

RECORD OF DECISION

As the Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, Installation Management, I have reviewed the *Final Environmental Impact Statement for BRAC Actions at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland*. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), prepared in compliance with the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) *Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)* (Title 40 of the *Code of Federal Regulations [CFR]* Parts 1500–1508) and *Environmental Analysis of Army Actions* (32 CFR Part 651), adequately assesses the impacts of implementing Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC Commission) recommendations for Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), Maryland, on the biological, physical, and cultural environment. The EIS is hereby incorporated by reference. The Army will proceed as indicated herein.

1.0 Background

On September 8, 2005, the BRAC Commission recommended that certain realignment actions occur at APG. The recommendations were approved by the President on September 15, 2005, and forwarded to Congress. Upon expiration of the statutory period for Congress to enact a joint resolution of disapproval on November 9, 2005, the recommendations became law and must now be implemented as provided for in the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510, as amended). Ten BRAC Commission recommendations affect APG by relocating specified organizations and activities to the post:

From Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

- Relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Repairables to APG, and designate them as Inventory Control Point functions, detachment of Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to APG (BRAC Recommendation 5).
- Relocate the Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research and Development and Acquisition to APG (BRAC Recommendation 5).

From Fort Belvoir, Virginia

- Relocate and consolidate Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare research, development, and acquisition (RDA) activities to APG, except the Night Vision Lab and the Project Manager Night Vision/Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Target Acquisition (PM NV/RSTA) (BRAC Recommendation 5).
- Relocate and consolidate Information Systems RDA (except for the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems) to APG (BRAC Recommendation 5).
- Relocate the Chemical Biological Defense (CBD) Research component of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) to the Edgewood Chemical Biological Center (ECBC), APG (BRAC Recommendation 174).

From Fort Knox, Kentucky

- Realign the Army Research Institute (ARI) by relocating Human Systems Research to APG (BRAC Recommendation 5).

From Redstone Arsenal, Alabama

- Relocate and consolidate Information Systems Development and Acquisition to APG (BRAC Recommendation 5).

From Park Center Four, Alexandria, Virginia

- Relocate and consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) with its subcomponents to APG (BRAC Recommendation 136).

From Brooks City Base, San Antonio, Texas

- Relocate the Non-Medical CBD Development and Acquisition to ECBC, APG (BRAC Recommendation 170).

From Falls Church, Virginia, Skyline 2 and 6

- Relocate the Joint Program Executive Office for CBD (JPEO-CBD) to ECBC, APG (BRAC Recommendation 174).

From Fort Huachuca, Arizona

- Relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Repairables to APG, and designate them as Inventory Control Point functions, detachment of Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio. Relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to APG (BRAC Recommendation 176).

From Langley, Virginia and Glenn, Ohio

- Realign the Army Research Laboratory (ARL) Langley, Virginia, and Glenn, Ohio, by relocating the Vehicle Technology Directorates (VTD) to APG (BRAC Recommendation 187).

From Silver Spring, Maryland

- Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C. by relocating the Medical Chemical Defense Research of the Walter Reed Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) to APG (BRAC Recommendation 169).

The BRAC Commission recommended relocation of three organizations from APG. The EIS addresses the impacts associated with the departure of these organizations from APG, but does not address the potential impacts of their future realignment at their new locations. Impacts of those actions will be included in separate NEPA documents prepared for BRAC realignment actions at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, Fort Lee, Virginia, and Fort Dix, New Jersey. These realignment activities include:

From Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland

- Realign APG by relocating the Army Environmental Command (AEC) to Fort Sam Houston.
- Realign APG by relocating the Ordnance Center and School to Fort Lee.
- Realign APG by relocating all Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group mobilization functions to Fort Dix, New Jersey, designating it as Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site Dix/McGuire/Lakehurst.

2.0 Preferred Alternative

The Army proposal to implement the BRAC Commission's recommendations to realign APG. Implementation has two aspects:

- Together the planned departures (4,371 positions) and planned increases (8,774 positions) result in an estimated net gain of 4,403 positions at the installation.
- New construction, renovation of 22 buildings, and demolition of 72 buildings are estimated at 2,479,450 square feet (SF), 816,987 SF, and 822,732 SF, respectively, to produce a net increase of 1,656,718 additional SF of facilities.

Realignment of APG will increase APG's average daily population total to about 21,008 personnel (an approximate 26.5 percent increase). Implementing the Preferred Alternative at APG requires the estimated 3.296 million SF of new construction and renovation to be a combination of administrative, laboratory, and miscellaneous facility spaces, parking, and other logistic appurtenances. The majority of this space will support administrative functions, high-tech communications and electronics research, development, testing, evaluation, and acquisition.

Current APG infrastructure is not adequate to support the needs of the installation following realignment. The Preferred Alternative requires upgrades to APG entrance gates, roadways, signage, and communications infrastructure. Improvements to electric, central steam, water, sanitary sewer, and natural gas service are required. Sidewalks, lighting, fencing, and signage improvements are also necessary to meet current anti-terrorism and force protection standards. The current communications network on APG is not adequate to support the incoming requirements and requires upgrades to support incoming organizational requirements.

The majority of the 72,000-acre APG is located on two peninsulas, a Northern Peninsula and Southern Peninsula, bordered and separated by the Bush and Gunpowder Rivers encompassing the majority of Harford County, Maryland's Chesapeake Bay waterfront. The U.S. Army

Ordnance Center and School (USAOC&S) is realigning to Fort Lee, Virginia. The USAOC&S, which occupies facilities on each peninsula, utilizes the majority of facilities that will be vacated by APG's outgoing organizations. To accommodate realignment organizations and to begin building construction and renovation for the incoming organizations quickly, APG's Northern Peninsula sites posed the most reasonable and efficient site locations for placement. This, along with various utilization constraints for APG's Southern Peninsula, focuses incoming BRAC placement on APG's Northern Peninsula, except to collocate medical and CBD organizations on APG's Southern Peninsula where like organizations currently reside.

Siting of New Construction and Renovation of Existing Facilities

Multiple alternatives or courses of action were developed for each incoming activity. APG's BRAC 2005 construction and siting decisions consist of a combination of several factors, including mission synergies, facility/infrastructure requirements, land use compatibility, environmental impacts, and timing. The results are optimal siting options for each of the incoming organizations that maximize to the extent practical reuse/new construction scenarios. APG's siting guidelines rest on three primary Army elements:

- **BRAC Law:** The BRAC Commission's recommendations for realigning organizations to APG rest on consolidation of training and related development to a single installation, which promotes training effectiveness and functional efficiencies. The recommendations improve the military functionality by consolidating related branch centers and schools. It enhances military value, supports the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address unforeseen requirements. This provides the same or better level of service at a reduced cost. Therefore, BRAC realignments are geared toward consolidating knowledge, skills, and capabilities to APG.
- **Army Regulation 210-20, *Master Planning for Army Installations*,** establishes Army policy to maximize use of existing facilities. The regulation directs that new construction would not be authorized to meet a mission that can be supported by existing, underutilized, and structurally adequate facilities, provided that use of the facilities would not degrade operational efficiency. Under this policy, selection and use of facilities to support mission requirements adheres to the foregoing choices in the order in which they are listed. That is, if there are adequate existing facilities to accommodate requirements, and absent other overriding considerations, further examination of renovation, leasing, or construction alternatives is not required. Similarly, if a combination of use of existing facilities and renovation satisfies the Army's needs, leasing or new construction need not be addressed. New construction may proceed only when use of existing facilities, renovation, leasing, or a combination of these measures are inadequate to meet mission requirements.
- **APG Master Plan:** The siting of the facilities is based principally on the idea that the APG Master Plan, the Installation Design Guide and the APG Strategy 2025 seek to collocate like uses and separate incompatible uses. Potential locations for new construction conform to the Master Plan and Strategy 2025. The locations adhere to the general and specific siting criteria set forth in the Draft BRAC Planning Study. This planning study utilized the most recent estimates of incoming activities to determine

facility requirements at APG. This study examined a number of siting options, taking into consideration environmental constraints, engineering considerations, logistics, and the requirements of the incoming missions to prepare the most preferred configurations. The EIS presents the most recent siting configurations for APG's Northern and Southern Peninsulas; however, as further siting and design considerations are conducted (*e.g.*, wetlands delineation, geotechnical investigations) the final placement may vary slightly from that shown in the EIS. The EIS assesses the impacts to resources within a zone that includes the Preferred Alternative development areas, thus including final siting variations within the assessment. The preferred locations reflect the results of the Army's Master Planning process for APG.

3.0 Purpose of and Need for the Preferred Alternative

The purpose of the Preferred Alternative is to implement the BRAC Commission's recommendations pertaining to APG.

The need for the Preferred Alternative is to improve the ability of the Nation to respond rapidly to the challenges of the 21st century. To carry out its tasks, the Army must adapt to changing world conditions and must improve its capabilities to respond to a variety of circumstances across the full spectrum of military operations. BRAC supports advancing the goals of transformation, improving military capabilities, and enhancing military value. The Army must carry out the BRAC recommendations at APG to achieve the objectives for which Congress established the BRAC process and to comply with the law.

4.0 Alternatives to the Preferred Alternative

Alternative 1 - No Action Alternative

Alternative 1, The No Action Alternative, is required by CEQ regulations to serve as the benchmark against which federal actions can be evaluated. The No Action Alternative must be described because it is the environmental baseline condition or the current status (established at the beginning of analysis as November 2005) of the environment if the Preferred Alternative is not implemented. No action assumes that the Army would continue its mission at APG as it existed in autumn 2005, with no units relocating from other locations, no new units established, and no new facilities constructed. Because the BRAC Commission's recommendations now have the force of law, continuation of the autumn 2005 APG mission is not possible without further congressional action. The No Action Alternative is evaluated in detail in the EIS.

Alternative 2 - Preferred Alternative

Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, consists of implementing all actions recommended by the BRAC Commission Report. The Army determined that the existing square footage of facilities is insufficient to accommodate the personnel and specialized functions of organizations being realigned to APG. Therefore realignment of incoming organizations must be accomplished through a combination of new construction and reuse of existing facilities to accommodate incoming missions. Due to the physical limitations for siting incoming activities,

scheduling constraints imposed by the BRAC Commission Report, and budgetary limitations affecting implementation of the Preferred Alternative at APG, no additional realistic, distinct, or feasible alternatives to the Preferred Alternative have been identified for inclusion in the EIS.

5.0 Environmental Consequences

Preferred Alternative

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative at APG will result in significant adverse and some beneficial environmental effects at APG. The majority of effects will be direct adverse impacts on affected resources, with many of them being long term or permanent. The following paragraphs summarize the expected effects associated with the Preferred Alternative for each resource at APG, as discussed in the EIS.

Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the No Action Alternative and the Preferred Alternative have been considered. Direct significant impacts have been identified for Socioeconomics and Transportation, and possibly Cultural Resources. No significant impacts have been identified for Land Use, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, Air Quality, Noise, Geology and Soil, Water Resources, Biological Resources, Utilities, and Hazardous or Toxic Substances.

An analysis of cumulative impacts together with impacts from the Preferred Alternative shows the potential for cumulative impacts to transportation.

Land Use. No impacts to land use are anticipated.

Aesthetic and Visual Resources. Under the Preferred Alternative, the direct and cumulative impacts would be similar. Long-term beneficial impacts would include renovation and demolition of deteriorated and dilapidated structures. Temporary impacts would result from construction activities, and long-term impacts would occur to natural vistas due to building height and overall square footage required for new construction.

Air Quality. Direct and indirect impacts would occur under the Preferred Alternative. The direct impacts include temporary and short-term impacts from increased construction and operation emissions, as well as long-term impacts associated from increased emissions from daily operations. The indirect impacts include temporary impacts associated with increased contractor and off-post emissions. A Conformity Analysis was conducted, along with a review of the regional SIP, and it was determined that all projected emission increases can be accounted for within the Maryland SIP and would not threaten a violation of Federal, state, or local regulations.

Noise. Temporary impacts from noise would occur under the Preferred Alternative. During construction, renovation, and demolition there would be temporary, localized noise impacts associated with increased traffic volumes and the operation of construction equipment and machinery, power tools, and the delivery of construction materials. Indirect noise impacts would occur to wildlife.

Geology and Soils. Temporary and short-term impacts on soil would occur under the Preferred Alternative. Soil would be disturbed by renovation activities such as compaction from vehicles and vegetative clearing, and by construction and demolition activities such as grading, vegetation clearing, and excavating during construction of the new facilities. Increased impervious surfaces would result in permanent impacts to the soil.

Water Resources. Under the Preferred Alternative, no construction will occur within the floodplains. Under the Preferred Alternative, indirect impacts include run-off from soil disturbance and related construction and demolition. Long-term impacts would occur due to increases in impervious surfaces, which could lead to an increase in stormwater runoff and reduce groundwater recharge. Portions of the Preferred Alternative footprint encroaches on the storm water protection area for the City of Aberdeen. Cumulative impacts from the Preferred Alternative include short-term impacts related to construction on- and off-post. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative at APG will be consistent with Maryland's Coastal Zone Management Program requirements, which are a network of Maryland state laws and policies designed to protect Maryland's coastal resources. These include the Chesapeake Bay Program and the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Protection Act.

The installation will implement best management practices to lessen impacts on water resources including: utilizing erosion control measures to reduce surface water runoff from construction sites; implementing water retention basins into office park designs; complying with Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (where applicable); and implementing Natural Resources Conservation Service Critical Area standards, *General Performance Standards* outlined in the Maryland Stormwater Design Manual and Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 26.17.02.

Biological Resources. Under the Preferred Alternative, direct impacts include short- and long-term impacts to isolated or jurisdictional wetlands.

A total of 15-23 acres of wetlands on APG may be affected by the Preferred Alternative. On APG's Northern Peninsula, the area of potential wetlands impact by project is estimated to be:

C4ISR	12-15 acres
ATEC	0-1 acres
ARL	0-1 acres
<u>Route 715 Gate</u>	<u>0-1 acres</u>
Northern Peninsula Total	12-18 acres

On APG's Southern Peninsula, the area of potential wetlands impact by project is estimated to be:

JPEO	2-3 acres
<u>Route 24 Gate</u>	<u>1-2 acres</u>
Southern Peninsula Total	3-5 acres

Indirect impacts include short- and long-term impacts on terrestrial and aquatic vegetation, wetlands, and wildlife due to increased erosion and sedimentation. Cumulative impacts include

long-term impacts on regional wetlands from ongoing and future activities at APG and continued growth in the surrounding region.

In accordance with Executive Order 11990, the Army has determined that there is no practicable alternative to the activities affecting wetlands. The action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands.

Cultural Resources. The Preferred Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts to Cultural Resources. If renovation and construction activities disturb previously unidentified archeological sites or destruct certain unevaluated architectural resources or buildings, adverse effects (significant impacts) could result to these cultural resources. Impacts to these cultural resources would be direct, long-term, and significant. Depending on final siting of the new facilities, potential significant impacts may result to APG cultural resources that have not yet been fully evaluated. Demolition or renovation of eight World War II buildings could result in direct and potentially significant impacts (adverse effects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA]) if these buildings are determined to be NRHP-eligible. Indirect impacts include potentially significant impacts (adverse effects under Section 106) due to vibration, audio intrusion, and other disturbance to unidentified NRHP-eligible resources adjacent to the area of potential effect.

Indirect impacts include potentially significant temporary impacts due to vibration, audio intrusion, and other disturbance to unidentified NRHP-eligible resources adjacent to the area of potential effect. Potentially significant, permanent cumulative impacts to archaeological sites and architectural resources would occur from construction, on-post and off-post, in undisturbed areas; renovation, and/or demolition of NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible buildings or structures from other APG and regional projects. Disturbing or destroying these cultural resources would further diminish the regional archaeological record decreasing the potential of its overall research contribution. In addition, the potential loss of NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible buildings and districts would undermine the historic quality of APG.

Socioeconomics. The Preferred Alternative will result in direct significant impacts to socioeconomic factors when the Primary Region of Influence is Harford and Cecil Counties. When the larger Region of Influence (ROI) (the City of Baltimore and Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, Howard, and Queen Anne counties) is evaluated, these socioeconomic factors are not considered to be significant.

The relocation of personnel over a one-year period would result in significant impacts in business sales volume, employment, and population in the primary ROI. Personnel relocation over two years would result in significant impacts to employment and population in the primary ROI. If the personnel relocations are distributed over three years, however, none of these economic variables would have significant impacts. Housing demand in the primary ROI could experience a significant impact if the relocation of personnel occurs over one or two years.

Direct short-term beneficial economic impacts would be realized by the regional and local economy during the construction phase of the Preferred Alternative. In addition, direct long-term economic impacts would be realized from the increase in operations and associated

personnel. Other direct impacts include those on schools, housing, and other social programs. The magnitude of the impacts will depend upon regional planning efforts to minimize impacts on schools and social services.

Transportation. Implementing the Preferred Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to the transportation system with respect to congestion and increased travel time to both the Northern Peninsula and the Southern Peninsula. Without structural improvements to affected intersections, the Preferred Alternative will result in significant impacts at selected intersections leading to access to APG's Northern Peninsula. One intersection leading to access to APG's Southern Peninsula is already experiencing unacceptable Levels of Service (LOS). The Preferred Alternative will result in further deterioration of LOS at this intersection. The Preferred Alternative will also result in temporary impacts to traffic congestion resulting from construction traffic activities at the Preferred Alternative development sites on both the Northern and Southern Peninsula.

Utilities. Under the Preferred Alternative, impacts to solid waste disposal capacity would occur from facility demolition. All utilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate the Preferred Alternative but all will be upgraded to meet maintenance, operational, and safety standards.

Hazardous and Toxic Substances. Under the Preferred Alternative, direct impacts include long-term impacts associated with increases in the use of hazardous and radiological materials and hazardous and radiological waste production. Long-term beneficial impacts would occur due to the removal and disposal of lead-based paint and asbestos containing materials from demolished buildings. Indirect impacts include short- and long-term impacts to soil, groundwater, and/or surface water should accidental hazardous and toxic substance spills be insufficiently contained or improperly identified and allowed to migrate to the surrounding media.

Cumulative Effects.

The cumulative impact analysis evaluated the incremental effects of implementing the Preferred Alternative when added to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future Army actions at APG and the actions of other parties in the surrounding area, where applicable. The potential cumulative impacts to affected resources are discussed in Section 4.14 of the EIS and summarized below.

- Cumulative impacts to air quality include short term impacts associated with fugitive dust from on- and off-post construction and increased use of privately owned and government owned vehicles.
- There is the potential for cumulative impacts to the soil through implementation of the Preferred Alternative construction projects and related projects on and off post.
- Cumulative impacts to biological resources include long-term impacts on regional wetlands from ongoing and future activities at APG and continued growth in the surrounding region.
- Beneficial cumulative impacts to socioeconomics would be in the form of increased business volume, income, and employment associated with construction activities and

increased on-post operations in combination with other non-BRAC proposed on-post actions and construction projects.

- Cumulative impacts to the local and regional roadway networks would result from the increased APG and dependent population.
- Cumulative impacts under the Preferred Alternative include a long-term beneficial impact on the installation core infrastructure.
- Cumulative impacts include the long-term potential for short-term impacts due to hazardous and toxic spills because of on- and off-post activities.

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Army would not implement the BRAC directed actions at APG. No impacts would occur to current or current land uses, air quality, noise, geology and soils, water resources, biological resources, or cultural resources. APG would maintain its existing clean-up and accounting of hazardous and toxic substances. Projected pre-BRAC regional growth would continue and not be affected by the federal action, thus the Army would not contribute to impacts to socioeconomic factors, or regional and local transportation.

The No Action Alternative is the Environmentally Preferred Alternative since it would not produce additional impacts to those under the current operating conditions. The No Action Alternative is not feasible since the Preferred Alternative is Congressionally mandated.

Aesthetic and Visual Resources. Under the No Action Alternative, long-term impacts to aesthetics and visual resources would include the continued deterioration of older buildings.

Utilities. Under the No Action Alternative, continued degradation of APG utility infrastructure would produce long-term impacts.

6.0 Mitigation

The EIS predicts that implementing the Preferred Alternative will result in significant adverse effects on several environmental resources. Other resources will incur minor adverse effects. The EIS identifies mitigation measures to minimize, avoid, or compensate for such effects. All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the selected alternative have been adopted, except as otherwise indicated below. The following mitigation measures are deemed appropriate.

Biological Resources. At APG, the Army will meet federal and state requirements for avoidance, minimization, and mitigation under the Clean Water Act (Sections 404 and 401) and the Maryland Tidal and Nontidal Wetland Permits for unavoidable impacts on wetland and surface waters. Any wetlands lost will be replaced at an appropriate ratio as determined by APG, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and State of Maryland Department of the Environment.

Cultural Resources. The preferred mitigation for impacts to cultural resources is avoidance. Avoidance preserves the integrity of cultural resources and protects their research potential (*i.e.*,

their NRHP eligibility). Avoidance also avoids costs and potential construction delays associated with data recovery.

Historically, data recovery of archaeological sites through professional techniques such as surface collection, mapping, photography, subsurface excavation, technical report preparation and dissemination, has been the standard mitigation measure. Data recovery of archaeological information is now considered, in and of itself, an adverse effect under the revised Section 106 regulations (36CFR800.5(a)(2)(i)). As such, data recovery is not the preferred mitigation, but still may be completed under the terms of a signed agreement with the Maryland Historical Trust. Data recovery investigations should be designed in consultation with the Maryland Historical Trust and implemented prior to construction.

Mitigation measures include ongoing Section 106 consultations with the Maryland State Historic Preservation Office, and may also include renovation using architecturally compatible design and materials and documentation through programs administered by the National Park Service.

In addition to avoidance, the Army will conduct Phase I archeological surveys in sites that might be affected by BRAC construction activities. If necessary, Army will conduct more detailed Phase II archeological surveys at these sites. The Army will coordinate with the Maryland agencies to evaluate other NRHP eligible resources.

No action that may affect listed or eligible properties at APG will be implemented without completion of the Section 106 consultation process.

Transportation. Implementing the Proposed Alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to the transportation system with respect to congestion and increased travel time to both the Northern Peninsula and the Southern Peninsula. Numerous state and regional organizations are involved in the assessment of transportation impacts from the BRAC actions at APG as well as at other military installations in Maryland (including Fort Meade, Andrews AFB, Fort Detrick, and Naval Medical Center Bethesda). Resolving these impacts at APG requires coordination with other statewide efforts to evaluate and maintain roadway integrity, intersection optimization, and roadway improvements.

The Army will provide mitigation for on-post impacts resulting from the Preferred Alternative. To mitigate on-post impacts, three APG entry/exit gates will be re-engineered to accommodate the increased vehicular volume. On APG's Northern Peninsula, traffic impacts from the new C4ISR campus will be mitigated by designing and constructing structural improvements to a number of intersections, turn lanes, and varying work-hour signal timing. These improvements will mitigate queuing on off-post roads leading to the APG gates during the AM peak traffic period and on the on-post roads during the PM peak traffic period. These mitigation projects have been resourced, and are adopted.

The Army will participate in regional planning studies that focus on the roadway network affected by implementation of the Preferred Alternative. For regional transit development, the Army will work with the state and regional agencies to evaluate mass transit options that could serve APG, including, for example, a shuttle service for its employees from their place of work

to a "mass transit facility." The Army will continue to explore mass transit options, etc. with MDOT to identify future transportation projects that may be submitted for approval under the Defense Access Roads (DAR) program, authorized in 23 U.S.C. 210, to mitigate the traffic impacts due to BRAC implementation.

APG may initiate action in accordance with paragraph 3-6 of Army Regulation 55-80 (DoD Transportation Engineering Program), which provides for the preparation and forwarding through command channels of a Defense Access Road Needs Report. If the Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command determines that any roadway improvement projects noted in the EIS are certified as important to the national defense, the Army will seek appropriate levels of funding for the project through the normal budgeting process.

The EIS recommended further study of transportation improvements outlined in the USACE Draft Planning Study and the Maryland Department of Planning BRAC Study as possible mitigation to adverse traffic conditions attributable to the Preferred Alternative. The Army is not currently resourced to execute these projects, and therefore they are not practicable and are not being adopted. As the Preferred Alternative proceeds, these projects may be submitted for Army funding. The Army will continue to coordinate with local agencies to plan and program future transportation improvements to accommodate APG traffic growth outside its boundaries.

The Army will minimize effects on all on-post environmental resources by implementing best management practices, including those listed in Table ES-2 of the EIS, as appropriate for the affected resource.

7.0 Decision

On behalf of the Department of the Army, I have decided to proceed with the Preferred Alternative. I have considered the results of the analysis presented in the EIS, supporting studies, and comments provided during formal comment and review periods. These factors as well as the description of the purpose and need for the Preferred Alternative guided my decision on whether to approve the Preferred Alternative. I gave special consideration to the effect of the Preferred Alternative on natural resources, cultural resources, and traffic. I also took into account the fact that the No Action Alternative would not meet the Army's purpose and need for the Preferred Alternative. This was critical because the BRAC realignment is required by Congress and needed for Army transformation to be effective. On the basis of this review, I have determined that implementing the Preferred Alternative reflects a proper balance between initiatives for protection of the environment, appropriate mitigation, and actions to achieve the Army's requirements. Consistent with this decision and the Preferred Alternative and analyses described in the EIS, the Army will:

- Relocate approximately 8,774 additional positions to APG and plan for the departure of 4,371 positions from APG as specified by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

-
- Construct, renovate, and demolish facilities at Aberdeen Proving Ground as described in the EIS and summarized in the second bullet of Section 2 of this ROD and subject to the availability of funds¹ and in good faith.
 - Implement the mitigation measures as specified in Paragraph 6.0, above, subject to the availability of funds. The Army will exercise good faith in seeking funding for the best management practices and mitigation measures adopted herein.
 - Before beginning facilities construction or training, the Garrison Commander at Aberdeen Proving Ground will develop and implement procedures, consistent with Appendix C of 32 CFR Part 651 (*Mitigation and Monitoring*), for mitigation measures outlined in Paragraph 6.0, above.


CRAIG E. COLLEGE
Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff
for Installation Management

19 AUG 07

Date

¹ The Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1341 (a)(1)), provides that an officer or employee of the U.S. government may not (a) make or authorize an expenditure or obligation exceeding an amount available in an appropriation or fund for the expenditure or obligation or (b) involve the government in a contract or obligation for the payment of money before an appropriation is made unless authorized by law.