UTARNG and the NGB will ensure that adequate funds are provided to achieve the goals and objectives set forth in this EA.

#### **7. Public Review and Comment**

The final EA and draft FNSI have been made available for public review and comment for 30 days following publication of a public notice in three local newspapers (i.e., the *Salt Lake Tribune*, *Deseret News*, and *Daily Herald*). The Final EA and Draft FNSI are available for public review on the UTARNG's website at: <https://ut.ng.mil/Resources/Environmental-Resources-Management/>. The public may submit written comments on the EA during the 30-day public review period to: Shaun Nelson, Environmental Program Manager, UTARNG, Environmental Resources Management Office, 12953 South Minuteman Drive, Draper, Utah 84020; or via email to [shaunnelson@utah.gov](mailto:shaunnelson@utah.gov).

#### **8. Draft Finding of No Significant Impact**

After careful review of the EA, I have concluded that implementation of the Proposed Action would not generate significant controversy or have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. Per 32 CFR Part 651, the Final EA and draft FNSI have been made available for a 30-day public review and comment period. Once any public comments have been addressed and if a determination is made that the Proposed Action will have no significant impact, the FNSI will be signed and the action will be implemented. This analysis fulfills the requirements of NEPA and the CEQ Regulations. An Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared, and the NGB is issuing this FNSI.

---

Date

---

ANTHONY HAMMETT, COL, EN CHIEF  
Army National Guard, G9