

DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

BRAC 05 RECOMMENDATION FOR CLOSURE AND DISPOSAL AND REUSE OF OSWALD U.S. ARMY RESERVE CENTER (FACID WA010)

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

On September 8, 2005, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission recommended closure of the Oswald U.S. Army Reserve Center (USARC) and realignment of essential missions to a new USARC to be constructed at a new location. This recommendation was made in conformance with the provisions of the BRAC Act of 1990, (Public Law [PL], 101-510) as amended.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) which identifies, documents, and evaluates environmental effects of the BRAC Commission's recommended closure of the Oswald USARC. The EA has been developed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and implementing regulations issued by the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The 2006 Base Realignment Closure Manual for Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act was used for guidance in preparing the EA.

1.0 PROPOSED ACTION

The Proposed Action would implement the BRAC Commission's recommendation, as mandated by BRAC law, Public Law 101-510, by closure and disposal of the facility. The following highlights the BRAC Commission recommendation for the Oswald USARC which is included as part of BRAC law, as quoted:

Close the Oswald United States Army Reserve Center, Everett, WA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the Everett, WA area if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for construction of the new facility.

The Proposed Action is the disposal of surplus property made available by the realignment of the Oswald USARC. Redevelopment and reuse of the surplus USARC property would occur as a secondary action under disposal.

Under BRAC law, the Army must close the Oswald USARC not later than September 15, 2011. After the Oswald USARC is closed, the Army will dispose of the property. As a part of the disposal process, the Army screened the property for reuse with the Department of Defense (DoD) and other federal agencies. No federal agency expressed an interest in reusing this property for another purpose.

2.0 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The EA evaluated the following three alternatives:

No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, the Army would continue operations at the Oswald USARC at levels similar to those that occurred prior to the BRAC Commission's recommendations for closure becoming final. Implementation of the No Action Alternative is not possible due to the BRAC Commission's recommendation to close the Oswald USARC having the force of law.

Caretaker Status Alternative. Under the Caretaker Status Alternative, the Army would secure the Oswald USARC after the military mission has ended to ensure public safety and the security of remaining

government property and any required environmental remediation actions. There may be a period between closure and the transfer of the Oswald USARC. From the time of operational closure until conveyance of the property, the Army would provide sufficient maintenance to preserve and protect the site for reuse in an economical manner that facilitates redevelopment.

Traditional Reuse and Disposal (Preferred Alternative). Under the Preferred Alternative, the Army would close the Oswald USARC for reuse by the Domestic Violence Services (DVS) of Snohomish County. The DVS would reuse the existing structures at the Oswald USARC to shelter victims of domestic violence and provide a service center for 24-hour crisis line, support group, and advocacy services. Interior renovations would be required to accommodate the reuse of the facilities and future construction may include expansion of the gymnasium and the construction of a 20-unit facility to provide transitional housing.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The EA, which is incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI), examined potential effects of the action and no action alternatives on seven resource areas of environmental and socioeconomic concern: land use, aesthetic and visual resources, geology and soils, cultural resources, socioeconomics (including environmental justice and protection of children), transportation, and hazardous and toxic substances. The following paragraphs summarize the expected effects associated with the Preferred Alternative for each resource, as discussed in the EA.

Land Use. No significant direct impacts to land use are anticipated. Changes to the existing buildings will be consistent with zoning, ordinances, community land use plans, and existing land uses in the vicinity of the property.

Aesthetic and Visual Resources. Under the Preferred Alternative, the majority of renovations will be limited to interior spaces. Any exterior changes will not be significant as any proposed renovation or construction is expected to match the exterior of the existing building. There will be short-term adverse impacts during construction from the presence of workers and construction equipment.

Air Quality. Under the Preferred Alternative, there will be temporary emissions during construction. Operational emissions will include the additional demand for heating as well as the addition of daily commuters to the site. Impacts to air quality will not be significant.

Geology and Soils Short-term, and long-term direct impacts on soil will occur under the Preferred Alternative. Renovation activities will not impact soils or geology. The expansion of the gymnasium and construction of the 20-unit transitional housing structure may require cutting and filling of the site, as well as the disturbance of soils, but these actions are not considered to be significant since soils in the project area have been previously disturbed and the majority of the site consists of impervious surfaces.

Cultural resources. Potential impacts to cultural resources from closure, construction, and reuse will not be significant because no historic properties have been identified or are likely to occur at the Oswald USARC.

Socioeconomics (including environmental justice and protection of children). There will be no significant impact on socioeconomic resources. There will be no change in the population of the ROI, no disproportionately high and/or adverse impacts on minority or low income populations, and no adverse impacts to children in the area.

Transportation. No significant direct or indirect impact on traffic are expected during the construction of the proposed facility. The construction project will be small and construction related traffic is not

expected to be significant. No significant adverse impacts to local traffic are expected from the operation of the DVS shelter as the daily commuters will be at levels similar to the existing use.

Hazardous and toxic substances. There are no significant direct or indirect impacts related to hazardous materials, use, handling, and storage. Prior to demolition, the DVS will be responsible for abatement of asbestos and lead-based paint by trained and certified personnel. Removal and disposal will be in accordance with applicable federal and state regulations and no significant impacts are expected. Reuse of the facilities will result in reduced demand for both hazardous materials and hazardous waste management compared to those used by existing facility maintenance, vehicle maintenance, or janitorial activities.

4.0 PUBLIC COMMENT

Interested parties were invited to review and comment on the EA and Draft FNSI during the 30-day comment period, December 16, 2011 through January 15, 2012. A Notice of Availability was published in the *Everett Herald* on December 16, 2011.

During the 30-day comment period a total of TBD public comments on the Final EA and Draft FNSI were received from interested parties. A summary of the comments received on the EA and the U.S. Army's responses to those comments are included in Appendix E of the EA.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Based on the EA, it has been determined that implementation of the Preferred Alternative will have no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative adverse effects on the quality of the natural or human environment. Because no significant environmental impacts will result from implementation of the Preferred Alternative, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required and will not be prepared. Preparation of this FNSI is appropriate.

Date: _____

Kurt F. Wagner
Colonel, U.S. Army
Director, Public Works