

## **DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FNSI)**

### **PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (PEA): IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NET ZERO PROGRAM AT ARMY INSTALLATIONS**

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army

**PROPOSED ACTION:** The Proposed Action (Alternative 3) and subject of this PEA is to strategically implement Net Zero at Army installations based on mission needs, consumption, and existing resource constraints while still achieving existing environmental mandates. The Proposed Action's potential projects represent a broad spectrum of possible energy, water, and waste related projects that may be implemented. The Net Zero Installation program would require Army installations to evaluate the feasibility of and then implement to the maximum extent practicable and fiscally responsible: (1) producing as much renewable energy on the installation as it uses annually, (2) limiting the consumption of freshwater resources and returning water back to the same watershed so as not to deplete the groundwater and surface water resources of that region in quantity or quality, and (3) reducing, reusing, and recovering waste streams, converting them to resource value with zero solid waste disposed in landfills. Not all potential projects discussed in this PEA will be implemented and some of these may have already been implemented at pilot and non-pilot installations to help achieve existing Federal and Army environmental mandates. The Army does not consider Net Zero as a stand-alone program and intends to leverage existing resources and collaborate with other federal agencies and the private sector to strive toward the Net Zero Initiative's energy, water, and waste reduction goals.

**ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:** During the preparation of this PEA, two alternatives to the Proposed Action were identified. Alternative 1 is No Action. This alternative would result in the Army not pursuing Net Zero Initiatives. Alternative 2 is to implement the Net Zero program Army-wide. This PEA characterizes and analyzes the probable and possible environmental impacts associated with implementation of the Proposed Action (Alternative 3) and Alternative 2.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES:** This PEA evaluates potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the Net Zero Installation program at Army installations. Potential environmental effects resulting from the Proposed Action and alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, are identified in this PEA. The Army identified no significant environmental effects associated with implementation of Net Zero that cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance with site-specific best management practices or other mitigation measures. Installation-specific actions to implement Net Zero will require an appropriate level of supplemental NEPA analysis and documentation.

**FACTORS CONSIDERED IN THE FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:** The PEA systematically reviews the nature of the Proposed Action and associated risks and issues. Alternatives with regard to needs of the United States and the U.S. Army and potential adverse effects on the environment are evaluated.

The following chart lists the effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the Proposed Action:

Resource	Effects
Land Use	Minor effects (except for any proposed large-scale renewable energy projects which would be mitigated within the installation-specific NEPA analysis)
Geological Resources	Negligible to minor effects
Air Quality	Minor to positive effects
Air Space	Negligible effects
Noise	Minor effects
Water Resources	Minor to positive effects
Biological Resources	Minor effects
Historical and Cultural Resources	Minor effects
Health and Safety	Minor effects
Hazardous Materials	Minor effects
Local Socioeconomic Environment	Negligible to positive effects
Cumulative Effects	Minor effects

Many of these effects are temporary in nature (e.g., associated with construction) that can be mitigated through project workplans and health and safety plans, and through implementation of best management practices. Some of the minor effects associated with the construction phase may also be offset by positive effects during the operations phase (e.g., the production of renewable energy, increased water conservation, lower greenhouse gas emissions).

**CONCLUSIONS AND FINDING:** The principal conclusions of this PEA are:

- Implementing Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 (the preferred alternative) would not result in significant adverse environmental effects, provided that installation-specific NEPA analysis is prepared and best management practices to mitigate any potential environmental effect are adhered to during construction and operation of potential projects;
- Implementing Alternative 3 (the preferred alternative) would allow the Army to address key Federal environmental mandates and sustainability initiatives;
- Implementing Alternative 1 (No Action) would not allow the Army to be as effective at addressing Federal mandates, nor enhance energy or water security.

Based on the analysis contained in the PEA and the Army's intent to follow prescribed regulations and implement mitigation measures identified above, I have determined that Alternative 3 will have no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative adverse effects on the human or natural environment. Therefore I conclude that Alternative 3 is not a major Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act and approve selection of Alternative 3.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Katharine Hammack  
Assistant Secretary of the Army  
(Installations, Energy and Environment)

Date: \_\_\_\_\_