

DRAFT Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI)

Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)

Headquarters (HQ) Annex

Fort Belvoir, Virginia

Name of Action: Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters Annex

Description of the Proposed Action and Need: The Proposed Action involves the construction of the headquarters annex building within Fort Belvoir's North Area, in the vicinity of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) complex. The Proposed Action would be implemented accordance with the NEPA, as amended (Title 42 U.S.C. §4321 et seq.), NEPA-implementing regulations of the CEQ (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), and the Army's NEPA-implementing regulations (32 CFR Part 651, *Environmental Analysis of Army Actions*).

The purpose of this project is to build and operate an approximately 77,000 net square foot/116,080 gross square foot administrative building with an associated parking structure at Fort Belvoir to consolidate administrative facilities for approximately 650 personnel from DIA HQ to address safety, security, and operational concerns specific to the administrative functions of the agency.

The need for the facility is to alleviate the current space constraints of existing leased facilities that pose sustained and increased safety and security concerns. The approximately 650 personnel proposed to be consolidated in an administrative facility on Fort Belvoir represent the authorized civilian and military strength and require quality work environment improvements to mitigate the lack of safety, security, and efficiency. The action would also provide for compliance with Office of Management and Budget guidance identifying “good stewardship of taxpayer resources” and increasing joint site usage efficiencies.

Alternatives: The Environmental Assessment (EA) evaluated the Proposed Action, as described above, and the No Action Alternative. Two other alternatives were considered but eliminated: a 4.1-acre site at the corner of Doerr Road and 3rd Street next to the hospital, and a 16.9-acre site at the southwest corner of 1st Street and Doerr Road, both in Fort Belvoir's 1400 East Area. These alternatives were not feasible primarily due to security standoffs necessary to protect the agency's mission.

No Action Alternative: The No Action Alternative would not construct the DIA HQ at Fort Belvoir. This would result in the continued use of multiple leased spaces spread throughout the National Capital Region (NCR), which is not secure or efficient and does not meet safety standards. Additionally, the existing facilities are not compliant with current Department of Defense (DoD) antiterrorism and force protection requirements Unified Facilities Criteria 4-010-01 *DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings*.

Environmental Consequences: Environmental effects of the Proposed Action would include those related to construction and operation of the Proposed Action as well as impacts of increased personnel and traffic to Fort Belvoir. Table 1 shows the resource areas analyzed in the EA and their expected effects for the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative.

Soils and surface waters would incur impacts from vegetation clearing, causing a temporary increase in erosion from destabilization. Erosion and sediment control measures would be taken to prevent soil erosion, taken in accordance with Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law (9

VAC 25-840). A stormwater pollution prevention plan and Virginia stormwater management program construction general permit would also be acquired/implemented to prevent negative effects. Stormwater would incur impacts from the addition of impermeable surface to the project area. Increases in stormwater would be addressed by stormwater management strategies and best management practices.

Vegetation would incur impacts from removal. Replanting of native vegetation to mitigate impacts would occur. Wildlife would incur impacts from construction noise, ground disturbance, and vegetation removal. These impacts will be mitigated by replanting of vegetation. However, wildlife will suffer few negative impacts due to the relatively small area of construction. The project area is also already highly urbanized and would not be affected greatly by the addition of the HQ. Rare, threatened, and endangered species (RTE) could incur impacts from the further disturbance of potential small-whorled pogonia habitat. However, the presence of the pogonia is highly unlikely in the area due to previous disturbance. Surveys for RTE would occur prior to construction and all guidelines for their protection would be followed.

Munitions would incur beneficial impacts from munitions surveys, resulting in permanently reduced threats from unknown munition threats.

Utilities would incur impacts from increased demands with the new HQ. All the utility systems are capable of handling increased demands and will remain functional.

Noise would incur impacts during construction, which will cease when construction is completed. In addition, construction vehicles would require noise-dampening equipment as well as only operate during the day. Permanent noise level increases from commuting to and from the HQ would remain within Noise Zone II levels.

Airspace would not incur impacts with the addition of a six-story HQ building, as it would not encroach into airspace associated with the Davison Army Air Field.

Air quality would incur less-than-significant, short- and long-term adverse effects. During construction, engine emissions and potential fugitive dust emissions would have adverse effects; however, these impacts would be minimized through standard construction BMPs. Long-term operation of the facility would result in de minimis emissions.

Traffic would incur less-than-significant, short-term adverse effects on the regional roadway network and project vicinity from construction worker commutes and delivery/pickup of construction materials/debris. Less-than-significant long-term effects of increased personnel commuting to/from FBNA would occur.

Cultural and historic resources would incur no effects. No sites eligible for listing on the NRHP are located within the study area.

Socioeconomics would incur less-than-significant, beneficial impacts from the increase in workers and spending to the area, causing small economic growth.

Summary of Environmental Impacts: Based on the findings of the EA, it is anticipated that the Proposed Action would result in no significant adverse impact to any of the aforementioned resource areas. As summarized in Table 1, the Proposed Action could have minor adverse impacts on selected resources, and an overall beneficial impact on topography and soils, hazardous waste and munitions, and socioeconomics. The adverse impacts would be maintained at a less-than-significant level by implementing BMPs, permit requirements, and performing other management measures throughout the construction and operational phases.

Table 1: Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences on Environmental Resources

Resource	Proposed Action	No Action Alternative
Geology, topography, and soils	Less-than-significant, short-term adverse effects to soils; long term beneficial effects	Less-than-significant adverse impacts to soils
Water resources (Surface water, riparian buffer areas, floodplains, groundwater, stormwater)	Less-than-significant, short-term adverse effects	Less-than-significant adverse impacts to surface waters
Biological resources (Vegetation, wildlife, special status species, partners in flight)	Less-than-significant, short-term adverse effects to vegetation, wildlife, and RTE	No effects
Hazardous Waste Materials and Munitions	Less-than-significant beneficial effects to hazardous waste and munitions	No effects
Utilities (Electric, Wastewater, and Natural Gas)	Less-than-significant, long-term adverse effects to electric, wastewater, and natural gas	No effects
Noise	Less-than-significant, short-term adverse effects	No effects
Air Space	Less-than-significant, adverse effects	No effects
Air Quality	Less-than-significant, short- and long-term adverse effects.	No effects
Traffic	Less-than-significant, short-term adverse effects and less-than-significant long-term effects.	No effects
Cultural and Historic Resources	No effects	No effects
Socioeconomics, environmental justice, and protection of children	Less-than-significant, short-term beneficial effects to socioeconomics	No effects

Notice of Availability: The EA and Draft FNSI have been made available for a 30-day review and comment period by the public, regulatory agencies, and stakeholder organizations. A Notice of Availability of the EA and Draft FNSI and the 30-day review period was published in the *Springfield Connection*, the *Mount Vernon Voice*, and the *Gazette*. Printed copies of the EA and Draft FNSI are available for review at the Fort Belvoir Van Noy Library; the Fairfax County Library - Kingstowne Branch, Lorton Branch, and the Sherwood Branch; and on the installation's website at: <https://home.army.mil/belvoir/index.php/about/Garrison/directorate-public-works/environmental-division>.

Response to Comments: Comments from federal, state, and local agencies and the public received during the public review period will be considered by Fort Belvoir for incorporation into the Final EA.

Conclusion: Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations; Title 40, CFR Section 1500-1508 regarding procedural implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969; and implemented for the Army by Title 32 CFR 651, Environmental Analysis of Army Actions, it is anticipated that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and that a FNSI is appropriate. An environmental impact statement (EIS) will not be prepared.

Joshua P. SeGraves
Colonel, U.S. Army
Commanding

Date