

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT PLAN  
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, UPDATED FEBRUARY 2006  
ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MARYLAND**

**1.0 Name of Action:** Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, Updated Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP).

**2.0 Description of the Proposed Action:** Fort Meade proposes to implement an updated IPMP to provide an integrated and comprehensive method for managing pest management activities on the installation. The updated IPMP defines roles and responsibilities for pest management within the installation and provides a basis for addressing all applicable legal requirements and best management practices consistent with achievement of the needs, goals, and objectives of the installation's military mission.

**3.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Action:** The proposed action is full implementation of the 2005 IPMP. The 2005 IPMP details Fort Meade's Pest Management Program at Fort Meade, which is designed to employ chemical and non-chemical control measures to achieve effective pest control with minimal environmental impact. Pest control is needed to prevent interference with military operations and to minimize nuisance pest infestation among post inhabitants and the general public. This plan identifies the existing pests at Fort Meade and characterizes their destructive abilities. This plan provides guidance for operating and maintaining an effective pest management program.

Principles of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) are stressed in this plan. IPM uses the best mix of available control methods for achieving the most effective, economic and environmentally safe pest management possible. Use of the information contained in this plan and adherence to the IPM principles would ensure the selection and implementation of effective control measures are both economically and environmentally acceptable.

The "No Action" Alternative is one in which the IPMP is not implemented and thus, there would be no integrated approach to pest management on Fort Meade. Principles of IPM would not be employed. Pest management would continue to be conducted in support of military training and would comply with state and federal legal requirements.

**4.0 Anticipated Environmental Impacts:** The proposed action is consistent with current military standards and criteria, and designed to be integrated to the greatest extent possible with the mission of the post. Compliance with the plan also would ensure that proper regulatory procedures have been followed. Maintenance of the plan would be provided by technical on-site program reviews, and annual updates by the Installation Pest Management Coordinator with assistance from other professionals pursuant to Army Regulations. All objectives outlined in this plan are to be reviewed on a five-year cycle.

Major revisions based on new regulations, laws, and mission changes should be incorporated into the plan at the five-year review cycle.

Full implementation of the IPMP is anticipated to have overall positive impact to all six major environmental areas: land use, natural resources, cultural resources, human health and safety, sociological environment and military training. Beneficial effects are anticipated for all major attributes of these six areas. Therefore, this is the preferred alternative. The goals, objectives, and established procedures of the IPMP are consistent with agency regulations and guidance. The IPMP emphasizes that all chemical applications would follow specific label directions, which is the EPA's letter of the law for use of chemicals.

There would be no formal, integrated plan for the management of pests under the "No Action" Alternative. The absence of a formal set of management measures inhibits an installation's ability to adequately engage in future strategic planning and new initiatives. It would not capture benefits derived from identifying and executing comprehensive, integrated pest management actions. Also, there would be no formal set of goals and objectives established for the natural resources management program that explicitly guides pest management. Therefore, this is not the preferred alternative.

**5.0 Findings:** Implementing the proposed action addressed in the EA would not be expected to significantly alter baseline environmental conditions. Based on the analysis of potential impacts, the implementation of the updated IPMP would not constitute a significant Federal action that would affect the quality of the human or natural environment as defined within Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended. An Environmental Impact Statement is, therefore, not required for this action and will not be prepared.

**Notice of Availability:** Copies of the EA and this Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) are available for public review and comment online at <http://www.fortmeade-ems.org/> under the NEPA program area and at the Anne Arundel West County Area Library, or may be obtained at the Fort Meade Environmental Division Office, 239 Ross Road, Fort Meade, Maryland, 20755. Interested parties are invited to submit written comments for consideration on or before 30 days after publication of the Notice of Availability of the EA and FNSI to the above address. The proposed action will not be implemented before this date. For more information, contact Mr. Michael Butler at (301) 677-9648.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
KENNETH O. MCCREEDY  
Colonel, Military Intelligence  
Commanding