

SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS [TABS FINAL VERSION]

SCENARIO # USA-0223v5

TITLE: CLOSE FT MONMOUTH C4ISR

GENERAL DESCRIPTION: Close Ft. Monmouth, NJ.

Relocate Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research and Development & Acquisition (RDA) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate the elements of the Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems and consolidate into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA. Relocate the Joint Network Management System Program Office to Fort Meade, MD. Relocate the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY. Realign Ft. Belvoir, VA by relocating and consolidating Sensors, Electronic Warfare & Electronics Research and elements of Research and Development and Acquisition to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Research and Development and Acquisition (except for the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Realign Army Research Institute, Fort Knox, KY, by relocating Human Systems Research to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL, by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Development and Acquisition to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Realign the PM Acquisition, Logistics and Technology Enterprise Systems and Services (ALTESS) facility at 2511 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA, a leased installation, by relocating and consolidating into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

Proposal affects the following Army installations:

1. Ft Monmouth closes.
2. Aberdeen Proving Ground gains approximately 5,000 personnel and approximately 1,325,000 SF of new MILCON
3. West Point gains approximately 300 personnel and 82,000 sq ft of new MILCON
4. DSCC Columbus gains approximately 50 personnel and requires no new MILCON. This is not an Army-owned facility – impacts assessed on “Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts Scenario #USA-223 (DLA only)”
5. Fort Belvoir has a net loss of personnel (more personnel moving to Aberdeen than arriving from Momnouth) but approximately 50,000 SF of new construction will still be necessary.
6. Fort Meade gains approximately 2 people
7. Fort Knox, Crystal City Lease, and Redstone are all losing personnel.

ANALYST: _____

LAST UPDATE: 05/09/05

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 in Non-Attainment area for Ozone. Addition of operations may exceed major source thresholds for NOx and VOCs. Added operations will require New Source Review, Air Conformity Analysis and modifications to existing Title V permit.	#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. #212-No threshold exceedences reported #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	<p>78 Historic properties, 5 archeological resources identified to date and areas with high archeological potential, but no restrictions to mission reported.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Potential impacts may occur as result of increased times delays and negotiated restrictions, due to tribal government interest. Potential impacts may occur, since resource must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, thereby causing increased delays and costs.</p>	<p>#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.</p> <p>#235 – 78 Historic properties identified</p> <p>#229 – No known limitations to fee-simple ownership</p> <p>#230 – 5 archaeological resources known on installation; no restrictions reported</p> <p>#231 – Native People sites identified</p> <p>#236 – No Programmatic Agreement with SHPO</p> <p>#201 – Operations are not restricted due to cultural/archaeological/tribal resources however, these resources were identified.</p> <p>#234 – 5 tribes have asserted interest in burial/sacred sites; in contact, but no formal consultation yet.</p> <p>#232 – Areas with high archaeological potential identified.</p>
Dredging	<p>No Impact. If the new unit/activity requires dredging, then UXO and endangered species surveys may be required.</p>	<p>#227 – If new unit/activity requires dredging, then dredging may not be able to occur in the short term due to known dredging impediments.</p> <p>#226 – If the new unit/activity requires dredging, then UXO and endangered species surveys may be required.</p>
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resource Areas	<p>No Impact.</p> <p>Four SRAs identified but cause no restrictions.</p>	<p>#30 – 2,863 buildable acres reported, approximately 223 acres required. (based on the 5.2 times the size of a Large Admin Organization that typically holds 970 people)</p> <p>#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.</p> <p>#256 – 4 Sensitive Resource Areas identified but cause no restrictions</p> <p>CERL– Moderate Encroachment</p>
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources/ Marine Sanctuaries	<p>No impact.</p>	<p>#248, #250, #252, #253 - No restrictions</p> <p>#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)</p>

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.
Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical Habitat	<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.</p> <p>TES already restrict operations. 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 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)</p> <p>#259 – TES listed include Shortnosed Sturgeon (<i>Accipenser brevirostrum</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.</p> <p>#260 – No critical habitat identified</p> <p>#261 – Biological Opinion for Bald Eagle restricts range operations</p> <p>#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.</p> <p>#263, #264 – No candidate species/habitat reported</p> <p>#201 - TES have restricted operations by limiting night flying times.</p>
Waste Management	No impact.	<p>#269 – Interim RCRA Subpart X OB/OD Permit, Permit has been submitted</p> <p>#265- Installation is a permitted hazardous waste RCRA Treatment Storage and Disposal (TSD) facility.</p> <p>#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 publicly owned off-installation plant for potable water. IREM indicates capacity for potable water to support 33,500+ 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</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 USA-0223v5

Env Resource Area	# 2 <i>Gaining</i> Installation Assessment Inst Name: <u>Ft Belvoir</u>	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	<p>Impact Expected. Ft Belvoir is currently in Non-Attainment area for Ozone (8-hour) and projected for non-attainment for PM 2.5.</p> <p>Added operations will require New Source Review permitting.</p>	<p>#213 –Moderate Non-Attainment for Ozone (8-hour), proposed/projected for Non-Attainment for PM2.5. #211 - Permit thresholds projected to be exceeded for VOCs (based on 30% incr in emissions at Belvoir) #220 – Has a Major Title V Permit and (Natural) Minor Operating Permit. #218/ISR – No mission impact/No restr.</p>
Cultural/Archeological/Tribal Resources	<p>12 historical/prehistoric archeological resources reported, with restrictions to future construction. 62 historic properties listed.</p> <p>Cultural / archeological resources currently restrict operations. Additional operations may impact these resources and result in further restrictions on training or operations. Potential impact may occur since resources must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, thereby causing increased delays and costs. Likely no impact. Sufficient buildable acres exist to accommodate new construction without disturbing cultural resources.</p>	<p>#230- 12 historic/prehistoric (and 193 potentially eligible) sites that restrict future construction in certain areas. #231- No Native peoples sites; #232 - No high potential sites #233 - 100% surveyed #234 – No tribes interested in resources. #235 - 58 historic properties, 1 district and 4 resources outside of district. #236 – No Programmatic Agreement. ISR2 - No impact to mission</p>
Dredging	No Impact.	<p>#227 - If new activity requires dredging, then dredging may not be able to occur in the short term due to known dredging impediments #226, 228 - N/A</p>
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resource Areas	No Impact.	<p>Buildable Acres - 1 req'd, approx 2,355 acres available. #201, 254– No restrictions/coordination required. #256 – One Sensitive Resource Area that restricts airspace. CERL Study – high encroachment projected</p>
Marine Mammals/Mar	No Impact.	#248-253 - No restr
Noise	No Impact.	#239 - No noise contours off-installation.

Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical Habitat	<p>Federally listed species includes Bald Eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>). Restrictions for TES include aircraft height restriction over nest during nesting season, and no land-disturbing training or timber clear cutting along undeveloped/undisturbed shorelines.</p> <p>Additional operations may further impact threatened / endangered species leading to additional restrictions on training or operations.</p>	<p>#249 Restrictions for TES are in place – no clear cutting or training 750 feet inland along undisturbed and undeveloped shoreline. Restricted helicopter flying #259 1 TES identified, Bald Eagle #260-262,264 - No habitat restrictions, no proposed critical habitat #263 – No candidate species; ISR2 shows no impact.</p>
Waste Management	No Impact.	#269 – No RCRA Subpart X Permit; none required.
Water Resources	No Impact.	<p>#276,278,293 – No water restrictions reported #279 - Doesn't discharge to impaired waterway. #824/825 indicates adequate water avail IREM – potable water infr. can support 19,000 more people. #291 – 1 off-installation public water production plant #297 – 1 off-installation public ww plant #282 – No industrial wastewater trmt plant</p>
Wetlands	No impact. Land outside of wetlands is available for construction.	<p>#251 – Installation was surveyed in 1997 #257 – 10.2% of installation has wetlands that restrict operations, permits needed if planning to disturb wetlands.</p>

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED);
SCENARIO # USA-0223v5

Env Resource Area	#3 Gaining Installation Assessment Inst Name: West Point	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	<p>Impact Expected. Receiving installation currently in Non-Attainment for O3 (8-hour).</p> <p>Added operations will require New Source Review permitting, Air Conformity Analysis, and modifications to their Title V permit.</p>	<p>#213 – Non-Attainment for O3 #211 - Current emissions inventory exceeds permit for Nox, NO2 (requires modifications to permit); Major Source for VOC, Nox, NO2. #212-No exceedences reported #220 - Major Operating Permit #218/ISR-No current mission impact</p>
Cultural/Archeological/Tribal Resources	<p>50 archeological sites identified, with restrictions on construction and training / operations. 234 historic properties identified.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Cultural / archeological / tribal resources currently restrict operations. Additional operations may impact these resources and result in further restrictions on training or operations.</p>	<p>#230,232 - 150 arch sites - with tng/oper restr #231,234- No Native People's sites #233 - <1% surveyed #235 - 234 Historical sites, #236 – Has Programmatic agreement</p>
Drudging	No Impact	#226, 227, 228 – N/A
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resource Areas	No Impact.	<p>#30 - 24 buildable acres available, scenario requires approx 13 acres (based on 0.3 Large Admin Organization which typically houses 970 people) #256 - 5 SRAs, no restr CERL Study – moderate encroachment</p>
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources	No Impact	<p>#248, #250-253 – No restrictions #249 – Short-nosed Sturgeon (Endangered Species) affects water operations (but no impacts to this scenario)</p>
Noise	No Impact - no noise increase.	#239 - 7 acres of Noise Zone 2 extends outside the installation, which is moderately encroached by development.
Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical Habitat	<p>TES on installation include Shortnosed Sturgeon and Bald Eagle, with restrictions on 105 acres - no training allowed.</p> <p>Additional operations may further impact threatened / endangered species leading to additional restrictions on training or operations.</p>	<p>#259 - 2 species (Shortnosed Sturgeon, Bald Eagle) #201 - 105 acres of habitat restricted - no training #260-264 – N/A</p>

Waste Management	No Impact	#269 - No RCRA Subpart X - none req'd
Water Resources	No Impact	#276,278,293 - No water restrictions #291 –3 on-installation gov't owned plants #297 – 2 on site domestic wastewater treatment plants #282 – No industrial ww trmt plant ISR2 - No restrictions IREM shows capacity to handle additional 15,000 personnel
Wetlands	No Impact	#251 – Survey completed 8/2000 #257 - 6.3% of inst restricted by wetlands (constr and training).

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED);SCENARIO **USA-0223v5**

Env Resource Area	#4 <i>Gaining</i> Installation Assessment Inst Name: Fort Meade	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	No Impact.	#213 – Installation is in Non-attainment area for Ozone and PM2.5. #211 - No permit/Major Source thresholds projected to be exceeded (based on 1% increase in emissions at Ft Meade) #220 - Synthetic Minor operating permit #218/ISR2 - No mission impact indicated
Cultural/Archeological/Tribal Resources	No impact.	#230 - 1 Arch site with training & construction restrictions #231,234 - No Native People's sites or interest asserted #232- High potential for arch resources #233 – 0% surveyed #235- 15 historic properties #236 - Has Programmatic Agreement ISR2 – No Adverse impact to mission
Dredging	No impact.	#226-228 – No restrictions
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resource Areas	No impact.	#30 - Buildable Acres - 1,270 acres available, none req'd. #254, 256 - No SRAs #201/ ISR2 – No impacts/restrictions CERL Study – moderate encroachment projected
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources/Marine Sanctuaries	No impact.	#248,249,252,253 – No restrictions #250 - Fresh water section of Little Patuxent River fish spawning area is restricted from disturbance.
Noise	No impacts	#239 – No noise contours extend off installation.
Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical Habitat	No Impact	#259, 260 – No TES or critical habitat #261,262- 2 Biological Opinions (Conserve Forested Wooded Lots, Preserve Sensitive Habitat) impose restrictions on the installation & training ranges, and impede development. #263, 264 – No candidate species, or Critical Habitat ISR2 shows no impact.
Waste Management	No impact	#269 – Installation does not have RCRA Subpart X permit

16

Water Resources	No impact	#276, 278, 279, 293 – No water restrictions #824, 825 Adequate water available IREM - infr can support 83K more people. #291 – Has 1 potable water production plant on-installation #297 – Installation uses 1 On Military Installation plant for sewage treatment #282 - No industrial ww treatment plant
Wetlands	No impact.	#251- Survey completed 06/1996 #257 - 3% of installation is wetland restricted

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED);
SCENARIO USA-0223v5

Env Resource Area	<i>#1 Losing Installation Assessment</i> Inst Name: Fort Knox, Redstone	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	No Impact.	Environmental impacts to losing installations are considered neutral or positive for all areas.
Cultural/ Archeological Resources	No impact.	
Dredging	No impact.	
Land Use Constraints/	No impact.	
Marine Mammals/ Marine Resources/ Marine Sanctuaries	No impact.	
Noise	No impacts	
Threatened & Endangered Species/ Critical Habitat	No Impact	
Waste Management	No impact	
Water Resources	No impact	
Wetlands	No impact.	

16

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED);
 SCENARIO [USA-0223v5](#)

Env Resource Area	#2 <i>Losing</i> Installation Assessment Inst Name: Ft. Monmouth	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	No impact	#213 – In non-attainment for Ozone (EPA website confirms non-attainment for Ozone 8-hour); unclassifiable data for 4 other criteria pollutants
Cultural/Archeological/Tribal Resources	Survey and consultation with SHPO will be required to ensure protection of cultural resources at the installation.	#235 – 108 historic prop identified #230 – 9 archeological resources identified on installation, no restrictions reported #231 – Native People sites identified on or contiguous to the installation #232 – Areas with high archaeological potential identified.
Dredging	No impact	
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resource Areas	Environmental media contamination issues include DERA IRP sites, and operational ranges potentially contaminated with UXO and munitions constituents. Restoration and/or monitoring of contaminated media will likely be required after closure in order to prevent significant long-term impacts to the environment.	# 240 DERA CTC = \$2.9M; with \$11M spent through FY03, No MMRP 11 operational ranges \$15.3-\$110M #273 - No MMRAs
Marine Mammals/ Marine Resources / Marine Sanctuarie	No impact	
Noise	No impact	
Threatened & Endangered Species/ Critical Habitat	No impact	#259 – No TES listed #260 – No critical habitat identified #263, #264 – No candidate species/habitat reported
Waste Management	No Impact	#269 –No RCRA Subpart X OB/OD Permit #265- No RCRA TSD facility #272 – No permitted solid waste disposal facility

16

Water Resources	Environmental media issues at the installation include Benzene, Chlorobenzene, Vinyl Chloride, Trichloroethene, Tetrachloroethene, Arsenic, Lead, Gasoline (Benzene, Ethyl Benzene, Toluene, Total Xylene), and MTBE in ground water, and cis-1,2-Dichloroethene; vinyl chloride; trichloroethene; tetrachloroethene; gasoline constituents including BTEX and MTBE in surface water. Restoration and monitoring of contaminated sites will likely be required after closure to prevent significant long-term impacts to the environment.	#275 -Groundwater contaminated with Benzene, Chlorobenzene, Vinyl Chloride, Trichloroethene, Tetrachloroethene, Arsenic, Lead, Gasoline (Benzene, Ethyl Benzene, Toluene, Total Xylene), and MTBE #281 – Surface water contaminated with Chlorinated compounds including cis-1,2-Dichloroethene; vinyl chloride; trichloroethene; tetrachloroethene; Gasoline constituents including BTEX and MTBE #297/#822- Installation has 2 domestic wastewater treatment plants
Wetlands	No impact	

16

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED);
SCENARIO USA-0223v5

Env Resource Area	#3 <i>Losing</i> Installation Assessment Inst Name: Crystal City Lease	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	No Impact.	Relocation of personnel away from leased sites has no environmental impact since bldg/facility owner is responsible for environmental compliance and impacts.
Cultural/ Archeological Resources	No Impact.	
Dredging	No Impact.	
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resources	No Impact.	
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources	No Impact.	
Noise	No Impact.	
Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical Habitat	No Impact.	
Waste Management	No Impact.	
Water Resources	No Impact.	
Wetlands	No Impact.	

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED);

SCENARIO USA-0223v5

IMPACTS OF COSTS

Env Resource Area	Gaining Installation Inst Name: <u>Aberdeen Proving Ground, Fort Belvoir, West Point, DSSC-Columbus, Fort Meade</u>	Losing Installation Inst Name: <u>Ft Monmouth, Fort Knox, Redstone, Crystal City Lease</u>
Environmental Restoration	None for Army Installations. See "Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts Scenario #USA-223 (DLA only)"	Fort Monmouth Cleanup DERA sites: \$2.9M CTC Cleanup 11 Operational Ranges: \$15.3-\$110M
Waste Management	None for Army Installations. See "Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts Scenario #USA-223 (DLA only)"	None
Environmental Compliance	<p><u>Aberdeen:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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 depending on size, location and complexity - Evaluation to determine if historic buildings/structures are significant. - \$1K-\$2K per building depending on size, complexity and location -Conduct Tribal government to government consultation \$500 to \$2,000 per meeting (TDY costs) -Develop Programmatic Agreement -\$10K -Endangered Species Management (includes monitoring) \$20K-\$2M -Realignment NEPA (EA) \$1M (due to large number of personnel coming to a sensitive area) -Install Best Management Practices to protect impaired waterways and reduce non-point source runoff from training areas and ranges -\$100K-\$3M <p><u>Fort Belvoir</u></p> <p>Re-alignment NEPA at gaining base <1000 people, very minimal construction - \$100K (EA)</p> <p><u>West Point</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Air Conformity Analysis - \$25K-\$75K -New Source Review Analysis - \$100K-\$500K. -Re-alignment NEPA at gaining base (EA) - \$100K. - Archeological/tribal resources inventory - \$25 to \$100 per acre depending on location and ground cover - Historic buildings/structure inventory - \$500 to \$1,500 per building/structure depending on size - Evaluation to determine if archeological/tribal site is significant -5,000 to \$40,000 per site Evaluation to determine if historic buildings/structures are significant - \$1,000 to \$2,000 per building depending on size -Evaluate significance & mitigation of historic buildings IAW PA -\$5K-\$25K per building -Endangered Species Management (includes monitoring) \$20K-\$2M <p><u>DSSC-Columbus</u></p> <p>See "Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts Scenario #USA-223 (DLA only)"</p> <p><u>Fort Meade</u></p> <p>No cost impacts</p>	<p><u>Fort Monmouth</u></p> <p>Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) \$300K-500K.</p> <p>Access controls / caretaker management - \$500K - 1M (annually).</p> <p>Asbestos / lead paint removal - \$200K - \$1M.</p> <p>Land Use controls management / enforcement in perpetuity - \$50K - \$100K per year.</p>

<p>COBRA Costs:</p>	<p><u>Aberdeen:</u> Air Conformity Analysis - \$50K New Source Review - \$100K NEPA (EA) -\$1M <u>Fort Belvoir:</u> Re-alignment NEPA (EA) - \$100K <u>West Point:</u> Air Conformity Analysis - \$50K New Source Review Analysis - \$100K Re-alignment NEPA (EA) - \$100K <u>DSSC-Columbus</u> None <u>Fort Meade</u> \$0</p>	<p>EBS + NEPA Disposal EIS = \$1.3M</p>
--------------------------------	--	---