

1 **Draft Finding of No Significant Impact**
2 **Fire-Flow Improvements to the Ammunition Supply Point,**
3 **Fort Irwin, California**

4 A Fire Flow Assessment Study conducted in 2014 used available information to identify fire-
5 flow deficiencies at existing buildings and recommended improvements to meet required
6 fire flows at Fort Irwin, California. The findings of this study indicated the need for fire-flow
7 improvements at the southern end of the water distribution system that includes buildings
8 located within the Ammunition Supply Point (ASP) area. Fort Irwin proposes a Capital
9 Improvement Project (CIP) to construct a water pipeline from the southwest edge of the
10 cantonment area, near the intersections of Barstow and Outer Loop Roads, to the ASP area,
11 as well as a water storage tank to improve fire flows (Proposed Action). CIP projects
12 typically address deficiencies in the infrastructure related to condition, age, insufficient
13 capacity, health and safety, and regulatory requirements. Projects that increase efficiency,
14 reduce associated operations and maintenance costs, and satisfy future projected demands
15 also are included. This project is necessary to comply with safety and health regulations,
16 meet current fire-flow needs, and provide for better system reliability, functionality, and
17 operability. This project would not result in increased water demand or use.

18 The Proposed Action includes constructing and operating approximately 2.0 miles of water
19 pipeline that would connect the water distribution system to the ASP area. The Proposed
20 Action also would involve constructing and operating a 300,000-gallon water storage tank.
21 The combination of the new pipeline and storage tank would improve water pressure and
22 fire flows to the ASP area. Fort Irwin has prepared the attached Environmental Assessment
23 (EA), which is incorporated by reference, and provides an evaluation of the environmental
24 and socioeconomic impacts of constructing and operating the Proposed Action. The actions
25 considered in the EA are part of a major federal action, which must be evaluated under the
26 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The Programmatic EA was prepared
27 pursuant to Code of Federal Regulations, Title 32, Part 651, and the President’s Council on
28 Environmental Quality regulations (Title 40, United States Code, Parts 1500 through 1508)
29 for implementing the procedural requirements of NEPA.

30 In preparation of the EA, no alternatives, other than those presented in the EA, were
31 determined to satisfy the purpose and need of the Proposed Action. Due to existing
32 underground infrastructure and potential conflicts, as well as the required elevation for the
33 water storage tank, no other locations to place the proposed water pipeline were considered
34 acceptable. Alternatives that were considered but dismissed because they did not satisfy the
35 purpose and need included one alternative that proposed piping without a storage tank and
36 one alternative that proposed piping and a booster pump station.

37 **Description of the Proposed Action**

38 The Proposed Action involves constructing recommended improvements to provide adequate
39 fire flow to the ASP area. These recommended improvements consist of three components:
40 emplacing new water pipelines, installing a 300,000-gallon water tank, and installing a new
41 water meter. The water pipelines for the Proposed Action consist of approximately 6,200 lineal
42 feet of 10-inch pipeline from near the intersection of Barstow and Outer Loop Roads to the
43 storage tank and approximately 4,400 lineal feet of 12-inch pipe from the water storage tank to

1 the ASP area. The proposed water pipeline would start at existing water infrastructure at the
2 southwestern edge of the developed cantonment near the intersection of Barstow and Outer
3 Loop Roads. The 10-inch pipeline would then traverse along road shoulders and open desert to
4 the proposed water storage tank. From the water storage tank, a 12-inch pipeline would
5 traverse across open desert and into the secured area of the ASP and connect to existing water
6 infrastructure at the ASP. The total length of the water pipeline would be approximately 2.0
7 miles. The water storage tank would contain 300,000 gallons and be constructed in the open
8 desert adjacent to an existing dirt tank trail roadway. The water storage tank would be fenced.
9 The fenced area of the water storage tank would be approximately 0.3 acre. The project would
10 also include installation of a new water meter near the intersection of Barstow and Outer Loop
11 Roads.

12 The construction limits, which generally consist of a 40-foot-wide corridor, would encompass
13 approximately 10.8 acres. Disturbance from construction of all components to improve fire
14 flow to the ASP area, including the 0.3-acre area for the water storage tank, would be confined
15 within the proposed construction limits. Three construction staging areas, totaling 6.15 acres,
16 would be used temporarily during construction. One of the proposed construction staging
17 areas is on the western side of Outer Loop Road near Barstow Road (0.62 acre), one is on the
18 eastern side of Outer Loop Road near Barstow Road (3.47 acres), and the third is near the
19 entrance of the ASP (2.06 acres). These areas have been previously disturbed and cleared of
20 vegetation.

21 The pipeline would be constructed using traditional cut-and-cover techniques. An
22 approximately 10-foot-wide trench would be required for new pipeline construction. The
23 depth of the trench would generally be 4.5 feet, but could be up to 6 feet. The crossing of
24 Fort Irwin Road would be constructed using a bore-and-jack tunneling method. An
25 approximately 0.3-acre area would be cleared for construction of the proposed water storage
26 tank, which would be included within the proposed construction limits. Approximately 20
27 workers would be needed to perform the construction work. Heavy excavation equipment
28 typically used for pipeline and civil construction would likely be used during construction of
29 the Proposed Action. This equipment could include track-mounted excavators, front-end
30 loaders, vibratory plate compactors, trench boxes, cranes, concrete pumps, chop saws, backhoe
31 excavators, water trucks, and survey equipment. Standard construction best management
32 practices (BMPs) would be utilized during construction to reduce impacts from erosion due to
33 wind and stormwater, which would occur within the proposed construction limits.
34 Construction for the Proposed Action would commence in late summer or early fall 2015.

35 **No Action Alternative**

36 Under the No Action Alternative, no construction would occur, and therefore, no
37 improvements to fire-flow deficiencies in the ASP area would occur. The buildings in the area
38 would continue to have insufficient water flow and pressure in the event of a fire incident.
39 Fort Irwin would be unable to provide for the protection of public health and safety by meeting
40 the required fire-flow demand. Under the No Action Alternative, Fort Irwin would not be able
41 to provide sufficient water supply to the ASP area to meet future water demands required
42 during a potential fire incident.

43

1 Environmental Consequences

2 The EA evaluated potential impacts on land use planning and aesthetics, geology, soils,
3 mineral resources, biological resources, water resources, air quality, noise, cultural
4 resources, socioeconomics, environmental justice, transportation, utilities, hazardous and
5 toxic substances, and recreation.

6 As discussed in the EA, implementing the Proposed Action would result in temporary and
7 less than significant negative impacts on flora and fauna from construction activities with
8 the use of mitigation. There would be temporary negative impacts on soils, air quality,
9 noise, water distribution, transportation, and hazardous and toxic substances from
10 construction activities including added workers and equipment use. There would be long-
11 term less than significant impact on aesthetics due to the change in the landscape resulting
12 from the water storage tank. Measures would be implemented, as appropriate, to reduce
13 impacts on these resources. Indirect impacts would not be expected as a result of the
14 Proposed Action.

15 There would be long-term beneficial impacts to the Fort Irwin water conveyance
16 infrastructure and health and human safety by providing needed water flow and pressure
17 for fire flows in the ASP area once the Proposed Action is operational. There would be
18 temporary beneficial impacts to the regional economy from jobs, income, and earnings from
19 construction.

20 To reduce temporary impacts related to potential traffic congestion that could occur during
21 construction a traffic control plan would be designed and implemented as needed. The
22 traffic control plan could include detours, flaggers, and would include coordination with
23 appropriate Fort Irwin staff to ensure that emergency operations are not impacted.

24 The Final EA was placed at the Barstow Public Library and Fort Irwin Environmental
25 Division, Directorate of Public Works, for public review. The public was invited to comment
26 through advertisements in the local papers.

27 For further information regarding this EA or Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI),
28 please contact: Mr. Clarence Everly, Fort Irwin Directorate of Public Works, Environmental
29 Division, Building 602, P.O. Box 105085, Fort Irwin, California, 92310-5085, or via e-mail to
30 clarence.a.everly.civ@mail.mil.

31 Conclusion

32 Based on the analysis presented in the EA, I find that implementation of the Proposed
33 Action would have no significant impact on the human or natural environment. Therefore, a
34 FNSI is issued for the Proposed Action, and no Environmental Impact Statement is required.

35

36

37

38 Date

39

40

G. Scott Taylor
COL, AR
Commanding