

Finding of No Significant Impact

Alternate Implementation of the Privatization of Army Lodging Program Fort Belvoir, Virginia

Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations (Title 40 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500–1508) for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (Title 42 of the *United States Code* 4321 *et seq.*) and 32 CFR Part 651 (*Environmental Analysis of Army Actions*), Fort Belvoir, Virginia, conducted an environmental assessment (EA) of the potential environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with implementing the Army's Privatization of Army Lodging (PAL) program with a new hotel constructed on a parcel of leased land near the Fort Belvoir Community Hospital, but with no new hotel constructed near Knadle Hall.

Background

The Army finalized an EA for implementation of the PAL program at Fort Belvoir, Virginia in January 2011 (2011 PAL EA). A Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) for the proposed action of that EA was signed on July 13, 2011. The Army's proposed action and Preferred Alternative in the 2011 PAL EA was to implement the PAL program at Fort Belvoir, which involved the Army's conveying specified lodging facilities to Lend Lease, LLC (Lend Lease) and granting to it a 48-year lease of the land underlying the installation's existing lodging facilities and other land for construction of new lodging facilities. The Army and Lend Lease signed a lease for the lodging facilities and land included in the PAL program on Fort Belvoir, which included the PAL Parcels A, B, C, D, and G, in August 2011.

The Army had planned to construct a Recreational Lodging Facility to serve visitors and family members of patients at the new hospital. The facility was to be funded separately from PAL actions. Funding for the Recreational Lodging Facility was denied, however. Under the PAL action at Fort Belvoir, as analyzed in the 2011 PAL EA, a new Staybridge Suites was to be constructed next to the existing Knadle Hall, the main visitor lodging facility on the installation. The Army determined, however, that if only one new lodging facility is to be constructed, the installation would best be served if it was near the new Fort Belvoir Community Hospital. These events came to pass after the FNSI for the 2011 PAL EA was signed.

Preferred Alternative

In this EA, the Army's Preferred Alternative is to execute a lease of an additional parcel of land to Lend Lease for the construction of a new hotel across Belvoir Road from the Fort Belvoir Community Hospital; a new hotel, therefore, would not be constructed near Knadle Hall, which was part of the Preferred Alternative in the 2011 PAL EA. The Army would grant a 47-year lease of the land (PAL Parcel F, or the Community Center parcel) on which the new facility across from the hospital would be constructed by Lend Lease. Most other aspects of the PAL program at Fort Belvoir would be implemented as described in the 2011 PAL EA (Table 1). Lend Lease would be expected to meet Fort Belvoir's lodging requirements by constructing and operating a new hotel on the Community Center parcel, as well as by operating and maintaining the existing facilities and renovating inadequate facilities. The new Preferred Alternative, as analyzed in the subject EA, would increase the number of lodging units under the PAL program at Fort Belvoir from the existing number of 525 to about 532.

**Table 1
Comparison of Preferred Alternatives in 2011 PAL EA and this EA**

Proposed Action as Presented in the 2011 PAL EA					New Preferred Alternative	
Acres	Building	Current units	End state	2011 PAL EA action	End state	New PAL action
Parcel A (Knadle Hall)						
10.5	470	219	217	Renovate and maintain in lodging portfolio	217	Renovate Knadle Hall and maintain in lodging portfolio; no new build
	NB	0	200	Preferred new build site; Staybridge Suites	0	
Parcel B (Fairfax Village)						
8	505	45	0	Renovate for short-term use, then demolish	0	No change in development plan
	506	29	0		0	
	507	42	42	Renovate and maintain in lodging portfolio	42	
	508	42	42		42	
	509	35	35		35	
Parcel C (PCS Suites)						
1.5	806	9	9	Renovate and maintain in lodging portfolio	9	No change in development plan
	807	16	15		15	
Parcel D (Historic BOQs)						
4	80	44	0	Renovate for STH, then return to Army	0	No change in development plan
	81	44	0		0	
Parcel G (Additional Lease Area)						
15.5	N/A	0	0	Site not to be used	0	No change in development plan
Parcel F (Community Center Parcel) (Preferred New Build Site)						
2	N/A	0	N/A	Not part of 2011 PAL action	172 ^a	Preferred new build site; Staybridge Suites

Notes: BOQs=Bachelor Officer's Quarters, FNSI=Finding of No Significant Impact, NB=New Build, PCS=Permanent Change of Station, STH = short-term hold.

^a A new hotel on the Community Center parcel is anticipated to have 141 rooms, but could have up to 172 rooms. For the purposes of this analysis, a hotel with the maximum number of rooms is assumed.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of and need for the proposed action is to provide affordable, quality transient lodging facilities to Soldiers and their families through a combination of new facilities and improvements to existing facilities, and to best serve the Fort Belvoir community, including Soldiers, visitors, and family members of patients in the new hospital.

Alternatives Considered

A No Action Alternative and a Preferred Alternative are analyzed in the EA. Under the No Action Alternative, the Army would implement the PAL program at Fort Belvoir as analyzed in the 2011 PAL EA (USACE Mobile District 2011) and its FNSI. The No Action Alternative is described in detail in the 2011 PAL EA.

Under the Preferred Alternative, Lend Lease would implement the PAL Program at Fort Belvoir in the same manner as described in the 2011 PAL EA and its FNSI, except that instead of a 200-room Staybridge Suites next to Knadle Hall on Parcel A, a 172-room Staybridge Suites would be constructed on the Community Center parcel near the Fort Belvoir Community Hospital. The new hotel would replace much of the outdated lodging infrastructure at Fort Belvoir. The Army would grant to Lend Lease a 47-year lease of the Community Center parcel for the construction of a Staybridge Suites. Other aspects of the PAL program implementation would remain unchanged.

Factors Considered in Determining that No Environmental Impact Statement is Required

The EA, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference into this FNSI, examines the potential effects of the No Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative on resource areas and areas of environmental and socioeconomic concern: land use, aesthetic and visual resources, air quality, noise, geology and soils, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics (including environmental justice and protection of children), transportation, utilities, and hazardous and toxic materials.

Implementing the Preferred Alternative would be expected to result in a combination of short- and long-term minor adverse and beneficial effects. No effects would be expected on land use, cultural resources, or hazardous and toxic materials. Short-term minor adverse effects on aesthetics and visual resources, air quality, noise, soils, surface and groundwater, biological resources, and transportation would be expected, primarily associated with construction and renovation activities. Long-term minor adverse effects would be expected on air quality (from operational emissions), water resources (from new impervious areas), and on utilities (from the consumption of landfill capacity). Long-term minor beneficial effects on aesthetics and visual resources and socioeconomics would be expected from the overall improved quality of the lodging facilities. Long-term minor beneficial effects on surface and ground waters would result from increased stormwater infiltration on any areas converted from an impervious to a pervious surface.

Mitigation actions are used to reduce, avoid, or compensate for significant adverse effects. The EA does not identify any significant adverse effects on human health or the environment; however, potential adverse effects of implementing the proposed action would be minimized by implementing the BMP listed below.

- In accordance with Fort Belvoir's two-to-one tree replacement policy, the Army or its proponent would replace any tree of 4 inches or more in diameter (at *breast height*) removed in the course of implementing the PAL program with two native trees to provide habitat value for wildlife on Fort Belvoir property.

Public Review

The final EA and draft FNSI were available for review and comment for 30 calendar days, beginning upon publication of a notice of availability (NOA) in the *Washington Post* and the *Springfield Connection* on September 27, 2012. Copies of the EA and Draft FNSI were available for review and comment the Fort Belvoir Van Noy Library and at five branches of the Fairfax County Public Library System (John Marshall, Kingstowne, Lorton, Sherwood Regional, and City of Fairfax Regional). Comments on the EA and draft FNSI were received from the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)—which included comments from Fairfax County, Virginia; the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS); the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA); and the Catawba Indian Nation. DEQ (and Fairfax County) and USEPA noted permitting and regulatory requirements that the Army would have to meet before and during PAL development, which the Army and Lend Lease will comply with as a matter of complying with state and federal regulatory requirements, and commented on the importance of incorporating energy- and water-saving features in site and hotel design. NRCS and the Catawba Indian Nation had no concerns with respect to the proposed project. No comment was received

that would alter the conclusion that no significant impacts would occur as a result of implementing the proposed action. The comments and responses to them are attached to the EA as Appendix J.

Conclusions

On the basis of the EA, the comments received on it, and this FNSI, it has been determined that implementing the Preferred Alternative would have no significant impacts on the quality of human life or the natural environment. Preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required before implementing the proposed action.



GREGORY D. GADSON
Colonel, US Army
Garrison Commander
Fort Belvoir, Virginia

17 Jan 13
Date