

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR  
FIELDING OF THE ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE**



Prepared by  
**UNITED STATES ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL COMMAND,  
JOINT BASE SAN ANTONIO – FORT SAM HOUSTON**



## **1.0. TITLE OF THE ACTION**

Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Fielding of the Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle (AMPV)

## **2.0. BACKGROUND.**

The United States (U.S.) Army has developed a Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) to analyze the environmental and socioeconomic impacts associated with the proposed fielding of the Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle (AMPV) to appropriate Active Component (AC) and Reserve Component (RC) units, including the Army National Guard, and subsequently operating and maintaining these vehicles in support of Army training and mission requirements. The PEA and this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) have been prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (Title 42 of the United States Code [U.S.C.] Section [§] 4321 *et seq.*), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA implementing regulation (40 Code of Federal Regulations [C.F.R.] Parts 1500-1508), and the Army's NEPA implementing regulation, *Environmental Analysis of Army Actions* (32 C.F.R. Part 651).

The Army's AC and RC support the Army's ability to conduct Multi-Domain Operations. This modernization strategy is identified in the 2019 Army Modernization Strategy (AMS). Development of one of the materiel solutions for this modernization strategy resulted in the AMPV, with the AMPV capability identified in the AMS as a signature effort of the Army's Next Generation Combat Vehicle Cross Functional Team.

The Army needs to replace the M113s to improve the safety and survivability of Soldiers and provide for improved integrated network capability and interoperability across the spectrum of combat vehicle mission roles. The M113 has remained in the formations as a general personnel carrier, ambulance, medical treatment vehicle, mortar carrier, and mobile command post for over 50 years. Locations that have been authorized the M113 variants should replace them with the AMPV.

## **3.0. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

The Proposed Action is to field AMPVs to replace five mission roles currently provided by M113s, to include associated operations, Soldier training, and AMPV maintenance activities.

Under the Proposed Action, the Army would field AMPV units to several proposed installations in order to replace, on a one-to-one ratio, the equivalent mission roles currently fulfilled by M113 variants. Though minor adjustments in the variant mix may occur, Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) structures and manpower would remain largely unchanged as a result of AMPV fielding. Approximately 130 vehicles of an M113 variant are fielded to each ABCT.

Under the No Action Alternative, the AMPVs would not be fielded; Army units would continue to use M113s despite the fact that M113s are no longer able to incorporate useful modifications, Soldier safety and survivability needs would not be addressed, and integrated network capability as well as interoperability improvements would not be realized.

#### **4.0. SUMMARY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of implementing the Proposed Action at any of the potential installations assessed in the PEA. The *Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle (AMPV) Life Cycle Environmental Assessment (LCEA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (July 2020)* determined that the AMPV is expected to have minimal overall impacts over the system lifecycle, and that it is typical of tracked, combat vehicle systems within the Army inventory.

Each resource area identified in the PEA was analyzed for potential impacts resulting from implementing the Proposed Action and any known cumulative actions. Potential impacts were classified by the following categories: beneficial impacts, no impacts, and potential adverse impacts (negligible, minor, moderate/ less than significant, significant but mitigatable, or significant). These impacts are summarized in Table 8, Summary of Potential Effects of the Evaluated Alternatives, of the PEA.

Impacts that are anticipated would be minimized through avoidance, best management practices (BMPs), and the implementation of existing environmental protection measures. Avoidance strategies depend on the installation selected. Examples of environmental protection measures would include implementing erosion and stormwater control measures; maintaining vehicles and equipment; and sustaining vegetation cover at the construction and training sites. Buffers for sensitive resources (biological and cultural) are employed during training, depending on the requirements of the installation. The Army will continue to adhere to legal and regulatory requirements, and continue to implement its approved management plans, standard operating procedures, and BMPs.

In compliance with Executive Orders 12898 and 14008 the Army reviewed the potential for impacts of the proposed action to Environmental Justice (EJ) communities. The relatively small population changes associated with the proposed action as compared to the population of each installation assessed would produce negligible socioeconomic changes. Detailed consideration of affects to EJ communities was dismissed; any changes would be distributed throughout the ROI with no disproportionate impacts to EJ communities or children. Also, any specific sites proposed as potential locations of facilities have been screened for other impacts such as construction or operational noise, hazardous materials and waste, or safety through the real property master planning process.

#### **5.0 PUBLIC REVIEW AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION**

The PEA and Draft FONSI were made available for a 30-day public, agency, and Tribal review on March 3, 2023, when a Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register. That same day, electronic copies of the PEA and draft FONSI were made available for download from the United States Army Environmental Command (USAEC) website at: <https://aec.army.mil/index.php?cID=352>. Comments were requested to be submitted at US Army Environmental Command, ATTN AMPV Public Comments, 2455 Reynolds Rd, Mail Stop 112, JBSA-Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-7588, by email to: [usarmy.jbsa.imcom-aec.mbx.nepa@army.mil](mailto:usarmy.jbsa.imcom-aec.mbx.nepa@army.mil), or by phone at 210-466-1590 or 210-466-1655.

Prior to the public comment period, the AMPV PEA and Draft FONSI were made available, and notices were sent to federally-recognized Native American Tribes affiliated with the assessed installations. They were invited to review the documents and initiate government-to-government consultations if they deemed them necessary. No government-to-government consultations have been initiated related to fielding the AMPV.

One comment was received from the Chicksaw Nation determining the project was outside their area and that they have no objection to it. No other comments were received during the public comment period related to fielding the AMPV.

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

Based on a careful review of the PEA and the fact that no specific comments were received as a result of the March 3, 2023 Notice of Availability publication, I have determined that no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to the human or natural environment are anticipated at any of the 28 installations as a result of implementation of either Alternative. The information in public comments and other new information discussed in the Public Review and Interagency Coordination section of this document do not constitute significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns that would require supplementation of the PEA. Nevertheless, all comments were taken into account in making this decision. The Army concludes that the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative are not major Federal actions that would significantly affect the quality of the environment per Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA; an environmental impact statement is not required and will not be prepared. My decision is based on the PEA's analysis of potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts associated with the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative. This decision meets the requirements of the NEPA and its implementing regulations and has been made after considering all submitted information and examining a full range of reasonable alternatives and all environmental impacts. This concludes the NEPA process for this action.



\_\_\_\_\_  
KEVIN VEREEN  
LTG, U.S. Army  
Deputy Chief of Staff, G-9



\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



\_\_\_\_\_  
PATRICK E. MATLOCK  
LTG, U.S. Army  
Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/7



\_\_\_\_\_  
Date