

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR A RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARK AT NAVAL  
SUPPORT ACTIVITY ANNAPOLIS, ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND**

**Introduction**

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 United States Code 4321 et seq.) and Department of the Navy (Navy) NEPA procedures, the Navy gives notice that an Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared and that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required for the construction of a recreational vehicle (RV) park at Naval Support Activity (NSA) Annapolis in Annapolis, Maryland.

**Description of the Proposed Action**

The Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) program proposes to construct a new RV Park at NSA Annapolis, featuring 35–50 individual sites with concrete RV pads and adjacent car pads. At least four concrete RV pads would meet the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) Accessibility Standards. Each site would have electrical service and freeze-proof hose and water and sewer connections. The RV Park would include tent and primitive camping sites and an ABA-accessible Comfort Station with laundry facilities, unisex cabana-style rooms, vending machines, Wi-Fi, and an enclosed dumpster/recycling pad. Utilities, including a 50-amp hook-up service, would be provided. Trash and recycling would be routinely serviced by a contractor. Natural surroundings would be preserved to the maximum extent practicable, and additional trees would be planted. The existing RV Park would remain in use for patrons who do not need ABA accessibility or modernized features.

**Purpose and Need**

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to construct an RV Park at NSA Annapolis. The RV Park would include ABA-compliant features, modern campground facilities and RV hook-ups (specifically, size and infrastructure to accommodate newer, larger RVs), and tent and primitive camping sites. The Proposed Action is needed for four reasons:

- 1. ABA Accessibility.** Eligible patrons do not have ABA-accessible, MWR program RV Park facilities in the Annapolis, Maryland area. The existing RV Park does not meet the ABA Accessibility Standards.
- 2. Military Health.** The mental, physical, and emotional well-being of military personnel positively affects the way military personnel think and act and is crucial for military retention and readiness. The MWR program is tasked with continually identifying additional opportunities for promoting positive military mental and physical health.
- 3. Capacity Demand.** The existing RV Park is not large enough to meet the demand for MWR program RV/camping facilities in the region.

**4. Infrastructure Demand.** The existing RV Park does not have adequate infrastructure to meet the demands of modern RVs.

### **Alternatives**

Alternatives were developed for analysis based upon the following screening factors:

1. The site should be large enough to accommodate the demand for 35–50 RV pads, an ABA-compliant Comfort Station, and associated facilities.
2. The site should have adjacent utilities and the ability to support permanent infrastructure for RV Park restroom and facilities.
3. Existing adjacent land uses should be compatible with a new RV Park to provide the desired RV Park setting: natural, quiet, and minimally developed.
4. The site should not adversely affect cultural resources.
5. The site should have easy access to an existing road.
6. The site should use previously disturbed areas, require minimal tree clearing, and avoid or minimize adverse effects on federal and state-listed rare, threatened, or endangered plant species and wetlands.

The Navy considered a No Action Alternative and two action alternatives that meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action.

**No Action Alternative:** Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not be implemented. Disabled eligible personnel who require ABA-compliant facilities would continue to be unable to access the NSA Annapolis RV Park. Eligible patrons—military patrons, their families, civilian employees, military retirees, and other eligible participants—would be limited to the existing non-ABA-compliant RV Park. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no additional benefits to the mental and physical well-being of military personnel.

In addition, the existing RV Park only includes 14 RV sites and 12 tent camping sites, which does not meet the demand for recreational campsites for military personnel and their families in the region. Furthermore, the existing RV Park does not meet the infrastructure requirements for modern, larger RVs. Thus, the existing RV Park would continue to be used only for RVs that do not require larger pads and modernized infrastructure. The No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action; however, the No Action Alternative is carried forward for analysis in this EA to establish a comparative baseline.

**Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative):** Under Alternative 1, the Proposed Action would be implemented at the northern end of Greenbury Point adjacent to and east of Hooper High Road, including a portion of Beach Circle (roadway). The Mill Creek shoreline and Mill Creek Marina are approximately 100 feet away from Alternative 1's northern site boundary, and the Whitehall Bay shoreline is approximately 100 feet away from the eastern site boundary.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR A RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARK AT NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY  
ANNAPOLIS, ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND

Alternative 1 is on an elevated parcel of land that previously contained three Bachelor's Enlisted Quarters, which were demolished in 2010.

Based on the size of the Alternative 1 site, approximately 35 individual RV sites (concrete RV pad with adjacent car pad) and tent and primitive campsites would be constructed. At least four of the RV sites would be ABA-compliant and an ABA-compliant Comfort Station would be constructed. Utilities would connect to the site, including water, wastewater, stormwater, and electrical utility lines. A trench or directional bore would be created for an internet line. A pedestrian walkway/drive aisle would likely connect the campsites and facilities to Hooper High Road. Under Alternative 1, the limit of disturbance would be approximately 3.25 acres, with approximately 1 acre of new impervious surface. Most of the site has grass and trees along the edges, which would be preserved to the maximum extent practicable; however, up to 0.5 acres of trees could be cleared along the southern boundary of the site, depending on final site designs.

**Alternative 2:** Under Alternative 2, the Proposed Action would be constructed at the North Severn Complex at Beach Road, just southwest of Kinkaid Road. Alternative 2 is adjacent to the existing RV Park and is 1,109 feet (0.21 miles) from the Severn River. The Alternative 2 site includes an existing grass softball field to the south and a forested area on the northeast portion. An installation support building, the Retelle building, is on the southwest portion adjacent to the softball field. The Retelle building was constructed in 1946 and is the only structure under Navy ownership that remains out of 96 buildings and other structures of the former Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC).

Under Alternative 2, approximately 35–50 individual RV sites (concrete RV pad with adjacent car pad) and tent and primitive campsites would be constructed. A proposed access road would connect the site to Beach Road. Utilities that would connect to the site include water, wastewater, stormwater, electrical, and internet lines. Due to the steep slopes and uneven terrain of the Alternative 2 site, extensive clearing and grading would be required, particularly beyond the relatively flat area of the softball field. Trees would be preserved to the maximum extent practicable, but up to 1.9 acres of trees may need to be cleared due to site grading requirements.

Under Alternative 2, the Proposed Action could be implemented with one of the following two options:

**Option A.** A new building would be constructed within the Alternative 2 site for the ABA-compliant Comfort Station. The Retelle building would remain on the site. Under this option, the limit of disturbance would be approximately 4.5 acres, and there would be 1.35 acres of new impervious surface.

**Option B.** The Retelle building would be renovated for use as the ABA-compliant Comfort Station. The Retelle building is currently used for recreational purposes. Under this option, the limit of disturbance would be approximately 4.5 acres. Option B would result in 1.30 acres of impervious surface (0.05 acres less than Option A) due to the reuse of the Retelle building.

### **Environmental Effects of the Preferred Alternative**

The EA examined in detail the potential effects of the No Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 on the following resource areas: air quality, water resources, geological resources, cultural resources, visual resources, biological resources, land use, noise, infrastructure, transportation, public health and safety. The following is a summary of the environmental consequences of Alternative 1, as it is the Navy's Preferred Alternative.

**Air Quality:** There would be no significant effects on air quality. The Proposed Action would result in direct, short- and long-term, minor effects on air quality due to construction and vehicular emissions from site use. Estimated construction and operations emissions would be well below *de minimis* and major source thresholds.

**Water Resources:** There would be no significant effects on water resources. Implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in direct effects to water resources. Short- and long-term effects on groundwater would be negligible during construction and operation of the RV park. There would be indirect, short- and long-term, minor effects on surface waters, wetlands, floodplains, and shorelines. However, no significant degradation or loss of function is anticipated.

The Navy submitted a Federal Coastal Consistency Determination to the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), concluding that the action alternatives are consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act. Shoreline functions would be maintained, and the project would remain consistent with the Coastal Zone Management requirements as indicated in the federal coastal consistency determination concurrence letter.

**Geological Resource:** There would be no significant effects on geological resources. Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in minor changes to site topography over the long term and minor short- and long-term effects on soils due to ground disturbance. Overall effects would be minimized with best management practices, including an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Stormwater Management Plan approved by the MDE. Geological resource changes would be localized and not significant.

**Cultural Resources:** There would be no significant effects on cultural resources. No short- or long-term effects on architectural historic properties or archaeological resources would occur. The Navy consulted with the Maryland State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). SHPO concurred that the Proposed Action would have no adverse effect on historic properties.

**Visual Resources:** There would be no significant effects on visual resources. Construction and operation of the RV park would cause minor short- and long-term effects to the visual setting. These effects would not substantially alter the existing landscape or viewshed and are not considered significant.

**Biological Resources:** There would be no significant effects on biological resources. Minor short- and long-term effects on vegetation and wildlife could occur due to site development.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR A RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARK AT NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY  
ANNAPOLIS, ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND

The Navy coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). USFWS concurred that the Proposed Action resulted in a “not likely to adversely affect” the tricolored bat and monarch butterfly based on the conservation methods identified and fact that minimal tree clearing will occur. MDNR stated that there are no official records for state or federal listed candidate, proposed, or rare plant or animal species within the project areas.

**Land Use:** There would be no significant effects on land use. The Proposed Action would result in short-term, minor effects during construction. However, long-term land use would be compatible with adjacent areas.

**Noise:** There would be no significant effects on noise. Minor short- and long-term noise effects are expected from construction equipment and RV operations. Noise levels would remain within acceptable thresholds and would not result in significant effects.

**Infrastructure:** There would be no significant effects on infrastructure. Short-term, negligible to minor effects are expected on infrastructure systems during construction. Long-term, minor increases in demand for potable water, wastewater, electricity, and solid waste management would occur, but existing systems have adequate capacity. Communications and stormwater systems would not be significantly affected.

**Transportation:** There would be no significant effects on transportation. Minor short- and long-term effects on transportation could result from increased vehicle trips during construction and RV park operation. These changes would be localized and would not significantly affect traffic flow or access.

**Public Health and Safety:** There would be no significant effects on public health and safety. The Proposed Action would result in minor short- and long-term effects to public health and safety during both construction and operation. Long-term, minor beneficial effects are expected due to improved recreational opportunities and health benefits for military patrons.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Potential cumulative impacts of any of the alternatives in combination with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions were analyzed and found to be not significant.

### **Public and Agency Involvement**

The Navy published a notice for public scoping for three days in the *Capital Gazette*, detailing the Proposed Action, public meeting date and location, and solicited public comments. The public scoping meeting was held on June 12, 2024, in Annapolis, Maryland. At this meeting the Navy provided information on the Proposed Action and Alternatives and solicited public comments.

The Navy also published a Notice of Availability for the Draft EA in the *Capital Gazette* for three days, which announced the Draft EA's availability for a 30-day public review and comment period, provided public meeting information, and where to review the Draft EA. The Navy held

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR A RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARK AT NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY  
ANNAPOLIS, ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND

a public meeting on June 5, 2025, to discuss the environmental effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives and to solicit comments on the Draft EA.

The Navy coordinated or consulted with other agencies, including but not limited to, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Maryland Department of the Environment, Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Maryland Historical Trust, and Maryland Department of Planning (Maryland State Clearinghouse).

The Navy received comments from the aforementioned federal and state agencies, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, and from private citizens. All comments received during agency and public review were considered in preparing the Final EA.

**Finding**

Based on the analysis presented in the EA, which is herewith incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact, the Navy finds that implementation of the Proposed Action (including Alternative 1 as the Navy's Preferred Alternative), would not significantly affect the quality of the human or natural environment or generate significant controversy. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

The EA prepared by the Navy addressing this action is on file. Interested parties may obtain a copy from:

Mr. Richard Brown  
Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command Washington  
1314 Harwood Street SE, Building 212  
Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374

or by email to NAVFACWashNEPA1@navy.mil.

18 AUG 2025

Date



David J. Faehnle  
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy  
Commandant  
Naval District Washington