

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FNSI) FOR THE
CLOSURE, DISPOSAL AND REUSE OF THE
WICHITA FALLS U.S. ARMY RESERVE CENTER,
WICHITA FALLS, TEXAS**

Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR 1400-1508) for implementing the procedural provisions of the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 et. seq.) and the U.S. Department of Army Regulation 32 CFR 651 (*Environmental Analysis of Army Actions*; Final Rule), as well as policy and guidance provided by the *Base Realignment and Closure Manual for Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act*, the U.S. Army conducted an environmental assessment (EA) of potential environmental effects associated with implementation of BRAC realignment actions.

Purpose and Need. On September 8, 2005, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended closure of the Wichita Falls United States Army Reserve (USAR) Center, Wichita Falls, Texas and relocation of essential missions to other installations. These recommendations were approved by the President on September 23, 2005, were forwarded to Congress, and on November 9, 2005, the recommendations became law. The BRAC Commission recommendations must now be implemented as provided for in the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended. The BRAC Commission made the following recommendations concerning Wichita Falls USAR Center, Wichita Falls, Texas:

“Close the Keathley and Burriss United States Army Reserve Centers located in Lawton and Chickasha, OK; close the Wichita Falls United States Army Reserve Center in Wichita Falls, TX; close the 1st, 3rd, 5th, and 6th United States Army Reserve Centers and Equipment Concentration Site (ECS) located on Fort Sill, OK, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Sill and a new United States Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site to be collocated with the Oklahoma Army National Guard Maneuver Area Training Equipment Site on Fort Sill”.

Description of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action, disposal and reuse, follows the BRAC Commission’s recommendation to close the Wichita Falls USAR Center, Wichita Falls, Texas.

Alternatives. Three alternatives are evaluated in this EA.

Preferred Alternative. For the Preferred Alternative, the Army would close Wichita Falls USAR Center and make a public benefit conveyance of the entire parcel to the City of Wichita Falls for use as a City of Wichita Falls Parks & Recreation Maintenance Facility and passive recreation area under the Federal Lands to Parks Program, as recommended by the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) in its reuse plan.

Caretaker Status Alternative. From the time of operational closure until conveyance of the Property, the Army will provide maintenance to preserve and protect the site for reuse in an economical manner that facilitates redevelopment. Under this alternative, the Army would reduce maintenance levels to the minimum level for surplus government property.

No Action Alternative. CEQ regulations require analysis of the No Action Alternative in an EA, for it serves as the baseline against which the impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives will be evaluated. Accordingly, the No Action Alternative is evaluated in this EA.

Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Further Analysis. Since no cleanup actions are required, the Property is not a suitable candidate for early transfer, and this alternative was not carried forward for further analysis. The Wichita Falls USAR Center LRA did not receive any additional notices of interest from other agencies or public entities; therefore, no other reuses are carried forward for further analysis in this EA.

Factors Considered in Determining that an Environmental Impact Statement is not Required. Impacts were analyzed for land use, aesthetics and visual resources, air quality, noise, geology and soils, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, transportation, utilities, and hazardous and toxic substances. No significant impacts from implementation of the proposed disposal and reuse action would occur.

Conclusion. Based on the environmental impact analyses described in the EA, which is hereby incorporated into this FNSI, none of the alternatives for the Proposed Action would have a significant impact on the quality of the natural or the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not required and will not be prepared.

Public Comment. The Army began a 30-day public review period by placing a Notice of Availability of the final EA and draft FNSI in the *Times Record News* of Wichita Falls and the *Dallas Morning News* on February 12, 2012. Interested parties were invited to review and comment on the EA and draft FNSI and were informed of their availability at the Wichita Falls Public Library, 600 11th Street, Wichita Falls, Texas 76301, and on the BRAC website at http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/env_ea_review.htm. Reviewers were invited to submit comments on the EA and draft FNSI during the 30-day public comment period via mail or e-mail to the following: Ms. Laura Caballero Chief, Environmental Division, 63d Directorate of Public Works, 230 R.T. Jones Road, Mountain View, California 94043 or e-mail: laura.caballero@usar.army.mil. No comments were received during the 30-day comment period.

Date: 11 APR 2012


FOR THE COMMANDER

ROBERT D. JOHNSON
COLONEL, EN
Regional Engineer