

SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS [TABS FINAL VERSION]

SCENARIO # 467

TITLE: TECH-0009R DEFENSE RESEARCH SERVICE LABS

CONSOL ARMY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION: This recommendation consolidates all of ARL's vehicle related research for propulsion, structures, and materials at APG, MD. It realigns C4ISR related analysis and evaluation functions of ARL Survivability/Lethality Analysis Directorate from White Sands to Aberdeen, MD.

Notes:

1. Scenario moves approximately 220 personnel to Aberdeen and constructs approximately 70,000 sq.ft.MILCON.
2. White Sands loses approximately 180 personnel.
3. Langley Research Center and Glenn Research Center (both located on NASA property) each lose 50 personnel. No specific environmental data was collected on these sites as they are not Army property.

ANALYST _____

DATE: 4/16/05

Env Resource Area	#1 Gaining Installation Assessment Inst Name: Aberdeen Proving Ground	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	Impact Expected. APG is currently over threshold limits for NOx and close to exceeding VOC threshold and in non-attainment for ozone 8-hour. Addition of operations and personnel may exceed major source thresholds for NOx and VOCs. Added operations will require New Source Review permitting and Air Conformity Analysis.	#213, 219 – In non-attainment for Ozone (EPA web site confirms non-attainment for Ozone 8-hour) #211 – Projected to exceed Major Source thresholds for Nox. #220 – Holds 2 Major Operating Permits (SIC code 9711) #222 – Emissions Credit Trading program available for NOx and VOCs #218 – No restrictions to operations reported due to air quality requirements
Cultural/Archeological/Tribal Resources	78 Historic properties, 5 archeological resources identified to date and areas with high archeological potential, but no restrictions to mission reported. A very limited portion of the installation has been surveyed for cultural resources; therefore, the extent of the cultural resources on the installation and impacts to those resources is uncertain. Potential impacts may occur as result of increased times delays and negotiated restrictions, due to tribal government interest. Potential impacts may occur, since resources must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, thereby causing increased delays and costs.	#233- A very limited portion of the installation has been surveyed for cultural resources (<5%) therefore the extent of cultural resources on the installation and impacts to these resources is uncertain. #235 – 78 Historic properties identified #229 – No known limitations to fee-simple ownership #230 – 5 archeological resources known on installation; no restrictions reported #231 – Native People sites identified #236 – No Programmatic Agreement with SHPO #201 – Operations are not restricted due to cultural/archaeological/tribal resources however, these resources were identified. #234 – 5 tribes have asserted interest in burial/sacred sites; in contact, but no formal consultation yet. #232 – Areas with high archeological potential identified.

Dredging	No Impact.	#227 – If new unit/activity requires dredging, then dredging may not be able to occur in the short term due to known dredging impediments. #226 – If the new unit/activity requires dredging, then UXO and endangered species surveys may be required.
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resource Areas	No Impact. Four SRAs identified but cause no restrictions.	#30 – 2,863 buildable acres reported, approximately 22 acres required. (based on approximately 1/2 of a Large Admin Organizations) #201 - Constraints listed include (4) limited ability to accept new or different missions due to availability of unconstrained land, (5) altered, modified or re-routed flight operations and/or flight patterns and (6) altered, modified or re-routed ground operations. #256 – 4 Sensitive Resource Areas identified but cause no restrictions CERL Encroachment Study – Moderate Encroachment Projected
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources/ Marine Sanctuaries	No impact.	#248, #250, #252, #253 - No restrictions #249 – TES listed include Shortnosed Sturgeon (<i>Accipenser brevirostrum</i>) (restricting Poole's Island Shoal waters around island) and Bald Eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>), (restricting Poole's Island areas near nest sites, APG Shoreline & Areas near nest sites- affecting 17.2 acres of installation)
Noise	No impact. No noise expected to be generated by this proposal.	#239 – 235,848 acres of Noise Zone 2 extend outside installation, which is moderately encroached by development. #202 – Installation has published noise abatement procedures for main installation and training range but not for auxiliary airfield.

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical Habitat</p>	<p>Installation has Federally listed species (Shortnosed Sturgeon, Bald Eagle), that affect 17.2 acres of the installation and restricts night time flying operations (protection buffers around nests) on 7.9% of installation. Additional operations may further impact threatened/endangered species leading to additional restrictions on training or operations.</p>	<p>#249 – TES listed include Shortnosed Sturgeon (<i>Accipenser brevorostrum</i>) (restricting Poole's Island Shoal waters around island) and Bald Eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>), (restricting Poole's Island areas near nest sites, APG Shoreline & Areas near nest sites- affecting 17.2 acres of installation) #259 – TES listed include Shortnosed Sturgeon (<i>Accipenser brevorostrum</i>) and Bald Eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>). The Bald Eagle has delayed operations due to protection of buffers around nests during nesting season on approximately 7.9% of installation. #260 – No critical habitat identified #261 – Biological Opinion for Bald Eagle restricts range operations #262 – Development restrictions reported. Eagles: Existing Biological Opinions have limited impacts as they impose a monitoring responsibility primarily; some sites are protected. The ongoing Biological Assessment and subsequent Opinion will include an incidental take statement and some mitigation limits for some of the SOCOM training functions is expected. The extent of the limits is unclear, as the BA is still in development. Sturgeon: APG has a BA and BO from NOAA containing no limitations. APG is to coordinate with them if specific projects pose a risk. #263, #264 – No candidate species/habitat reported #201 - TES have restricted operations by limiting night flying times.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Waste Management</p>	<p>No impact.</p>	<p>#269 – Interim RCRA Subpart X OB/OD Permit, Permit has been submitted #265- Installation is a permitted hazardous waste RCRA Treatment Storage and Disposal (TSD) facility. #272 – Not a permitted solid waste disposal facility</p>

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Water Resources</p>	<p>Minimal impact expected.</p> <p>Water quality is impaired by pollutant loadings. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA water quality standards.</p>	<p>#276 – Installation not located over a sole-source aquifer #278 – McCarren Amendment does not apply #293 – Potable water restrictions in FY99 (33 days), FY01 (134 days) and FY02 (147 days). Source restrictions to prevent exceeding withdrawal permits, FY99 (9% of time restriction in place), FY01 (37%), FY02 (40%) from CHPPM Water Resources Report. #291 – Installation uses one Gov’t owned on-installation plant and one publically owned off-installation plant for potable water. IREM indicates remaining capacity for potable water to support 33,500 more personnel #279 –Installation discharges to impaired waterway; nutrient discharges from installation further impair waterway but is not a source of potable water. #297 – Two Sewage treatment plants on site; 1 gov’t owned, 1 privatized. #282 – Industrial Gov’t owned wastewater treatment system located on installation. #822, 824, 825, 826, ISRII – no restrictions reported Final Stat Packages- Scenario increases current population by approximately 3%</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Wetlands</p>	<p>No impact.</p>	<p>#251- Survey completed 04/92. #257 – Wetlands affect 0.3% of range and installation each but do not restrict operations.</p>

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED);

SCENARIO # 467

Env Resource Area	<i>Losing</i> Installation Assessment Inst Name: <u>White Sands Missile Range, Langley Research Ctr, & Glenn Research Ctr</u>	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	No impact	Reduction in personnel is considered as neutral or positive impact to all environmental areas for sites listed. No installation closures are involved.
Cultural/ Archeological Resources	No impact	
Drilling	No impact	
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resources	No impact	
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources	No impact	
Noise	No impact	
Threatened & Endangered Species	No impact	
Waste Management	No impact	
Water Resources	No impact	
Wetlands	No impact	

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED);

SCENARIO # 537

IMPACTS OF COSTS

Env Resource Area	Gaining Installation Inst Name: <u>Aberdeen</u>	Losing Installation Inst Name: <u>White Sands Missile Range, Langley Research Ctr, & Glenn Research Ctr</u>
Environmental Restoration*	None.	None.
Waste Management	None.	None.
Environmental Compliance	<p><u>Aberdeen:</u> -Air Conformity Analysis - \$25K-\$75K -New Source Review Analysis and -Permitting - \$100K-\$500K -Archeological/tribal resources inventory - \$25-\$100 per acre. - Historical building/structure inventory - \$500 - \$1,500 per structure -Evaluation to determine if arch/tribal site is significant - \$15K - \$40K per site - Evaluation to determine if historic buildings/structures are significant. -Conduct Tribal government to government consultation \$500 to \$2,000 per meeting -Develop Programmatic Agreement - \$10,000 -Endangered Species Management (includes monitoring) \$20K-\$2M -Install Best Management Practices to reduce non-point source runoff from training areas and ranges and protect impaired waterways -\$100K-\$3M -Realignment NEPA (EA) \$100K.</p>	None.
COBRA Costs:	<p><u>Aberdeen:</u> Air Conformity Analysis - \$50K New Source Review - \$100K NEPA (EA) \$100K</p>	None.