Appendix B
Draft PEIS Comments

Comment by	Reference	Comment	Action/Response
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) [June 17, 2003]	Sections 2.3.4.1 and 2.4.3.2.c	1.a. Air Quality – Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Air Division recommends that at sites within ozone non-attainment areas or ozone maintenance areas DoD take additional precautions to limit emissions of volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides.	No changes required – Response letter documents Clean Air Act requirements and site-specific permitting for Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren Laboratory (NSWCDL).
	Section 1.2.2.3	1.b. Air Quality – DEQ Air Programs Coordination Division indicates that in the event of construction activities in VA, fugitive dust emissions must be kept to a minimum…	No changes required – Response letter states that scope of Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is limited to operational activities.
	Section 1.2.2.3	1.c.Air Quality – DEQ notes that if DoD plans to burn any debris as part of the activities pursuant to the Program, the burning activity must meet the requirements (under regulations for open burning) and may require a permit.	No changes required – Response letter states that open burning is not an operational activity under the CBDP.
	Sections 2.4.3.2.c and 5.11.2	2. Water Quality – DEQ Water Permits Support Office indicates that, since strict decontamination and waste management procedures are already in place at NSWCDL, the program will not be likely to give rise to water resource impacts, and no water program permits will be required.	No changes required – Response letter states opinion that DEQ evaluation for NSWCDL would also apply to other CBDP sites.
	Sections 2.3.4.2 and 2.3.4.4	3. Solid and Hazardous Waste Management – According to DEQ Waste Division, the DPEIS discussed solid and hazardous waste issues and mentioned pollution prevention.	No changes required – Response letter acknowledges comment and documents site-specific information for NSWCDL.
	Sections 2.3.4.4 and 2.4.3.2.c	4. Pollution Prevention (PP) – DEQ advocates the principles of PP be used in all construction projects as well as in facility operations.	PEIS amended – Information added on DoD policy for PP and to document the NSWCDL PP plan. Response letter documents benchmarks for PP (both sections).
	Sections 2.3.4.1 and 2.4.3.2.c	Regulatory and Coordination Needs 1. Air Quality Regulation – "If any activities undertaken as part of the Program include open burning, construction and use of fuel-burning facilities, or other activities affecting air quality and subject to state or federal regulation, air permitting requirements may apply."	PEIS amended – Added reference to new source review and Title V operating permits (Sect 2.3.4.1); added information on permits held by NSWCDL and Virginia Regulations for Air Pollution (Sect 2.4.3.2.c).

Figure B-1. Comment Resolution Matrix

Comment by	Reference	Comment	Action/Response
Virginia DEQ	Sections 4.1.5 and 4.3.5	Regulatory and Coordination Needs 2. Federal Consistency under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) – "Pursuant to the CZMA of 1972, as amended, federal activities located inside or outside of Virginia's designated coastal management area that can have reasonably foreseeable effects on coastal resources or coastal uses must, to the maximum extent practicable, be implemented in a manner consistent with the Virginia Coastal Program."	PEIS amended – Added reference to regulatory requirement for Federal agencies engaged in programs affecting the coastal zone to be consistent with state-enforceable CZM programs, to the maximum extent practicable (both sections); added documentation of NSWCDL compliance with CZMA requirements (Sect 4.1.5).
	Section 6	Other Matters – "DoD should bear in mind that other activities undertaken in support of (or separately from) the Program that may give rise to significant effects on the environment will require appropriate NEPA [National Environmental Policy Act] documentation."	No changes required – Response letter notes that Conclusion No. 4 of the PEIS addresses this: "… future activities not identified in this PEIS may require both site-specific and programmatic NEPA documentation."
	Section 2.4.3.2.c	Editing – Add Subtitle D Sanitary" to the description of the King George County landfill	PEIS amended – To incorporate DEQ editing changes.
		Editing – Change "Department of Environmental Protection" to "Department of Environmental Quality"	PEIS amended – To incorporate DEQ editing changes.
U.S. EPA [June 20, 2003]		"Lack of Objections"	No changes required – Letter of acknowledgement prepared.
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality [July 31, 2003]	Sections 2.4.6.2.c, 4.1.1, and 4.6.1	"A review …for General Conformity … indicates that the proposed project is located statewide, which is currently…in nonattainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for one or more of the six criteria air pollutants. While general conformity rules apply, the project as proposed contains no demolition, construction, rehabilitation or repair component which will produce dust and particulate emissions and we, therefore, have no objections or comments at this time."	No changes required – Letter of acknowledgement prepared.
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) [June 10, 2003]		"…it has been determined that this project is consistent with MDE's plans, programs, and objectives."	No changes required – Letter of acknowledgement prepared.
Maryland Department of Planning [August 13, 2003]		"The Maryland Departments of State Police, Natural Resources, and the Environment; Frederick County; the City of Frederick; and the Maryland Department of Planning found this project to be consistent with their plans, programs, and objectives."	No changes required – Letter of acknowledgement prepared.

Figure B-1. Comment Resolution Matrix (cont.)

Comment by	Reference	Comment	Action/Response
Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) [June 18, 2003]	Sections 4.1.3, 4.2.3, and 5.4.1	"The DPEIS [Draft PEIS] indicated that for the example site Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) in Harford County, MD, the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan is in place and would be utilized for any activities resulting from the CBDP [Chemical and Biological Defense Program]. Based upon this example site, the (Maryland Historical) Trust believes implementation of the CBDP would constitute no adverse effect to historic properties."	No changes required – Letter of acknowledgement includes statement confirming DHCD understanding that individual reviews would be initiated when CBDP activities involve construction, maintenance, or ground disturbing actions
Maryland Department of Planning [August 13, 2003]		"The Maryland DHCD, including the Maryland Historical Trust…found this project to be generally consistent with their plans, programs, and objectives, but included certain qualifying comments… . While the Trust determined that the projects would have no adverse effects on historic properties, the Trust sought to review future proposals that involve construction, maintenance, or ground-disturbing actions."	No changes required – Letter of acknowledgement refers to previous comment by DHCD.
U.S. Department of the Interior [June 16, 2003]	Sections 2.4.4, 4.4.5, and 4.4.10.1	"The DPEIS lacks detailed information regarding the method of containment, removal and disposal of large animal waste at LARF [large-animal research facility]." Interior Dept. also expressed concern for impacts on several species of interest due to animal waste from the USAMRIID [U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases] LARF potentially contributing significant amounts of contaminants (including contaminants from test pathogens, pharmaceuticals, and hormones) and nutrients to streams and wetlands.	PEIS amended – To clarify that the LARF barn in Area A is used only for storage (all three sections). Response letter provides specific references to information on LARF animal waste handling and disposal (all three sections) and indicates that potential impacts from that waste would be negligible and mitigable.

Figure B-1. Comment Resolution Matrix (cont.)

Comments

07/09/2003 WED 7:27 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 003/003

MDP

Maryland Department of Planning

Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr.
Governor
Michael S. Steele
Lt. Governor

Audrey E. Scott
Secretary
Florence E. Burian
Deputy Secretary

May 9, 2003

Ms. JoLane Souris
Project Manager, ATTN: MCMR-ZC-S
U.S. Army Medical Research Command
504 Scott Street
Fort Detrick, MD 21702-5012

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW PROCESS
State Application Identifier: MD20030507-0425
Reply Due Date: 06/08/2003
Project Description: Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Chemical and Biological Defense Program: consider an integrated defense program and the "no action" alternative
Project Location: Frederick County - City of Frederick
Clearinghouse Contact: Bob Rosenbush

Dear Ms. Souris:

Thank you for submitting your project for intergovernmental review. Your participation in the Maryland Intergovernmental Review and Coordination (MIRC) process helps to ensure that your project will be consistent with the plans, programs, and objectives of State agencies and local governments.

We have forwarded your project to the following agencies and/or jurisdictions for their review and comments: the Maryland Departments of State Police, Housing and Community Development, including the Maryland Historical Trust, Transportation, Natural Resources, the Environment; the Maryland Military Department; Frederick County; the City of Frederick; and the Maryland Department of Planning. A composite review and recommendation letter will be sent to you by the reply due date. Your project has been assigned a unique State Application Identifier that you should use on all documents and correspondence.

Please be assured that we will expeditiously process your project. The issues resolved through the MIRC process enhance the opportunities for project funding and minimize delays during project implementation.

A "Project Survey" form is enclosed with this letter. Please complete and return it within 14 days of the date of this letter. If you need assistance or have questions, contact the State Clearinghouse staff noted above at 410-767-4490 or through e-mail at brosenbush@mdp.state.md.us. Thank you for your cooperation with the MIRC process.

Sincerely,

Linda C. Janey, mop

Linda C. Janey, J.D., Manager
Maryland State Clearinghouse for Intergovernmental Assistance

LCJ:BR
Enclosure(s)

03-0425-NEW2.doc

301 West Preston Street • Suite 1101 • Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2305
Telephone: 410.767.4500 • Fax: 410.767.4480 • Toll Free 1.877.767.6272 • TTY Users: Maryland Relay
Internet: www.MDP.state.md.us

07/09/2003 WED 7:27 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 002/003

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT
1800 Washington Boulevard o Baltimore Maryland 21230-1718
(410) 537-4120

Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr.
Governor

Kendl P. Philbrick
Acting Secretary

June 10, 2003

Ms. JoLane Souris
U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
504 Scott Street
Fort Detrick MD 21702

RE: MDE Identifier: ES20030506-0021
Project: Chemical and Biological Defense Program Draft EIS

Dear Ms. Souris:

Thank you for providing the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) with the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced project. Copies of the documents were circulated throughout MDE for review, and it has been determined that this project is consistent with MDE's plans, programs and objectives.

Again, thank you for giving MDE the opportunity to review this project. If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to call me at (410) 537-4120.

Sincerely,

Joane D. Mueller
MDE Clearinghouse Coordinator
Technical and Regulatory Services Administration

cc: Bob Rosenbush, State Clearinghouse

06/30/2003 MON 10:25 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 005/021

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
Custom House, Room 244
200 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106-2904

IN REPLY REFER TO:

June 16, 2003

ER 03/426

Ms. JoLane Souris, Environmental Coordinator
U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
Attn.: MCMR-ZC-S
504 Scott Street,
Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

Dear Ms. Souris:

The U.S. Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS) for the Chemical and Biological Defense Program, Fort Detrick, Frederick County, Maryland. Please give careful consideration to the following comments.

The U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMIRIID), Large Scale Research Facility (LARF) houses large animals used in testing diseases, pathogens, vaccines and other biological agents, in several buildings located in Areas A and B at Fort Detrick. Several hundred feet from from the LARF in Area A are three wetlands, including the Nallin Farm Pond, which flood seasonally. All stormwater runoff from this area drains directly into unnamed tributaries that flow into the Monocacy River. The LARF in Area B drains into Carroll Creek. There are state-listed threatened and endangered mussel species located in the Monocacy River drainage and a pair of federally threatened bald eagles nesting on the Monocacy River.

Numerous contaminants from test pathogens, pharmaceuticals and hormones used in both research and in the care of animals are found in the waste products. Animal waste contributes significant amounts of contaminants and nutrients to streams and wetlands. The DPEIS lacks detailed information regarding the method of containment, removal and disposal of large animal waste at LARF. If guidelines are in place, an explanation of how the waste is controlled and managed should be provided, and a reference given. If protocols do not exist, we recommend such guidance be developed.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. If you have any questions, please contact Sherry Krest, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 177 Admiral Cochrane Drive, Annapolis, Maryland (telephone: 410-573-4525).

Sincerely,

Michael T. Chezik
Regional Environmental Officer

06/30/2003 MON 10:26 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 007/021

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

W. Tayloe Murphy, Jr.
Secretary of Natural Resources

Street address: 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219
Mailing address: P.O. Box 10009, Richmond, Virginia 23240
Fax (804) 698-4500 TDD (804) 698-4021
www.deq.state.va.us

Robert G. Burnley
Director

(804) 698-4000
1-800-592-5482

June 17, 2003

Ms. JoLane Souris
Environmental Coordinator
U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
Attn: MCMR-ZC-S
504 Scott Street
Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702

RE: Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Chemical and Biological Defense Program, dated April 2003
DEQ-03-090F

Dear Ms. Souris:

The Commonwealth of Virginia has completed its review of the above Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "Draft PEIS"). The Department of Environmental Quality is responsible for coordinating Virginia's review of federal environmental documents and responding to appropriate federal officials on behalf of the Commonwealth. The Department of Emergency Management and the Department of Health joined the Department of Environmental Quality in this review.

Project Description

The Defense Department (hereinafter "DoD") proposes to integrate its Chemical and Biological Defense Program (hereinafter "the Program") in a number of research laboratories, including the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Dahlgren (Draft PEIS, pages i and 1-8 through 1-10). The document analyzes the potential environmental effects of executing and integrating these research, development, and acquisition activities, provides a framework for future program decision-making, and is intended to provide a single information resource for the public (Draft PEIS, page 1 2, section 1.2). The Program is aimed at protecting personnel in the armed services from chemical and biological threats they may face in combat (page 1-1, section 1.1).

At Dahlgren, the only laboratory in Virginia involved with the Program, the research, development, test, and evaluation activities include collective protection, de-contamination, and modeling and simulation (Draft PEIS, page 2-52, section 2.4.3.1).

Ms. JoLane Souris
Page 2

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

1. Air Quality. DEQ's Air Division recommends that at sites within ozone non-attainment areas or ozone maintenance areas, DoD take additional precautions to limit emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). It should be noted that the Dahlgren, Virginia laboratory site is not a non-attainment area or maintenance area for ozone.

DEQ's Air Programs Coordination Division indicates that in the event of construction activities in Virginia, fugitive dust must be kept to a minimum by using control methods outlined in 9 VAC 5-50-60 et seq. of the Regulations for the Control and Abatement of Air Pollution. These precautions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Use, where possible, of water or chemicals for dust control;
- Installation and use of hoods, fans, and fabric filters to enclose and vent the handling of dusty materials;
- Covering of open equipment for conveying materials; and
- Prompt removal of spilled or tracked dirt or other materials from paved streets and removal of dried sediments resulting from soil erosion.

If DoD plans to burn any debris as part of the activities pursuant to the Program, the burning activity must meet the requirements under 9 VAC 5-40-5600 et seq. of the Regulations for open burning, and may require a permit (see "Regulatory and Coordination Needs," item 1, below). The Regulations provide for, but do not require, the local adoption of a model ordinance concerning open burning. DoD should contact King George County officials to determine what local requirements, if any, exist. The model ordinance includes, but is not limited to, the following provisions:

- All reasonable effort shall be made to minimize the amount of material burned, with the number and size of the debris piles;
- The material to be burned shall consist of brush, stumps and similar debris waste and clean burning demolition material;
- The burning shall be at least 500 feet from any occupied building unless the occupants have given prior permission, other than a building located on the property on which the burning is conducted;
- The burning shall be conducted at the greatest distance practicable from highways and air fields;
- The burning shall be attended at all times and conducted to ensure the best possible combustion with a minimum of smoke being produced;
- The burning shall not be allowed to smolder beyond the minimum period of time necessary for the destruction of the materials; and

- burning shall be conducted only when the prevailing winds are away from any city, town or built-up area.

2. Water Quality. DEQ's Water Permits Support Office indicates that, since strict de-contamination and waste management procedures are already in place at the Dahlgren Laboratory in Virginia, the Program will not be likely to give rise to water resource impacts, and no water program permits will be required.

3. Solid and Hazardous Waste Management. According to DEQ's Waste Division, the Draft PEIS discussed solid and hazardous waste issues, and mentioned pollution prevention (see next item).

4. Pollution Prevention. DEQ advocates that principles of pollution prevention be used in all construction projects as well as in facility operations. Effective siting, planning, and on-site Best Management Practices (BMPs) will help to ensure that environmental impacts are minimized. However, pollution prevention techniques also include decisions related to construction materials, design, and operational procedures that will facilitate the reduction of wastes at the source. We have several pollution prevention recommendations that may be helpful in conducting construction or other activities pursuant to the Program.

- Consider development of an Environmental Management System (EMS). An effective EMS will ensure that the proposed facility is committed to minimizing its environmental impacts, setting environmental goals, and achieving improvements in its environmental performance. DEQ offers EMS development assistance and recognizes facilities with effective Environmental Management Systems through its Virginia Environmental Excellence Program.
- Consider environmental attributes when purchasing materials. For example, the extent of recycled material content, toxicity level, and amount of packaging should be considered and can be specified in purchasing contracts.
- Consider contractors' commitments to the environment (such as an EMS) when choosing contractors. Specifications regarding raw materials and construction practices can be included in contract documents and requests for proposals.
- Choose sustainable materials and practices for infrastructure and building construction and design. These could include asphalt and concrete containing recycled materials, and integrated pest management in landscaping, among other things.
- Integrate pollution prevention techniques into facility maintenance and operation, to include the following: inventory control (record-keeping and centralized storage for hazardous materials), product substitution (use of

non-toxic cleaners), and source reduction (fixing leaks, energy-efficient HVAC and equipment). Maintenance facilities should be designed with sufficient and suitable space to allow for effective inventory control and preventive maintenance.

DEQ's Office of Pollution Prevention provides free information and technical assistance relating to pollution prevention techniques and EMS. If interested, DoD may contact that Office (Tom Griffin, telephone (804) 698-4545).

Regulatory and Coordination Needs

1. Air Quality Regulation. If any activities undertaken as part of the Program include open burning, the construction and use of fuel-burning facilities, or other activities affecting air quality and subject to state or federal regulation, air permitting requirements may apply. In that case, DoD must contact DEQ's Northern Virginia Regional Office (Terry Darton, Air Permits Manager, telephone (703) 583-3845) to inquire about the applicability of the open burning permit program, the new source review program, and the Title V Operating Permit program, along with other air quality regulatory programs that may apply to DoD activities at the Dahlgren site.

2. Federal Consistency under the Coastal Zone Management Act. Pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, federal activities located inside or outside of Virginia's designated coastal management area that can have reasonably foreseeable effects on coastal resources or coastal uses must, to the maximum extent practicable, be implemented in a manner consistent with the Virginia Coastal Resources Management Program (VCP). The VCP consists of a network of programs administered by several agencies. The DEQ coordinates the review of federal consistency determinations with agencies administering the Enforceable and Advisory Programs of the VCP.

For activities affecting Virginia's coastal resources or coastal uses, DoD must determine their consistency with the Virginia Coastal Resources Management Program (VCP) (see section 307(c)(1) of the Act and 15 CFR Part 930, sub-part C, section 930.34). This involves an analysis of the activities in light of the Enforceable Programs of the VCP (first enclosure), and submission of a consistency determination reflecting that analysis and committing DoD to comply with the Enforceable Programs. In addition, we invite your attention to the Advisory Policies of the VCP (second enclosure). The federal consistency determination may be provided as part of the documentation concluding the NEPA process, or independently, depending on your agency's preference. Section 930.39 gives content requirements for the consistency determination. If you need clarification of these comments, please contact Charles Ellis at (804) 698-4488.

06/30/2003 MON 10:27 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 011/021

Ms. JoLane Souris
Page 5

Other Matters

1. NEPA Responsibilities. As the Draft PEIS indicates (page 1-2, section 1.2), its preparation will be helpful to DoD and other federal and state agencies involved with chemical and biological defense work, and it will enable these agencies to focus on key issues in follow-up NEPA analyses. DoD should bear in mind that other activities undertaken in support of (or separately from) the Program that may give rise to significant effects on the environment will require appropriate NEPA documentation. (See, among other provisions, the definition of "Significantly" in the NEPA regulations at 40 CFR Part 1508, 1508.27.)

2. Editing. As DEQ's Waste Division points out, we recommend the correction of two minor errors in the Draft PEIS:

- Page 2-54, line 43: add "Subtitle D Sanitary" to the description of the King George County landfill; and
- Page 2-55, lines 22-23: "Virginia Department of Environmental Protection" should be "Virginia Department of Environmental Quality."

Thank you for the opportunity to review this Draft PEIS.

Sincerely,

Ellie L. Irons
Program Manager
Office of Environmental Impact Review

Enclosures

cc: Thomas D. Modena, DEQ-Waste
Kotur S. Narasimhan, DEQ-Air
Ellen Gilinsky, DEQ-Water
Gary Shirley, DEM

06/30/2003 MON 10:27 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 012/021

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

W. Tayloe Murphy, Jr.
Secretary of Natural Resources

Street address: 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219
Mailing address: P.O. Box 10009, Richmond, Virginia 23240
Fax (804) 698-4500 TDD (804) 698-4021
www.deq.state.va.us

Robert G. Burnley
Director

(804) 698-4000
1-800-592-5482

Attachment 1

Enforceable Regulatory Programs comprising Virginia's Coastal Resources Management Program (VCP)

a. Fisheries Management - The program stresses the conservation and enhancement of finfish and shellfish resources and the promotion of commercial and recreational fisheries to maximize food production and recreational opportunities. This program is administered by the Marine Resources Commission (VMRC); Virginia Code §28.2-200 to §28.2-713 and the Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF); Virginia Code §29.1-100 to §29.1-570.

The State Tributyltin (TBT) Regulatory Program has been added to the Fisheries Management program. The General Assembly amended the Virginia Pesticide Use and Application Act as it related to the possession, sale, or use of marine antifoulant paints containing TBT. The use of TBT in boat paint constitutes a serious threat to important marine animal species. The TBT program monitors boating activities and boat painting activities to ensure compliance with TBT regulations promulgated pursuant to the amendment. The VMRC, DGIF, and Virginia Department of Agriculture Consumer Services (VDACS) share enforcement responsibilities; Virginia Code §3.1-249.59 to §3.1-249.62.

b. Subaqueous Lands Management - The management program for subaqueous lands establishes conditions for granting or denying permits to use state-owned bottomlands based on considerations of potential effects on marine and fisheries resources, tidal wetlands, adjacent or nearby properties, anticipated public and private benefits, and water quality standards established by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The program is administered by the Marine Resources Commission; Virginia Code §28.2-1200 to §28.2-1213.

c. Wetlands Management - The purpose of the wetlands management program is to preserve wetlands, prevent their despoliation, and accommodate economic development in a manner consistent with wetlands preservation.

(1) The tidal wetlands program is administered by the Marine Resources Commission; Virginia Code §28.2-1301 through §28.2-1320.

(2) The Virginia Water Protection Permit program administered by DEQ includes protection of wetlands --both tidal and non-tidal; Virginia Code §62.1-44.15:5 and Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.

Attachment 1 continued

Page 2

d. Dunes Management - Dune protection is carried out pursuant to The Coastal Primary Sand Dune Protection Act and is intended to prevent destruction or alteration of primary dunes. This program is administered by the Marine Resources Commission; Virginia Code §28.2-1400 through §28.2-1420.

e. Non-point Source Pollution Control – (1) Virginia's Erosion and Sediment Control Law requires soil-disturbing projects to be designed to reduce soil erosion and to decrease inputs of chemical nutrients and sediments to the Chesapeake Bay, its tributaries, and other rivers and waters of the Commonwealth. This program is administered by the Department of Conservation and Recreation; Virginia Code §10.1-560 et.seq.).

(2) Coastal Lands Management is a state-local cooperative program administered by the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department and 84 localities in Tidewater (see i) Virginia; Virginia Code §10.1-2100 –10.1-2114 and 9 VAC10-20 et seq.

f. Point Source Pollution Control - The point source program is administered by the State Water Control Board (DEQ) pursuant to Virginia Code §62.1-44.15. Point source pollution control is accomplished through the implementation of:

(1) the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program established pursuant to Section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act and administered in Virginia as the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) permit program.

(2) The Virginia Water Protection Permit (VWPP) program administered by DEQ; Virginia Code §62.1-44.15:5 and Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.

g. Shoreline Sanitation - The purpose of this program is to regulate the installation of septic tanks, set standards concerning soil types suitable for septic tanks, and specify minimum distances that tanks must be placed away from streams, rivers, and other waters of the Commonwealth. This program is administered by the Department of Health (Virginia Code §32.1-164 through §32.1-165).

h. Air Pollution Control - The program implements the federal Clean Air Act to provide a legally enforceable State Implementation Plan for the attainment and maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. This program is administered by the State Air Pollution Control Board (Virginia Code §10-1.1300 through §10.1-1320).

(i) Coastal Lands Management is a state-local cooperative program administered by the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department and 84 localities in Tidewater, Virginia established pursuant to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act; Virginia Code §10.1-2100 10.1-2114 and Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations; Virginia Administrative Code 9 VAC10-20 et seq.

Attachment 2

Advisory Policies for Geographic Areas of Particular Concern

a. Coastal Natural Resource Areas - These areas are vital to estuarine and marine ecosystems and/or are of great importance to areas immediately inland of the shoreline. Such areas receive special attention from the Commonwealth because of their conservation, recreational, ecological, and aesthetic values. These areas are worthy of special consideration in any planning or resources management process and include the following resources:

a) Wetlands
b) Aquatic Spawning, Nursery, and Feeding Grounds
c) Coastal Primary Sand Dunes
d) Barrier Islands
e) Significant Wildlife Habitat Areas
f) Public Recreation Areas
g) Sand and Gravel Resources
h) Underwater Historic Sites.

b. Coastal Natural Hazard Areas - This policy covers areas vulnerable to continuing and severe erosion and areas susceptible to potential damage from wind, tidal, and storm related events including flooding. New buildings and other structures should be designed and sited to minimize the potential for property damage due to storms or shoreline erosion. The areas of concern are as follows:

i) Highly Erodible Areas
ii) Coastal High Hazard Areas, including flood plains.

c. Waterfront Development Areas - These areas are vital to the Commonwealth because of the limited number of areas suitable for waterfront activities. The areas of concern are as follows:

i) Commercial Ports
ii) Commercial Fishing Piers
iii) Community Waterfronts

Although the management of such areas is the responsibility of local government and some regional authorities, designation of these areas as Waterfront Development Areas of Particular Concern (APC) under the VCRMP is encouraged. Designation will allow the use of federal CZMA funds to be used to assist planning for such areas and the implementation of such plans. The VCRMP recognizes two broad classes of priority uses for waterfront development APC:

Attachment 2 con't

i) water access dependent activities;
ii) activities significantly enhanced by the waterfront location and complementary to other existing and/or planned activities in a given waterfront area.

Advisory Policies for Shorefront Access Planning and Protection

a. Virginia Public Beaches - Approximately 25 miles of public beaches are located in the cities, counties, and towns of Virginia exclusive of public beaches on state and federal land. These public shoreline areas will be maintained to allow public access to recreational resources.

b. Virginia Outdoors Plan - Planning for coastal access is provided by the Department of Conservation and Recreation in cooperation with other state and local government agencies. The Virginia Outdoors Plan (VOP), which is published by the Department, identifies recreational facilities in the Commonwealth that provide recreational access. The VOP also serves to identify future needs of the Commonwealth in relation to the provision of recreational opportunities and shoreline access. Prior to initiating any project, consideration should be given to the proximity of the project
site to recreational resources identified in the VOP.

c. Parks, Natural Areas, and Wildlife Management Areas - Parks, Wildlife Management Areas, and Natural Areas are provided for the recreational pleasure of the citizens of the Commonwealth and the nation by local, state, and federal agencies. The recreational values of these areas should be protected and maintained.

d. Waterfront Recreational Land Acquisition - It is the policy of the Commonwealth to protect areas, properties, lands, or any estate or interest therein, of scenic beauty, recreational utility, historical interest, or unusual features which may be acquired, preserved, and maintained for the citizens of the Commonwealth.

e. Waterfront Recreational Facilities - This policy applies to the provision of boat ramps, public landings, and bridges which provide water access to the citizens of the Commonwealth. These facilities shall be designed, constructed, and maintained to provide points of water access when and where practicable.

f. Waterfront Historic Properties - The Commonwealth has a long history of settlement and development, and much of that history has involved both shorelines and near-shore areas. The protection and preservation of historic shorefront properties is primarily the responsibility of the Department of Historic Resources. Buildings, structures, and sites of historical, architectural, and/or archaeological interest are significant resources for the citizens of the Commonwealth. It is the policy of the

06/30/2003 MON 10:29 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 016/021

Attachment 2 con't

Commonwealth and the VCRMP to enhance the protection of buildings, structures, and sites of historical, architectural, and archaeological significance from damage or destruction when practicable.

06/30/2003 MON 10:29 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 017/021

If you cannot meet the deadline, please notify CHARLIE ELLIS at 804/698-4488 prior to the date given. Arrangements will be made to extend the date for your review if possible. An agency will not be considered to have reviewed a document if no comments are received (or contact is made) within the period specified.

REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS:

A. Please review the document carefully. If the proposal has been reviewed earlier (i.e. if the document is a federal Final EIS or a state supplement), please consider whether your earlier comments have been adequately addressed.

B. Prepare your agency's comments in a form which would be acceptable for responding directly to a project proponent agency.

C. Use your agency stationery or the space below for your comments. **IF YOU USE THE SPACE BELOW, THE FORM MUST BE SIGNED AND DATED.**

Please return your comments to:

MR.CHARLES H. ELLIS III
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REVIEW
629 EAST MAIN STREET, SIXTH FLOOR
RICHMOND, VA 23219
FAX #804/698-4319

RECEIVED
JUN 09 2003
DEQ-Office of Environmental Impact Review

Charles H. Ellis III
CHARLES H. ELLIS III
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM PLANNER

COMMENTS

No Comments

(signed) Alan D. Weber (date) 6-4-03
(title)
(agency) VDH

PROJECT # 03-090F 8/98

06/30/2003 MON 10:29 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 018/021

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

W. Tayloe Murphy, Jr.
Secretary of Natural Resources

Street address: 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219
Mailing address: P.O. Box 10009, Richmond, Virginia 23240
Fax (804) 698-4500 TDD (804) 698-4021
www.deq.state.va.us

Robert G. Burnley
Director

(804) 698-4000
1-800-592-5482

MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles Ellis

FROM: Thomas Modena TDM

DATE: June 11, 2003

COPIES: Kevin Greene

SUBJECT: Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program

RECEIVED
JUN 11 2003
DEQ-Office of Environmental Impact Review

The Waste Division has reviewed the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program. We have the following comments concerning the waste issues associated with this project.

Solid and hazardous waste issues and representative sites were detailed in the report. Also, pollution prevention was mentioned.

For our specific comments, on Page 2-54, Line 43, 'Subtitle D sanitary' should be added to the description of the King George County Landfill. Also, on Page 2-55, Line 23 'Protection' should be deleted and 'Quality' should be added.

If you have any questions or need further information, please let me know.

06/30/2003 MON 10:30 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 019/021

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
DIVISION OF AIR PROGRAM COORDINATION

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS APPLICABLE TO AIR QUALITY

TO: Charles H. Ellis III **DEQ - OEIA PROJECT NUMBER: 03 - 090F**

PROJECT TYPE: ☐ STATE EA / EIR / FONSI **X FEDERAL EA / EIS** ☐ SCC

☐ CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION/CERTIFICATION

RECEIVED
JUN 02 2003
DEQ-Office of Environmental Impact Review

PROJECT TITLE: CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

PROJECT SPONSOR: DOD/ARMY MEDICAL RESEARCH & MATERIEL COMMAND

PROJECT LOCATION: (VARIES)
☐ OZONE NON ATTAINMENT AREA
☐ AINTENANCE AREA
☐ STATE VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS & NITROGEN OXIDES EMISSION CONTROL AREA

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTSMAY BE APPLICABLE TO: ☐ CONSTRUCTION
X **OPERATION**

STATE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD REGULATIONS THAT MAY APPLY:

1. ☐ 9 VAC 5-40-5200 C & 9 VAC 5-40-5220 E – STAGE I
2. ☐ 9 VAC 5-40-5200 C & 9 VAC 5-40-5220 F – STAGE II Vapor Recovery
3. ☐ 9 VAC 5-40-5490 et seq. – Asphalt Paving operations
4. X **9 VAC 5-40-5600 et seq. – Open Burning**
5. X **9 VAC 5-50-60 et seq. Fugitive Dust Emissions**
6. ☐ 9 VAC 5-50-130 et seq. - Odorous Emissions; Applicable to
7. ☐ 9 VAC 5-50-160 et seq. – Standards of Performance for Toxic Pollutants
8. ☐ 9 VAC 5-50-400 Subpart_____, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources, designates standards of performance for the
9. ☐ 9 VAC 5-80-10 et seq. of the regulations – Permits for Stationary Sources
10. ☐ 9 VAC 5-80-1700 et seq. Of the regulations – Major or Modified Sources located in PSD areas. This rule may be applicable to the
11. ☐ 9 VAC 5-80-2000 et seq. of the regulations – New and modified sources located in non-attainment areas
12. ☐ 9 VAC 5-80-800 et seq. Of the regulations – Operating Permits and exemptions. This rule may be applicable to

COMMENTS SPECIFIC TO THE PROJECT:

At sites within ozone non-attainment or maintenance area, additional precaution is to be taken to restrict emiss0ns of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx).

K.S. Narasimhan

(Kotur S. Narasimhan)
Office of Air Data Analysis

DATE: May 30, 2003

06/30/2003 MON 10:30 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 020/021

MEMORANDUM
VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS OFFICE

To: Mr. Charles Ellis III, DEQ
Fm: Mr. Gary Shirley, VDEM
Subj: Comments on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the Chemical and Biological Defense Program (CBDP) at the Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren Laboratory (NSWCDL)
Date: 16 June 2003

The Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) has no comments regarding the CBDP PEIS for NSWCDL.

06/30/2003 MON 10:30 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 021/021

Review Instructions:

A. Please review the document carefully. If the proposal has been reviewed earlier (i.e. if the document is a federal Final EIS or a state supplement), please consider whether your earlier comments have been adequately addressed.

B. Prepare your agency's comments in a form which would be acceptable for responding directly to a project proponent agency.

C. Use your agency stationery or the space below for you comments. **If you use the space below, the form must be signed and dated.**

Please return your comments to:

Mr. Charles H. Ellis, III
Dept. of Environmental Quality
Office of Environmental Impact Review
629 East Main Street, Sixth Floor
Richmond, VA 23219
Fax: (804) 698-4319

RECEIVED
JUN 17
DEQ-Office of Environmental Impact Review

Charles H. Ellis, III
Environmental Program Planner

Comments:

The only facility in Virginia to be utilized as part of the Chemical and Biological Defense Program is Dahlgren Laboratory at the Naval Surface Warfare Center in Dahlgren, Virginia. The report states that the facility is to be used primarily for collective protection, decontamination, and modeling and simulation purposes. Since these activities are to be conducted indoors at the Dahlgren Laboratory and strict decontamination and waste management procedures are already in place, there should be no water related impacts as part of the proposed project and water program permits will not likely be required. (SB)

Name: Ellen Gilinsky, Ph. D, PWS
Signature: Ellen Gilinsky
Date: 6/17/03

Title: VWP Permit Program Manager
Agency: DEQ - Water Permits Support

Project: 03-090F

Electronic Version Revised: 7/2002

2

06/30/2003 MON 10:25 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 006/021

Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr.
Governor
Michael S. Steele
Lt. Governor
Victor L. Hoskins
Secretary
Shawn S. Karimian
Deputy Secretary

D·H·C·D
MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

June 18, 2003

Ms. JoLane Souris,
Environmental Coordinator
U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
Attn: MCMR–ZC–S
504 Scott Street
Fort Detrick, MD 21702–5012

Re: Draft PEIS: Chemical and Biological Defense Program
SAI MD20030507-0425 (Section 106 Review – ARMY)

Dear Ms. Souris:

Through the Maryland State Clearinghouse for Intergovernmental Assistance, the Maryland Historical Trust (Trust) received the above referenced project on May 16, 2003. In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, we are reviewing the project to assess potential impacts to historic properties

The Trust understands that the United States Army is proposing to execute an integrated Chemical and Biological Defense Program (CBDP) that would include research, development and acquisition projects (RDA). These RDA projects would be dynamic, occurring across the United States and could involve historic or archeological properties. The draft programmatic environmental impact statement indicated that for the example site Aberdeen Proving Ground in Harford County, Maryland, the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) is in place and would be utilized for any activities resulting from the CBDP. Based upon this example site, the Trust believes implementation of the CBDP would constitute no adverse effect to historic properties. It our understanding from the PEIS that individual Section 106 reviews would be initiated when CBDP activities involve construction, maintenance or ground disturbing actions.

If you have questions regarding this matter, please contact Dixie Henry (for archeology) at 410-514-7638 or Tania Georgiou Tully (for historic built environment) at 410-514-7636. Thank you for providing us this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Andrew Lewis
for Elizabeth J. Cole
Administrator
Project Review and Compliance

EJC/TGT/200301915
cc: Bob Rosenbush (MDP)

DIVISION OF HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL PROGRAMS 100 COMMUNITY PLACE CROWNSVILLE, MARYLAND 21032 PHONE: 410-514-7600
FAX: 410-987-4071 TOLL FREE: 1-800-756-0119 TTY/RELAY: 711 OR 1-800-735-2258 WWW.DHCD.STATE.MD.US

08/25/2003 MON 10:29 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 005/005

MDP

Maryland Department of Planning

Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr.
Governor
Michael S. Steele
Lt. Governor

Audrey E. Scott
Secretary
Florence F. Burian
Deputy Secretary

PROJECT STATUS FORM

Please complete this form and return it to the State Clearinghouse upon receipt of notification that the project has been approved or not approved by the approving authority.

TO: **Maryland State Clearinghouse**
Maryland Department of Planning
301 West Preston Street
Room 1104
Baltimore, MD 21201-2305

DATE: _____
(Please fill in the date form completed)

FROM: _____
(Name of person completing this form.)

PHONE: ____-____-_____
(Area Code & Phone number)

RE: **State Application Identifier:** **MD20030507-0425**
Project Description: Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Chemical and Biological Defense Program: consider a coordinated defense program and the "no action" alternative

PROJECT APPROVAL

This project/plan was: ☐ **Approved** ☐ **Approved with Modification** ☐ **Disapproved**

Name of Approving Authority: **Date Approved:**

FUNDING APPROVAL

The funding (if applicable) has been approved for the period of:

_____, 200____ to _____, 200____ as follows:

Federal $:	Local $:	State $:	Other $:

OTHER

☐ **Further comment or explanation is attached**

MDPCH-1F

301 West Preston Street • Suite 1101 • Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2305
Telephone: 410.767.4500 • Fax: 410.767.4480 • Toll Free: 1.877.767.6272 • TTY Users: Maryland Relay
Internet: www.MDP.state.md.us

06/30/2003 MON 10:24 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 003/021

06/23/03 12:36 FAX 002

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 20 2003

OFFICE OF
ENFORCEMENT AND
COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE

Environmental Coordinator
U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
Attn: NCMR-RCQ-E
504 Scott Street
Fort Detrick, MD 21702-502

Re: 030200

Dear Sir or Madam:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS) for the Chemical and Biological Defense Program (CBDP). Our review is provided under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA Implementing Regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

EPA commends the Army's efforts in applying NEPA in a programmatic manner using selected example sites for detailed analyses. We appreciate your commitment that NEPA considerations will continue to be addressed as necessary for site specific proposed actions, including both construction and operations that are part of the CBDP.

EPA has rated this document **LO, Lack of Objections** (see attached definition of EPA ratings).

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please feel free to contact me at (202) 564-5400 or Marguerite Duffy at (202) 564-2400.

Sincerely,

Anne Norton Miller
Director
Office of Federal Activities

Enclosure

Internet Address (URL) • http://www.epa.gov
Recycled/Recyclable - Printed with Vegetable Oil Based Inks on Recycled Paper (Minimum 20% Postconsumer)

SUMMARY OF RATING DEFINITIONS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTION

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO--Lack of Objections
The EPA review has not identified any potential impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC--Environmental Concerns
The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EO--Environmental Objections
The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU--Environmentally Unsatisfactory
The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potential unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1--Adequate
EPA believes that draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2--Insufficient Information
The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3--Inadequate
EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

08/18/2003 MON 15:49 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 002/002

Robert J. Huston, *Chairman*
R. B. "Ralph" Marquez, *Commissioner*
Kathleen Hartnett White, *Commissioner*
Margaret Hoffman, *Executive Director*

rec'd 18 Aug 03

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution

July 31, 2003

JoLane Souris
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
504 Scott Street
Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

Re: TRACS #5535–Chemical and Biological Defense Program

Dear Ms. Souris :

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) has reviewed the above-referenced project and offers the following comments:

A review of the above-referenced project for General Conformity impact in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93 and Chapter 101.30 of the TCEQ General Rules indicates that the proposed project is located statewide, which is currently classified as in nonattainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for one or more of the six criteria air pollutants. While general conformity rules apply, the project as proposed contains no demolition, construction, rehabilitation or repair component which will produce dust and particulate emissions and we, therefore, have no objections or comments at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If you have any questions, please call Mr. Daniel Burke, Policy and Regulations Division, at (512) 239-1543.

Sincerely,

Jim Muse

Jim Muse, Director
Policy and Regulations Division

P.O. Box 13087 • Austin, Texas 78711-3087 • 512/239-1000 • Internet address: www.tceq.state.tx.us

printed on recycled paper using soy-based ink

08/25/2003 MON 10:28 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 002/005

MDP

Maryland Department of Planning

Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr.
Governor
Michael S. Steele
Lt. Governor

Audrey E. Scott
Secretary
Florence H. Burton
Deputy Secretary

August 13, 2003

Ms. JoLane Souris
Project Manager, ATTN: MCMR-ZC-S
U.S. Army Medical Research Command
504 Scott Street
Fort Detrick, MD 21702-5012

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE RECOMMENDATION

State Application Identifier: MD20030507-0425
Applicant: U.S. Army Medical Research Command
Project Description: Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Chemical and Biological Defense Program: consider a coordinated defense program and the "no action" alternative
Project Location: Frederick County - City of Frederick
Approving Authority: U.S. Army

Funds: Federal: $11,080,245.00 State: $ 0.00 Local: $ 0.00 Other: $232,801.00
Recommendation: **Consistent with Qualifying Comments and Contingent Upon Certain Actions**

Dear Ms. Souris:

In accordance with Presidential Executive Order 12372 and Code of Maryland Regulation 14.24.04, the State Clearinghouse has coordinated the intergovernmental review of the referenced project. This letter, with attachments, constitutes the State process review and recommendation based upon comments received to date. This recommendation is valid for a period of three years from the date of this letter.

Review comments were requested from the Maryland Departments of the Environment, Transportation, Natural Resources, State Police, Housing and Community Development, including the Maryland Historical Trust, the Maryland Military Department, Frederick County, the City of Frederick, and the Maryland Department of Planning. As of this date, the Maryland Military Department has not submitted comments. **This recommendation is contingent upon the Applicant considering and addressing any problems or conditions that may be identified by their review. Any comments received will be forwarded.**

The Maryland Departments of State Police, Natural Resources, and the Environment; Frederick County; the City of Frederick; and the Maryland Department of Planning found this project to be consistent with their plans, programs, and objectives.

The Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, including the Maryland Historical Trust (the Trust) found this project to be generally consistent with their plans, programs, and objectives, but included certain qualifying comments attached here. While the Trust determined that the project would have no adverse effects on historic properties, the Trust sought to review future proposals that involve construction, maintenance, or ground-disturbing actions.

301 West Preston Street • Suite 1101 • Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2305
Telephone: 410.767.4500 • Fax: 410.767.4480 • Toll Free: 1.877.767.6272 • TTY Users: Maryland Relay
Internet: www.MDP.state.md.us

08/25/2003 MON 10:28 FAX 301 619 6627 USAMRMC-MCMR-RCQ 003/005

Ms. JoLane Souris
August 13, 2003
Page 2

Any statement of consideration given to the comments(s) should be submitted to the approving authority, with a copy to the State Clearinghouse. The State Application Identifier Number must be placed on any correspondence pertaining to this project. The State Clearinghouse must be kept informed if the approving authority cannot accommodate the recommendation.

Please remember, you must comply with all applicable state and local laws and regulations. If you need assistance or have questions, contact the State Clearinghouse staff person noted above at 410-767-4490 or through e-mail at brosenbush@mdp.state.md.us. **Also please complete the attached form and return it to the State Clearinghouse as soon as the status of the project is known.** ***Any substitutions of this form must include the State Application Identifier Number.*** **This will ensure that our files are complete.**

Thank you for your cooperation with the MIRC process.

Sincerely,

Linda C. Janey

Linda C. Janey, J.D., Director
Maryland State Clearinghouse
for Intergovernmental Assistance

LCJ:BR
Enclosure(s)
cc: Kathy Opferman - DHCD/MHT
Jennifer Dougherty – City of Frederick
Joane Mueller - MDE
Ronald Spalding - MDOT
Ray Dintaman - DNR
Leigh Maddox - MDSP
Friedrich Martin - MILT
James Shaw - FRDR

03-0425_CRR.CLS.doc

Requests for Copies

Mailing List Request
From: Janis Graham [Janis.U.Graham@jpl.nasa.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2001 2:13 PM
To: CBDP-PEIS@DET.AMEDD.ARMY.MIL
Subject: Future CBDP NEPA Documentation

I attempted (and may have succeeded) to send my name and address, via your website, to be added to your mailing list for future NEPA documention on this proposed action; however, I did not receive a confirmation, nor any indication that my message was received as my screen did not change. So, I will repeat the information here, in the event that it did not reach you. If the information did reach you, please ignore the duplication of information, and to avoid similar confusion in the future, you might want to add a function to your website that will acknowledge receipt for those who respond.

Thank you,

Janis U. Graham
Jet Propulsion Laboratory
M/S 301-472
4800 Oak Grove Dr.
Pasadena, CA 91109
USA
818-354-1095

Page 1

From: Souris, JoLane D Ms USAMRMC [jolane.souris@us.army.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2003 7:44 AM
To: Miller, James Mr SAIC
Subject: FW: CBDP EIS Comments

Jim
FYI on the below email. Please add her to your
list of those who will receive notice of availability
of the document.

The document has been through my boss, JAG and is in Dr. Linden's office. Hopefully I'll get it today and take it up to the PAO. Not sure if we'll make the
3rd. But I'm pushing them.
JoLane

-----Original Message-----
From: jolane.souris@det.amedd.army.mil
[mailto:jolane.souris@det.amedd.army.mil]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2003 4:20 PM
To: jolane.souris@DET.AMEDD.ARMY.MIL
Subject: CBDP EIS Comments

Name:
Jennifer J Lasecki

Organization:
DynCorp Systems & Solutions, LLC

Address:
6101 Stevenson Ave Alexandria, VA 22304

Country:
USA

Email Address:
jennifer.lasecki@dyncorp.com

Phone:
703-461-2024

Comments:
Dear Sir or Madam:

I noticed that according to your schedule the draft PEIS for the CBDP would be available as of 2/17/03. I am writing to request a copy of the draft document for review; and would like a copy of the final document once it has completed revisions.

Thank you for your time and attention to my inquiry.

VBR,

Jennifer J. Lasecki
National Security Analyst
DynCorp Systems & Solutions, LLC
6101 Stevenson Ave
Alexandria, VA 22304
Tel: 703-461-2024
jennifer.lasecki@dyncorp.com

CBDP EIS Comments

From: cbdp-peis@det.amedd.army.mil
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2003 11:31 AM
To: cbdp-peis@det.amedd.army.mil
Subject: CBDP EIS Comments

Name:
Jennifer J Lasecki

Organization:
CSC

Address:
6101 Stevenson Ave Alexandria, VA 22201

Country:
USA

Email Address:
jennifer.lasecki@dyncorp.com

Phone:
703-461-2024

Comments:
I am writing to request a copy of the CBDP EIS.

Thank you,

Jennifer J. Lasecki
National Security Analyst
CSC
National Security Programs
6101 Stevenson Ave
Alexandria VA 22201
703-461-2024
jennifer.lasecki@dyncorp.com

Page 1

From: Bill Ganzer [mailto:bill.ganzer@ps.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2003 8:55 AM
To: jolane.souris@amedd.army.mil
Subject: Chemical and Biological Defense Program Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Date: 5/5/2003

Ms. Souris,

I support the Department of the Navy, Naval Seas Systems Command (NAVSEA) Office of Environmental Protection, Occupational Safety and Health, NEPA and Environmental Planning Branch. Ms. Deborah Verderame, the Branch Chief has requested that I contact you to obtain a copy of the Chemical and Biological Defense Program Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Date: 5/5/2003. I would like to obtain either a CD or Hard Copy of the document. Can you please provide me information on how I may do this.

Respectfully,

Bill Ganzer
Senior Environmental Analyst
PEROT Systems Government Services
1600 Beauregard Street
Suite 201
Alexandria, Virginia 22311

703-933-8281

From: Ellis,Charles [<mailto:chellis@deq.state.va.us>]
Scnt: Thursday, May 15, 2003 10:42 AM
To: jolane.souris@amedd.Army.mil
Subject: Draft Programmatic EIS on Chemical/biological defense

Ms. Souris - thank you for calling me back. As I indicated, our job, in the Office of Environmental Impact Review of DEQ, is to coordinate the review by ourselves and other state agencies. Here are the state agency contact people's addresses I promised -- minus two, with whom I checked just now.

Please distribute the 7 remaining copies as follows (1 copy each):

Mr. Alan Weber Mr.
Virginia Department of Health
Division of Drinking Water
1500 East Main Street 629
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Thomas Modena
Department of Environmental Quality
Waste Management Division
East Main Street, 4th floor
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mr. Kotur Narasimhan
Department of Environmental Quality
Air Division
629 East Main Street, 8th floor
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mr. Michael Cline
Department of Emergency Management
10501 Trade Court
Richmond, Virginia 23236

Mr. Martin Ferguson
Department of Environmental Quality
Water Division
629 East Main Street, 9th floor
Richmond, Virginia 232129

Mr. Charles Ellis
Department of Environmental Quality
Office of Environmental Impact Review
629 East Main Street, 6th floor
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Thank you very much for your help on this matter. If you have questions, feel free to call or send an e-mail.

Charlie Ellis
DEQ-OEIR
5/15/03

tel. (804) 698-4488
e-mail: chellis@deq.state.va.us

PEIS Requests Page 1 of 1

From: Souris, JoLane D Ms USAMRMC [jolane.souris@us.army.mil]
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2003 1:48 PM
To: Miller, James Mr SAIC
Subject: PEIS Requests

Jim
The following people have requested copies of the PEIS (phone messages):

1. Margery Duff
   2 hard copies
   USEPA
   Office of Federal Activities
   1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW
   Code 2253AR
   Washington DC 20460

2. Jim Woolford
   1 hard copy
   USEPA
   Office of Federal Facilities
   Crystal Gateway 1235
   Code CG12603
   Arlington, VA 22202

2. Jack Skeen
   1 hard copy
   US Army Dougway Proving Ground
   Attn: CSTE-DTC-DP-JA
   Dougway, Utah 84022

3. Bud Ford
   1 hard copy
   Commanding Officer
   Division of Environmental Programs
   Conservation & Preservation Branch
   Bldg 5330
   Vasquez Circle, room, 1513
   Attn: Bud Ford
   Dougway, Utah 84022-5000

JoLane D. Souris, CHMM
Command Environmental Coordinator
U.S. Army Medical Research Materiel Command
MCMR-ZC-S
504 Scott Street
Fort Detrick, MD 21702-5012
jolane.souris@det.amedd.army.mil
301-619-2004
fx 301-619-6627