

United States Department of Agriculture

Farm Service Agency

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

For



Poultry Operation, Kosciusko County, Indiana

The United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency (FSA) has prepared a Final Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the environmental consequences associated with implementing the proposed project to construct a 150,000 Pullet operation Kosciusko County, Indiana.

Proposed Action

In this project, FSA-Farm Loan Programs proposes to approve an application for financing for the construction of multi-level aviary pullet operation. operation. In addition to the barns, the proposed project includes a litter shed and a truck turn-around. The facility will utilize the existing infrastructure, such as well, water and electric lines, and driveways. The new operation would have a maximum operating capacity of 150,000 pullets. The total animal capacity of the operation, as approved and permitted by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, is the previously listed value. The other pre-existing legacy structures will not be utilized for livestock production as they are well beyond their useful life and not to spec for the associated integrator. Upon completion, this project would provide income to the applicant and facilitate the production of pullets to supply local egg layer operations for the national market. These outcomes align with the FSA's mission to deliver timely, effective programs and services to America's farmers and ranchers to support them in sustaining our Nation's vibrant agricultural economy. The action will begin within calendar year 2026.

Alternatives

The first alternative considered was the No Action Alternative, in which the applicant would be required to seek other options to generate the income needed to support its farming operation. With this alternative, the application for financing would not be approved and the proposed project would not proceed with federal support. Other alternatives considered included: construction of a similar operation at a different location and alternative project designs. FSA identified no significant effects from the proposed project. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would provide no significant benefits. An alternative location could present a hardship for the applicant. The proposed location has been approved by state regulators and local authorities. FSA identified no significant effects from construction at the proposed location. Moving the proposed barn to a different location would require additional costs and delay. Therefore, an alternative site is not a

feasible option. Altering the project design would result in increased construction cost and potentially reduce the operational efficiency and suitability of the project. FSA identified no significant effects created by the design of the project. Therefore, an alternative design is not a feasible option.

FSA analyzed the proposed project to determine if it would significantly affect environmental resources, including wildlife and habitat, cultural resources, or air and water quality. FSA identified no significant effect on any protected resources. The project would be operated under all permits required by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM). In Indiana, IDEM is recognized as the regulatory authority on water quality and operational compliance for poultry projects like the one proposed. FSA has not identified any environmental advantages associated with the alternatives considered. However, each alternative would present additional hardships or lost opportunity for the applicant. Therefore, the proposed project is the preferred alternative, and the agency recommends approval of the application for financing and for the project to proceed as planned.

Mitigation Measures

Measures to mitigate or minimize adverse effects have been incorporated into the proposal. Myron Miller has completed a manure management plan that meets requirements of the IDEM permitting process. IDEM permits, construction permits, consultation results, and other documentation supporting the location and scope of this project can be found in the appendices of the EA.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action and Why Not Significant

In consideration of the analysis documented in the EA and the mitigation implemented as outlined in this FONSI, the preferred alternative will not have a significant impact on the quality of human or natural environment:

1. Both beneficial and adverse impacts of implementing the preferred alternative have been fully considered within the EA. The benefits outweigh any potential adverse impacts. Potential adverse cumulative impacts are expected to be minor as implementation of the preferred alternative will cause little if any adverse impact on the area of potential effect and the human environment.
2. The preferred alternative will not significantly affect public health or safety.
3. The preferred alternative would not significantly affect any unique characteristics which includes historic and cultural resources, parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers or ecological critical areas.
4. The preferred alternative does not significantly impact the quality of the human environment that is likely to be controversial with the implementation of the defined mitigation measures listed below.

5. The preferred alternative would not impose highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.
6. The preferred alternative would not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects and does not represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.
7. The preferred alternative is not related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulative significant impacts. Cumulative impacts of implementing the preferred alternative were determined to not be significant.
8. The preferred alternative would not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Registry of Historic Places or cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historic resources.
9. The preferred alternative would not have adverse effects on threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat. In accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, there is no effects of implementing the preferred alternative on threatened and endangered species and designated habitat and informal consultation was not necessary.
10. The preferred alternative does not threaten to violate a Federal, State or local law or requirements imposed for protection of the environment.

Supporting Documents

A Final EA was prepared and found no significant impact of the human environment. The EA and supporting documentation are stored with the loan application and available for further review.

Determination

According to the National Environmental Policy Act and FSA's environmental regulations at 7CFR part 799 implementing the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality, 40 CFR parts 1500-1508, I find that the Proposed Action is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, no environmental impact statement will be prepared.

State Environmental Coordinator:


Tyler Austin LePage
Digitally signed by TYLER
LEPAGE
Date: 2026.03.31 15:00:46 -04'00'

Signature

3/31/2026

Date

Tyler Austin LePage

Name

Designated Project Approval Official for the Proposed Action:

USDA
Tyler Austin LePage

Digitally signed by TYLER
LEPAGE
Date: 2026.03.31 15:01:02
-04'00'

Signature

3/31/2026
Date

Tyler Austin LePage

Name