

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared for the proposed development of a new Readiness Center to be operated by the 35th Infantry Division Headquarters (35ID HQ; Division Headquarters) of the Kansas Army National Guard (KSARNG) located at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The purpose of this EA is to inform decision-makers and the public of the likely environmental consequences of the Proposed Action and alternatives, and to solicit input from the public and regulators concerning implementation of the Proposed Action.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to provide the 35ID HQ a new facility with the greatest efficiency and lowest overall costs at the same licensed area as the Mission Training Command (MTC). Currently, the site offers only enough area for one of the units to fulfill their mission requirements; the majority of the existing facilities are fitted to support the MTC mission. The Proposed Action of building a new Readiness Center for the 35ID Headquarters is needed to increase overall efficiency, maximize return on costs, and to meet the mission objectives of the 35ID Headquarters by providing a modernized facility in Fiscal Year 2015.

Alternatives

This EA includes evaluation of potential environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic impacts resulting from the following alternatives:

Alternative 1: Proposed Action – Construct, occupy, and operate an approximately 120,450 square-foot Readiness Center facility at the current privately owned vehicle (POV) parking lot, and construct a 500-space and 62-space POV parking lot located north of the Mission Training Complex (MTC) in Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Alternative 2: No Action Alternative – Continue with operations as currently conducted; maintain the status-quo and do not implement the Proposed Action.

Evaluation of Environmental Consequences

The EA presents a discussion of the current environmental conditions that would be affected if the Proposed Action was implemented. Environmental consequences evaluated as part of this EA include the following:

- Land Use
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Geology, Topography, and Soils
- Water Resources
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Socioeconomics

- Environmental Justice
- Infrastructure
- Hazardous and Toxic Materials

Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts for the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future were also analyzed for each of the environmental consequences as a result of the Proposed Action and the No Action alternatives. Local, state, and federal agencies were contacted for expertise in evaluating the impacts of the alternatives on the environment.

Where applicable, mitigation measures were investigated for the direct and indirect impacts resulting from the Proposed Action.

Public Comment

Following the initial drafting of this EA, a public comment period was conducted for 30 days. The comments submitted by agencies, organizations, or members of the public during this period were included into the Final EA and were addressed as appropriate.

Conclusion

The evaluations and analyses performed within this EA conclude that there would be no significant adverse impact, either individually or cumulatively, to the local environment or quality of life as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative during construction. Therefore, this EA's analysis determines that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is unnecessary for implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative, and that a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) is appropriate. This EA recommends implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative. No mitigation measures will be necessary to reduce any adverse environmental impacts to below significant levels.