

DRAFT
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
IMPLEMENTATION OF A MILITARY VEHICLE FUELING PLAN
FORT BLISS, TEXAS

Description of the Proposed Action: Fort Bliss, in partnership with the Defense Logistics Agency – Energy (DLA-E), proposes to implement a Fueling Plan to address the military tactical and retail (non-tactical) fueling needs of the installation. As part of the fueling Plan, five fueling facilities to be located at Doña Ana Range Camp, Orogrande Range Camp in New Mexico and at Biggs Army Airfield, the Main Post, and the Infantry Bridge Combat Team (IBCT) area in Texas would be constructed. All new tanks installed would be above-ground storage tanks (ASTs). Of several existing facilities, one would be renovated with ASTs and three obsolete facilities with underground storage tanks (USTs) would be decommissioned and demolished. The Fueling Plan also directs the DLA-E to transfer operations, and in some cases ownership, of most facilities to professional contractors. Fueling facilities at Fort Bliss dispense bulk and retail (non-tactical) fuels to include gasoline, JP8, E85, and biodiesel.

Purpose and Need: The purpose of the Fueling Plan is to address fuel facility shortfalls through the construction of new facilities and renovation of facilities, and ensure that fueling operations are carried out in a professional, safe, and environmentally sound manner. The US Army is in the process of investing significant force structure at Fort Bliss, which is the home of the US Army 1st Armored Division and the platform for multiple units deploying to the Afghan theater. Fort Bliss is therefore required to facilitate the training of troops for combat readiness. A need exists to provide fueling facilities for tactical and retail or non-tactical (government owned cars and SUVs) vehicles in support of this training, especially in more remote up-range areas such as Doña Ana Range Camp and Orogrande Range Camp. Presently, Soldiers are hauling fuel via tanker trucks to training sites, and subsequently running the risk of spilling fuel, getting involved in a catastrophic accident, and impacting soil and water resources.

These fueling facilities will provide a cost effective manner to supply both JP8 and retail fuel to Soldiers training both on the Cantonment Area and in the field; provide a regulated method of dispensing fuel per current United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED), and Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) standards; allow storage of fuel in regulated containers with secondary containments with leak detection devices; and will provide a professional operation where fuel facilities would be managed by trained professionals.

No Action Alternative: Under the No-action Alternative, fueling facilities would not be constructed or renovated at Fort Bliss. USTs would remain in the ground potentially creating a leaking tank situation. Soldiers would continue the practice of hauling fuel via tanker trucks to training sites, resulting in the increased risk of spills and safety hazards. Fuel spills could result in long-term impacts to soil and groundwater. Additionally, new Installation Restoration Program sites could be generated based on the amount of fuel spilled. Fuel spills affecting soils could also result in direct and indirect impacts to vegetation, habitat, and wildlife species. Under the No-action Alternative, there would be no change in baseline conditions of land use,

infrastructure, air quality, cultural resources, noise, socioeconomic resources, or environmental justice.

Summary of Environmental Resources and Impacts: Implementation of the Proposed Action with the incorporated design, construction, operation, and safety measures will have no significant impacts on land use, soils, biological resources, cultural resources, water resources, air quality, hazardous materials and waste, transportation and infrastructure, health and safety, and noise on Fort Bliss or the surrounding area. Construction new facilities with ASTs, removing out-dated USTs, and turning over operation of fueling facilities to professional operators would provide a net benefit to the environment. The cumulative impacts from the construction of training support infrastructure have been addressed in the *Fort Bliss, Texas and New Mexico Mission and Master Plan Final Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* for which a Record of Decision (ROD) was signed 30 April 2007 and the *Fort Bliss Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment Final Environmental Impact Statement* for which a Rod was signed 8 June 2010. This Environmental Assessment (EA) is tiered to these documents. The Proposed Action is encompassed within the scope of analysis contained in these documents.

Conclusion: Based on the analysis of the Proposed Action and the design, construction, operation, mitigation, and safety measures presented in the EA, I conclude that the impacts of the Proposed Action will not significantly affect the human or natural environment of Fort Bliss or the surrounding area. I further conclude that implementation of the Proposed Action will not constitute a major federal action requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190). Therefore, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) is warranted.

Date