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This response to the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment is provided by the Army Alliance, Inc. and the Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor (CSSC) as a coordinated community response with support from Harford County Government. The CSSC and Army Alliance are well established and widely recognized community organizations within the state of Maryland and Washington, D.C. area.

Our SPEA response includes two specific requests: (1) reconsideration of certain information that appears to be inconsistent or missing from the Assessment and (2) schedule one of the first public listening sessions indicated for October 2014 through March 2015. We currently understand that the APG listening session may be as late as the first week of December.

Our SPEA response contains the following sections: Section 1, information on the organizations responding to the SPEA on behalf of the community surrounding Aberdeen Proving Ground; Section 2, our response to the SPEA with specific concerns about certain elements of the SPEA and some of its conclusions; Section 3, our process in preparing this response; and Section 4, community letters and signatures of support.

The Army made a significant investment in APG as a result of BRAC 2005, both in personnel and infrastructure costs, to continue to grow its technology missions to support Soldiers, the Army, and the Department of Defense. As a result, we urge you to reconsider the SPEA force reduction recommendation position on APG which, if implemented, could have significant negative impact on not just our community, but most importantly on the ability of APG to continue to support the Warfighter and their missions by providing them safe and effective equipment. We conclude the marginal environmental benefits identified within the SPEA are not realistically achievable and clearly are not worth the risk to the Warfighter, the Army’s missions, and our Nation’s defense. We look forward to your consideration and response to the “Response to the SPEA” from our region.

Jill McClune
President
Army Alliance, Inc.

Karen L. Holt
Regional Manager
Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor (CSSC)
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Section 1

Who is responding to the SPEA:

Army Alliance, Inc.
Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor (CSSC)

Both organizations are supported by Harford County Government, Maryland

The Army Alliance was established in 1999 as a 501(c)(4) community advocacy organization working on behalf of Harford County and Aberdeen Proving Ground and the surrounding communities. The Alliance is supported by grants and sponsorships from interested organizations and individuals, and its all-volunteer board is comprised of retired defense officers and local business and community leaders. Its goal is to support our Army; to specifically help fill the information gap between the APG tenants who are primarily Army, the defense industry, and the local communities that provide the support to nurture the highly technical workforce in place today and essential for tomorrow. The Army Alliance also plays a critical role as an authoritative source of information to state and federal officials.

The CSSC is a regional, multi-jurisdictional cooperative consortium that was established to support growth needs and analysis during BRAC 2005, primarily in the areas of transportation, infrastructure, education, and workforce. CSSC and Harford County secured more than $10 million in federal funding for studies and growth assessments to support strategic planning and implementation during BRAC 2005 from transit oriented development to curriculum gap analysis for advanced degree needs, to university research park feasibility. Today, CSSC continues to serve as a regional coordinating body. Ongoing initiatives include an APG Joint Land Use Study, telework best practices assessment, and demand management efforts for traffic mitigation. CSSC was named the 2014 Community of Excellence by the Association of Defense Communities.

Collaboratively, the Army Alliance and the CSSC are joined in focusing on sustaining RDTE capabilities and missions of APG and its defense community, while supporting economic vitality for the region. Both organizations serve as model programs, recognized state wide and nationally for their committed efforts to APG and our national defense and both played a major role in the successful implementation of BRAC 2005. The CSSC leveraged its role as a regional authority clearinghouse to educate and coordinate private and governmental agencies and provide a focused outlet for combined efforts, and the Alliance as an authoritative source of information and unified voice for military prioritization and funding for sustainment and modernization of APG to elected officials from Annapolis to Washington, D.C.
Please note that all pictures in this response are either owned by the respondents or are courtesy of U.S. Army.
Section 2

The Response to SPEA

Community organizations and concerned citizens of the area surrounding Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, (“APG”) have reviewed the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) for Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment, and upon review declare our support for the U.S. Army and APG, while expressing concern for apparent deficiencies in the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) methodology.

For nearly 100 years, APG, Harford County, and the surrounding area have worked together for the common good of the Nation’s defense and APG has become the Army’s Center of Excellence for C4ISR, CBRNE, and T&E. BRAC 2005 capitalized on that advantage and strengthened APG’s standing, effectiveness, and contribution by consolidating many C4ISR, chemical-biological defense, test and evaluation, and other functions at APG. Just one example of the inclusion of tenants working together and providing expertise can be found in the C4ISR Network Integration Exercise (NIE) that now includes ATEC and ARL as part of the exercise among many others at APG. The community and State of Maryland responded and met their responsibility for the “outside the gate” support needed. Together with the Army and the communities surrounding APG, the Army Alliance and CSSC worked tirelessly to ensure the 2005 BRAC was successfully implemented in 2011. The result, as noted in the SPEA 2014, is that “Today Aberdeen Proving Ground is considered a DoD and universal leader in the Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDTE) of Army materiel, including the training of military personnel who use the materiel.” (see SPEA, page 4-9, lines 21-24)

We recognize that economic and budget pressures expressed in formal budget guidance to the Department of Defense and Army require reducing the size of the Army and that many if not all installations will experience strength losses of some kind. We stand firm with the Army in hoping that sequestration does not happen as currently programmed, and that more stable budgeting cycles lie ahead. However, we are concerned that the SPEA has certain logical inconsistencies and factual omissions that could misdirect future deliberations. The BRAC 2005 Commission Report criticized several inconsistencies and lack of coordination in the data available during their review and we are concerned that similar omissions in the SPEA will misinform future actions. (see Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report, 8 September 2005)

In fact, the numbers proposed for reduction at APG have already had a negative impact. Industry, academia, and our workforce population have viewed the SPEA as an indicator of possible steps ahead by the Army. We are extremely concerned about the assumptions used, the incompleteness of installations targeted, and the impacts if the current information in the SPEA is not further assessed.
We are particularly concerned in light of the statements made in the SPEA regarding the overall Army NEPA decision. Specifically:

As with the 2013 PEA, the socioeconomic impacts analyzed in this SPEA are of particular concern to the Army. Socioeconomic impacts analyzed within this SPEA may approach or exceed significance thresholds. CEQ and Army NEPA regulations, however, do not require preparation of an EIS when the only significant impacts are socioeconomic. CEQ’s regulation states: “economic or social effects are not intended by themselves to require preparation of an environmental impact statement” (40 CFR Part 1508.14). In the same vein, the Army’s NEPA regulations do not require preparation of an EIS for realignment or stationing actions where the only significant impacts are socioeconomic with no significant environmental impact [32 CFR Part 651.42(e)]. Absent significant environmental impacts, the exceedance of significance thresholds for socioeconomic impacts alone would not require the Army to issue a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS. (see SPEA, page 1-9, lines 18-28)

Our view is consistent with the guidance in 40 CFR Part 1500, the President’s Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA Guidance, Section. 1508.14, Human environment, states, “‘Human environment’ shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment. (See the definition of "effects" (Sec. 1508.8)). This means that economic or social effects are not intended by themselves to require preparation of an environmental impact statement. When an environmental impact statement is prepared and economic or social and natural or physical environmental effects are interrelated, then the environmental impact statement will discuss all of these effects on the human environment. Additionally, 32 CFR Subpart F § 651.41(d) and (g), identify the following conditions normally required for the conducting of an EIS:

(d) Result in significant or uncertain environmental effects, or unique or unknown environmental risks. . . .

(g) Adversely interact with other actions with individually insignificant effects so that cumulatively significant environmental effects result.

We are concerned that the current SPEA makes invalid assumptions about the availability of workforce and capabilities after the contemplated reductions that would be required in order to not have any negative impacts to the valued environmental components. Since missions were not assessed regarding the specific personnel to be reduced, it seems shortsighted to assume that resources would continue to be available to maintain the level of positive environmental stewardship that are resulting in some of the more positive contemplated impacts of Alternative 1. Additionally, it is difficult to see how certain personnel reductions would be made at APG, particularly with regards to Soldiers, that would not result in these activities simply moving instead of being eliminated entirely. While both of these issues are discussed in more detailed later in this response, the combination of these issues highlights critical uncertainties and unknowns, along with the possibility for APG reductions to adversely interact or impact actions at other installations such that there are potential significant cumulative environmental effects not assessed under the current SPEA.
Another significant example of an adverse interaction with other actions that is not assessed under the SPEA, though both actions are contemplated under the SPEA, is the cumulative effects on the impacted communities and the State of Maryland should the proposed workforce reductions for both APG and Fort Meade be implemented. These installations are only 50 miles apart and have some workforce, residential, and economic communities in common. Any impact to either installation will have at minimum a socioeconomic impact on the other installation. This obvious interaction between the regions surrounding these two installations also has not been assessed. Therefore, we raise the concern that at minimum certain site-specific Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) may be required for APG and other assessed installations.

We are aware that the SPEA promises that public listening sessions will be held from October, 2014 to March, 2015. It is our current understanding that the listening session for APG is being coordinated for the first week of December, 2014. In addition to the request regarding reconsideration of certain information, we ask that the planned public listening session for APG be moved into the October 2014 timeframe. A driving reason for this is the inconsistency in criteria that will be noted later in this response. The community is very aware of them, has questions, and would appreciate comprehensive answers.

Generally, for every element except Socio-Economic, the impact of the proposed action is favorable since the action would reduce the number of people impacting the environment, thus improvement is a prima facie conclusion. While we can appreciate in general that fewer individuals at APG would likely have environmental benefits due to the general reduction in military and industrial activities in and around APG, the public assessment of such reductions, without contemplating the specific organizations that would be reduced and the resulting missions impacted, raises concerns regarding some of the environmental conclusions since they could depend on the organizations and activities ultimately reduced. Additionally, socioeconomic impacts are uniformly noted as “significant,” the highest rating available, but that does nothing to provide quantitative information for decision making nor does it force deeper analysis in the form of an Environmental Impact Statement.

In summary, it is our position that the environmental “benefits” of a smaller APG workforce infers that there is an environmental “problem” that needs correction. This “problem” is unidentifiable, is unknown to the people who work on and off APG, and is only subjectively described in the SPEA. The assumption that a reduced APG population in the aggregate can be mathematically correlated to an environmental “benefit” without precise definition of which people and missions would be reduced is flawed.

APG has one of the most progressive environmental campaigns found in the nation, and certainly one of the best in the Army. Some examples of APG’s environmental successes are described in our detailed response below. While there is an understanding that less people imply a smaller carbon footprint, the assumption that any quantifiable number for employment reduction purposes based on only an inferred environmental problem is not based on a holistic review of the facts regarding APG. There is no identified or theoretical environmental problem associated with the current workforce size at APG in need of corrective action.

Lastly, we acknowledge and commend the Army for its commitment to environmental stewardship, as demonstrated by the programs and achievements at APG. However, while the SPEA states that “[e]ven
if the full end-strength reductions were to be realized at Aberdeen Proving Ground, [that] the Army would ensure that adequate staffing remains so that the installation would comply with all mandatory environmental regulations,” (see SPEA, page 4-13, lines 14-16), this statement would only ensure the continuation of the minimum efforts required to satisfy the mandatory environmental regulations, and not the concerted efforts that have resulted in APG improving its environmental impacts since 2009 despite its significant growth. As a result, there is a potential that a reduction in personnel at APG could result in increased negative environmental impacts that were not contemplated in the SPEA.

In addition to the summary concerns described on the previous pages, this response identifies various specific concerns with the SPEA content and conclusions. First, we identify and address the three primary deficiencies we see with the SPEA: (1) APG’s inclusion as an exception to the stated SPEA criteria, (2) the appropriateness of correlating troop and civilian reductions to an installation whose primary missions are research, development, test and evaluation (“RDTE”), and (3) assessment of APG troop reductions without consideration of the highly unique training and capabilities of the majority of APG stationed troops. Second, we highlight some questions and issues with the findings of specific valued environmental components.

First, there are three (3) primary areas where we judge the SPEA to be deficient as it pertains to APG. They are:

**Deficiency One, the Screening and Evaluation Criteria as Applied to APG**

SPEA Section 3.4, Screening and Evaluation Criteria used to Identify a Range of Potential Installations for Additional Force Reductions, provides the rationale for the selection of the installations include in the SPEA. However, it specifically identifies that APG is included in the SPEA as an exception to the guidance. “This SPEA does not include installations whose mission is primarily run by the Army Materiel Command, such as depots, arsenals, and army ammunition plants, or installations used primarily for test and evaluation. Their missions are managed by the Army Materiel Command and the Army Test and Evaluation Command, and it is not now anticipated that they could have a combined reduction of 1,000 Soldiers or Army civilian employees. The exception is Aberdeen Proving Ground, which has 1,428 Soldiers, and is included in this analysis.” (see SPEA, page 3-9, lines 19-24)

This exception is made without any rationale as to why the situation is different at APG over other AMC installations. The rationale to target APG for reduction (as well as Ft. Belvoir and Ft. Meade) is not clear and is counter to the selection criteria highlighted in the SPEA. Without additional information, it appears to us that other primarily civilian facilities, including AMC and RDTE installations, could also have been included. As a result of the inclusion of APG in the SPEA
inconsistent with the stated criteria and the lack of assessments for other primarily R&D and test and evaluation locations, particularly under AMC, the Army would not have available to it comparable information from APG’s peer installations; thereby putting APG at a disadvantage during any future decision-making associated with the contemplated reductions. As a result, the selection criteria used for identifying reductions by installation is inconsistent and/or incomplete.

As a result, whether it was intended or not, the actual effect of using just the numbers (not the specialized mission characteristics) of Soldiers opens up the civilian population to a vastly disproportionate reduction. This puts APG at a disadvantage in future consideration, especially with other high-civilian installations, which have even fewer military positions and thus were spared the opportunity to contribute to the current potential reductions. We advocate such a decision is much more significant than the language in the SPEA would suggest and should receive external or additional attention.

Additionally, the Army tenants at APG fall under multiple Army leadership channels; AMC is the dominant one, for example AMC CERDEC provides matrix support to PEOs and PMs. The PEOs report to the Army Acquisition Executive and ATEC reports to the Army Vice Chief of Staff. Therefore, a major current and historical portion of its activities are pure test and evaluation. While APG does have a Soldier population over 1,000, many of those Soldiers are senior military leaders and technical experts involved in research and development of materiel in the various laboratories and program management offices and RDTE commands at APG. Because of their highly dispersed tasks and locations any reduction would need to be almost one by one, a sensitive and difficult task that can only be managed at each specific management level, instead of in the aggregate as assessed in the SPEA. To achieve a military reduction close to the number the SPEA proposes, the 20th CBRNE Command would have to be essentially eliminated as described in Deficiency Three. However, the Soldiers of the 20th CBRNE Command are a highly-specialized, CBRNE-focused unit. Therefore, with the elimination of the 20th, which is not an “operational” force the way the term is used elsewhere in the SPEA, there were insufficient operational force Soldiers on APG to warrant APG’s inclusion in the SPEA under its criteria as started in Section 3.4.

**Deficiency Two, the Disproportionate Nature of the Soldier to Civilian Assessed Reductions**

According to the SPEA, a reduction in civilian spaces is tied to the reduction in military forces and the results show a direct numerical relationship. While we understand the general rationale that reductions in military forces will result in a corresponding reduction of support civilian personnel, this workforce reduction logic is inappropriate to be applied to APG for two reasons: (1) overall APG workforce mix is predominantly civilian, unlike Army installations that also serve as deployment hubs, and (2) the APG mission is RDTE focused instead of operational in nature.
The proposed cuts would leave APG with effectively zero military troop strength. As will be described in more detail under Deficiency Three, in order to achieve the proposed Soldier reductions, there would be complete loss of the 20th CBRNE Command, the only FORSCOM unit at APG. Additionally, while the RDTE mission is largely executed by civilian scientists and engineers, it is the military leadership and mix within the workforce that provides operational context to the research, development, testing, and evaluation performed uniquely at APG. Effective Army acquisition takes a balanced military and civilian workforce approach; both skills are essential. The cuts proposed by the SPEA would effectively negate the Army’s military contributions to the C4ISR and CBRNE program development, as well as the testing and evaluation of all Army weapons systems.

The troop strength reductions proposed for the Army are driven by a reduction in our operational forces. The workforce at APG supports the development of materiel these forces will use in combat; but (with one exception) is distinctly not part of the operational Army. The RDTE mission funding, which funds most of the APG workforce, does not reduce commensurate with Army end strength. Certain logic would dictate a need to increase certain R&D missions at APG to ensure that the Army has the technologies needed to produce similar mission outcomes despite its smaller size. Therefore we disagree with the logic used to derive the SPEA reductions.

The SPEA reductions span 90 tenants on one installation and, for reduction purposes, assume they can be reduced pro-rata with Army troop strength reductions. We recognize that the requirement for consideration of civilian reductions in addition to the troop strength reassessments are required by National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) 2013, §955. However, as described above, this reduction logic is misapplied for both the workforce composition and missions at APG. Additionally, the SPEA does not explain the rationale for the 70% Soldier/30% civilian formula used in the first phase of the SPEA conducted in 2013 and why it would be equally applicable to primarily civilian installations. In the 2013 original analysis that addressed reductions in “operational” forces, this ratio formula made sense as a way to apportion reductions between the Soldier force and the installation support force at their home location. In other words, this would be the civilian support “slice” associated with military forces that might be reduced. This logic does not apply to an installation such as APG. Additionally, there is no explanation and rationale for reversing the ratio for APG and the other installations assessed in Phase 2 of the SPEA.

Lastly, we do not agree that the reductions to the Army’s RDTE civilian workforce at APG should be in direct proportion to the total Army military drawdown. “Although we’re budgeting this way, research and development is not a variable-cost activity,” Alan R. Shaffer, Principal Deputy in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense Research and Engineering (ASD(R&E)). “Regardless of force size,” he explained, “the nonrecurring engineering costs of developing a new system are the same.” (See Pentagon Official: Research, Development No Place to Cut Costs, by Claudette Roulo, American Forces Press Service, 3/18/14 at http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=121856) Army RDTE funding is not being reduced at the same rate as military pay and troop strength, and the highest priority Army programs such as network modernization are being managed by the RDTE workforce at APG. RDTE efforts are also largely disassociated from the number of Soldiers or materiel they support. All new systems need to be sufficiently tested and evaluated regardless of the quantity to be procured. Therefore, any reductions proposed, should be driven by the nature of the missions being chosen for reduction, and identified uniquely by agency.
Deficiency Three, the Inability to Achieve the Proposed Military Reductions in light of the 20th CBRNE Command

While Deficiency Two focused on the critical and unique civilian population at APG, APG’s small uniformed contingents comprise of uniquely trained and capable assets that would not likely be reduced as part of general manpower reductions as being assessed by the SPEA. APG had significantly larger number of Soldiers in the past but these numbers were significantly reduced after the relocations and realignments resulting from BRAC 2005. Specifically, the primary source of military spaces at APG is the 20th CBRNE Command, the Army's only command that combats chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive (“CBRNE”) threats. Additionally there are uniquely-trained uniformed Soldiers assigned to the U.S. Army Public Health Command also stationed at APG. Elimination of either of these uniquely trained and qualified Soldiers would eliminate years’ worth of training and experience that could not be readily replicated.

While the 20th CBRNE Command was not uniquely identified in the SPEA, to achieve the military reduction numbers proposed, the 20th would certainly be the bill payer. The CBRNE mission at APG was a BRAC 2005 Center of Excellence (COE) objective approved by the Army and OSD and involved relocation of the Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical Biological Defense to APG. Taking the Soldier element of this Center of Excellence away (the net effect of achieving the SPEA military reductions) is counter to the 2005 BRAC legislation. Should this command be reduced to meet the SPEA numbers, this leaves APG an almost entirely civilian Army installation.

It appears unlikely that the 20th CBRNE Command would be an Army unit scheduled for elimination. They are the Army's only command that combats CBRNE threats worldwide. The 20th is a vital component of the Nation’s defense against weapons of mass destruction and provides support while deployed in hostile areas overseas, as well as domestically. It is also very specialized and its services are critical in ways independent of overt military engagements. Given the ongoing sensitivity and importance of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear defense needs it is highly unlikely this capability would be eliminated from the DoD capabilities, thus a loss at APG would likely mean only a transfer to another location, away from the specialized backup up support now provided from the Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, also located at APG. This unique mission must continue to be performed by Soldiers within our Army.

The assumption used in the SPEA is that the reductions in the APG workforce are true reductions; e.g., eliminated not just at APG but from the Army in total. We assert the 20th’s mission is uniquely different from the Brigade Combat Team (BCT) warfighting missions being drawn down and that the 20th CBRNE Command missions and functions would have to be performed by the Army somewhere. Our recommendation is to leave them intact, co-located with the CBRNE COE created at APG by BRAC 2005 and expanded into TEAM CBRNE located in the Edgewood Area of APG. Lastly, for the 20th or any of the other specially trained Soldiers located at APG including those with the Public Health Command, relocation to an alternative Army site would provide an environmental “benefit” to APG,
but the relocation would be offset by an environmental “problem” added at the receiver Army installation.

**Concerns Regarding Specific Valued Environmental Components**

_The Army Alliance and the CSSC would like to acknowledge that interested citizens have provided their thoughts and contributions to this response – particularly as it relates to specific valued environmental components. We understand that these individuals intend to directly submit their issues and concerns; therefore, we have not attempted to address every potential issue identified in the SPEA, but have ensured that we have addressed matters we are unaware of being addressed by others or is of particularly significant concern._

One particular concern that arises from the narratives in all but the Socio-Economic portion is the steady promise that any reductions at APG would not have an impact on the various elements of environmental programs and support. APG has numerous environmental concerns, generally inherited from its history in a time of low environmental consideration. Those programs have strong community support and have made much progress.

Surpassing its already stellar record of executing a cost-effective environmental cleanup program, the Directorate of Public Work's Installation Restoration Program recently was recognized in 2013 with two prestigious awards from the Secretary of the Army and the Department of Defense. In May, the team was announced as the winner of the Secretary of the Army Environmental Award for Environmental Restoration in the Installation category. After being advanced to compete at the next level, the team then won the 2013 Secretary of Defense Environmental Restoration Award.

There are other examples of the strengthening of environmental initiatives on APG that have strong support and additional benefit to the surrounding communities: APG’s American Bald Eagle population is a source of local pride. APG has documented significant growth in the installation's eagle population since the mid-1980s and is now at 138 eagles based on the last count in February, 2014. APG’s sustainable approach to cleaning up new O-Field is an example of using a green remediation approach to protect the Chesapeake Bay, its tributaries, and the surrounding environment at APG. Strong partnerships with regulators and the public, innovative strategies, and dynamic program management are credited for much of APG's success. The program focuses on supporting the APG mission while executing a cost-effective environmental cleanup program.

APG tenants are also embarking on various programs to explore and drive innovation of alternative energy resources and utilization. These efforts will provide economic benefits to the Army as overall
energy costs are reduced through transition to renewable energy sources. Additionally, they will continue APG’s overall environmental stewardship as it seeks to continue to reduce its carbon footprint and overall environmental and waste impacts due to energy requirements. The most recent example is a public-private partnership between the Army Test and Evaluation Center (“ATEC”) and Constellation, who jointly signed a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (“CRADA”) on August 4th, 2014. Under this CRADA, ATEC and Constellation Energy will collaborate on a number of alternative energy projects, including ones associated with geothermal and solar energy sources, that could be models for other tenants on APG and across DoD.

As a result of all these efforts, we remain wary that overall reductions can be made in a way that does not decrement or negatively impact the laudable environmental programs at APG, especially when the environmental elements scattered among the more than 90 tenant organizations are considered. Some of these organizations have major activity and significant environmental staff internally, none of which has been addressed with any granularity in the SPEA.

The following sections address concerns with the information or conclusions associated with specific valued environmental components of the SPEA assessment of APG. Not all valued environmental components are addressed. They are discussed in the order in which they are presented in the SPEA referring to their SPEA section number.

4.1.3 Air Quality

With regards to Air Quality, the data stated by the SPEA shows that despite the “significant growth” at APG since BRAC 2005, APG has been able to achieve significant reductions in certain pollutant emissions (see SPEA, page 4-12 Table 4.1-2). The SPEA acknowledges that “[e]missions would remain at levels below existing permit thresholds; however, PM10 emissions would continue to be a problem at certain vehicle testing tracks.” (see SPEA, page 4-12, lines 26-28) This statement seems inconsistent with the fact that APG added the Automotive Technology Evaluation Facility (ATEF), the only Army test track permitting vehicle testing at high speeds over extended periods during the time period being assessed. By testing the limits of handling and stability, this testing capability can reduce the number of vehicle accidents, the No. 1 cause of U.S. military deaths and a leading cause of non-hostile U.S. casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan. The ATEF was originally opened in 2010 with its capabilities expanded over the subsequent two years. Despite this increased use of vehicle testing tracks at APG, APG P10 emissions went from 4.19 in 2009 to 1.91 in 2013.

4.1.6 Noise
4.1.7 Soils
4.1.9 Wetlands

Under Alternative 1—Implement Force Reductions conclusions associated with Section 4.1.6, Noise; 4.1.7, Soils; and 4.1.9, Wetlands, the SPEA assumes the likelihood of decreased use of test ranges to conclude minor, beneficial impacts to both components. While we would concur that the general personnel reductions proposed would likely result in some positive benefit to noise soils, and wetlands impacts, we caution assuming a direct correlation to reductions in personnel to reductions in use of test ranges. The overall Army missions requiring the use of the test ranges is not proposed for reduction under the SPEA and would likely continue to be required even with the overall force realignment being assessed. The critical test and evaluation activities conducted on these ranges will still occur to support...
the ground combat vehicle, combat support systems, and live fire ballistic protection technology programs for the Army. The amount of testing and evaluation required for any given materiel would not likely be reduced, even though the overall quantity of materiel procured might be diminished. Therefore, since the majority of current impacts to noise, soils, and wetlands are a result of the activities conducted on the test ranges, the result of Alternate 1 on these components may only be negligible for noise and minor, at best, for soils and wetlands.

4.1.8 Biological Resources

As discussed above regarding general overall environmental stewardship at APG, the existence of an Army installation in this region of Maryland and the nation has actually resulted in increased biodiversity and support for wildlife then existed before the installation was founded around World War I. The SPEA provides an excellent overview of the considerable wildlife that exist on or are supported by the existence of APG, particularly for migratory birds and local wetland and water life. Of particular note are the concerted efforts by APG to save and help the American Bald Eagle, the symbol of the United States of America, thrive. As noted by CECOM Public Affairs, “Bald eagles thrive in our area because of decades of sound stewardship practiced by the Army and civilian communities. In fact, the efforts of Aberdeen Proving Ground were specifically cited by the Secretary of the Interior during the ceremony when the bald eagle was removed from the endangered species list. This success story highlights just one of many innovative and diligent efforts going on every day in our community to sustain our precious natural resources.” Currently, 138 bald eagles have been identified as living on the APG.

4.1.11 Facilities

It should be noted that APG is diligently proceeding to demolish underused buildings to cut down on utility usage. Between 2008 and 2013, 96 buildings were demolished reducing overall inventory by 375,000 square feet. APG’s Facility Reduction Program (“FRP”) plans for the demolition of an additional 165 buildings, 1.85 million square feet, between 2014 and 2020. The Army Alliance, as part of its advocacy initiatives, is encouraging Congress to significantly increase the funds for Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization (“FSRM”) for all DoD, but with a particular emphasis on the Army, in order to provide APG the potential for receiving sufficient funds to implement its FRP, particularly as it pertains to contaminated buildings. These reductions are in addition to those that will be carried out under APG’s public private partnership with Corvias Military Living, who is modernizing APG’s military housing inventory, including demolishing excess outdated buildings. APG also has the land to construct new buildings which are more energy efficient and investments in power and energy complexes on the Post that can potentially exercise alternative energy sources (i.e. solar sources, geothermal).
4.1.12  Socioeconomics

Employment and Income
While not significant, it should be noted that APG’s workforce lives and has an economic impact beyond the Maryland counties noted in the SPEA Section 4.1.12.1. APG’s civilian workforce also lives in Baltimore City and the States of Delaware, Pennsylvania, and even part time in New Jersey. While to a lesser extent, these jurisdictions would also have to address the economic and workforce impacts of the assessed workforce reductions.

It should be noted that there is no consideration of the assessed workforce reductions on contractor personnel and workforce levels in the region. Due to the budget constraints resulting in the Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment that has initiated the SPEA, it could be conceived that missions might be reduced at APG when the workforce is reduced. This could result in significant decreases to the local contractor workforce population, which would generate additional negative socioeconomic impacts due to additional unemployment. Alternatively, contractor personnel may be procured to fill in required staffing shortages if missions are not reduced in line with the assessed APG workforce reductions. Due to some of the critical missions that APG conducts in support of C4ISR and CBRNE requirements worldwide, it is conceivable that missions may be continued to be funded despite the anticipated workforce reductions. Under this scenario, the potential positive environmental impacts due to an overall reduction of personnel and activities at APG might not come to pass, therefore putting into question the stated positive SPEA findings for many of the value environmental components.

The presentation of the employment and income information on a County by County basis masks the overwhelmingly significant impact APG is to overall workforce demographics in Maryland. Also, the notation regarding the extent of Armed Forces in the various workforce demographics is not enlightening to the potential impacts of the proposed reductions due to APG’s overwhelmingly civilian workforce. APG is the largest employer in northeastern Maryland and the third largest employer in the State of Maryland with a total of nearly 21,800 employees. More than half of the other employers in Harford County have fewer than 500 employees with the only other major employers above the 1,000 mark being Harford County Government, Harford County Public Schools, University of MD Upper Chesapeake Heath System (3,129), and Rite Aid Mid-Atlantic Customer Distribution Center (1,938).

APG’s significant civilian workforce is employed in positions requiring significant training and expertise with a high percentage of post-secondary degrees, resulting in a well-compensated workforce that has increased the median income in the region and has a quite significant positive economic impact on the surrounding communities. The following table shows the positive impact to Harford County and Maryland as a result in the change in workforce demographics at APG as a result of BRAC 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>$46,242</td>
<td>$48,451</td>
<td>$50,740</td>
<td>$52,029</td>
<td>$50,221</td>
<td>$50,046</td>
<td>$50,575</td>
<td>$51,371</td>
<td>$51,071</td>
<td>+10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$61,546</td>
<td>$65,041</td>
<td>$67,989</td>
<td>$70,482</td>
<td>$69,193</td>
<td>$68,933</td>
<td>$70,095</td>
<td>$71,169</td>
<td>$72,999</td>
<td>+18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford County</td>
<td>$65,381</td>
<td>$69,253</td>
<td>$72,092</td>
<td>$76,620</td>
<td>$75,364</td>
<td>$71,848</td>
<td>$77,095</td>
<td>$76,220</td>
<td>$80,441</td>
<td>+23.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Household Income, 2005 through 2013 (see American Community Survey, Census.com)
While not a subject of this response, Fort George G. Meade is the largest employer in Maryland with a similar highly educated, experienced, and compensated workforce. Therefore, when combined with the proposed actions for APG, this SPEA could have a disproportional impact on the State of Maryland as a whole. Therefore we take exception to the SPEA assertion that:

To ensure the potential impacts were captured to the greatest extent possible, this population loss was assessed against the EIFS threshold value of 0.45 percent and determined to be a significant impact. This number likely overstates potential population impacts because some of the people no longer employed by the Army would continue to live and work within the ROI, finding employment in other industry sectors. (see SPEA, page 4-40, lines 26-30)

The combination of the proposed reductions at the two installations under the SPEA is almost 9,000 individuals. Specifically, the professional and skill sets of the current APG DoD workforce whose expertise is in engineering, acquisition, logistics, testing and contracting, along with the equally specialized workforce of Fort Meade which is only 50 miles away from APG, could not be absorbed by local industry. Therefore, we submit the SPEA is not likely to be overstating the potential socioeconomic impacts, if anything, when combined with the potential impacts to Fort Meade, the conclusions are an assumed consequence and oversimplification of the potential resulting negative situation at APG.

**Housing**

The SPEA asserts that, “[t]he population reduction under Alternative 1 should lead to a decreased demand for housing and increased housing availability on the installation and in the region, potentially resulting in a slight reduction in median home values.” (see SPEA, page 4-41, lines 2-4) This assertion dramatically understates the scenario. The housing market is still recovering from the impact of actions taken in support of BRAC 2005, with numerous communities under construction. Certain APG workforce population groups have elected to continue to commute from New Jersey and Virginia or to reside on APG itself already reducing the residential demand. Any population decrease at APG (or even simply the discussion of potential decrease) would have much more than a slight impact. Rather, it would create a problematic situation, resulting in continued unfinished communities, and significantly diminished housing values.

**Schools**

While we appreciate the extent to which the SPEA highlights the potential significant impact to regional schools if the anticipated workforce reductions result in families moving from the region, we want to emphasize that there are school children of APG employees beyond the identified schools in Harford County and in schools in other jurisdictions including Cecil and Baltimore counties, as well as Delaware. Additionally, we note that a number of Harford County Schools which would likely be impacted were not listed.
4.1.13 **Energy Demand and Generation**

Since the information was collected for the SPEA, ATEC has entered into a CRADA with Constellation Energy for the development of energy generation projects utilizing alternative energy sources including solar and geothermal. This effort, along with other geothermal and solar initiatives on APG, will continue to address the President Executive Order requirements for concerted efforts targeted at energy efficiency and environmental sustainability. It is anticipated that over the coming years, APG will develop a number of prototype projects that could become models for the Army and the federal government in alternative energy generation. Additionally, most new buildings at APG are LEED certification equivalent, including at the silver level. APG is also transitioning offices and commands out of outdated buildings providing opportunities for facility modernization or demolition. Some of these transfers have been done with internal “self-help” resources limiting or reducing the impact to the Federal Budget. As a result of all these collective current and long terms efforts, APG is deliberately and effectively addressing the statement that it continues to rely on “outdated, energy inefficient facilities” such that APG is proactively working to reduce its energy consumption and improve energy efficiency. *(see SPEA, page 4-43, lines 29-32)*

4.1.15 **Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste**

The SPEA indicates that “demolition and/or renovation of existing buildings as a result of the force reductions is not reasonably foreseeable and not part of the scope of this SPEA; therefore, potential impacts from these activities are not analyzed.” *(see SPEA, page 4-48, lines28-30)* While we appreciate that the SPEA drafters did not have information sufficient to assess demolition and renovation of existing buildings, as discussed above in Section 4.1.11, Facilities, APG has a Facilities Reduction Program (“FRP”) under which they are specifically addressing the decommissioning and demolition of contaminated buildings. The removal of these buildings from APG will significantly reduce APG’s existing hazardous waste and its associated risks. The Army Alliance is specifically advocating for additional FSRM funds for the DoD and the specifically the Army to support APG’s requests for sufficient funding to initiate these efforts.

4.1.16 **Traffic and Transportation**

Any population reduction could be viewed as beneficial to traffic congestion at a federal installation. Harford County and the State of Maryland have been implementing road structure improvements to address the increased population since the implementation of BRAC 2005. Along the Route 40 corridor there have been more than six (6) major highway intersections or complete road structure improvements, particularly MD 715 leading into APG’s main gate. Additional roadwork to address congestion prone areas is also underway. Past congestion has diminished significantly as a result of the completed roadway projects. If force reductions were implemented and if as the SPEA states several times that it expects that the laid off workforce would continue to reside and be employed in the region, the previous and current transportation efforts would likely not benefit the resulting new traffic patterns. It is most likely that those residing locally near APG who are displaced would add to the existing heavier congested traffic conditions further south towards regions of possible employment such as Baltimore and Washington, D.C. The Interstate 95 south of APG towards Baltimore already exhibits congested traffic conditions during the morning commute. As a result, there is a strong probability that reductions in the APG workforce that seek employment in the surrounding regions will
contribute to increased traffic congestion on existing roads or create new congestions not previously observed.

4.1.17 Cumulative Effects

While we appreciate the extent to which the SPEA identifies some potential cumulative effects of the assessed workforce reduction, we find that the conclusion that these impacts would be mostly minor does not address or take into account certain information or likely results of any significant workforce reductions:

- Across several of the components, the SPEA assumes that significant portions of the displaced workforce will be able to find alternative employment and continue to live in the region. A reduction of such a significant number of Soldiers and civilians from APG with the expectation that they would be readily absorbed within the regional area is highly unrealistic. Much of the APG workforce has highly specialized expertise and qualifications that would not be readily translated to the commercial workforce. Given continued challenges to the federal budget and the national job market in the present economy, such a reemployment assumption should be supported in the SPEA. For instance, a comparison of the APG workforce composition against likely employment availability. Therefore, the cumulative socioeconomic impact on the regional economy and housing could be significant rather than minor with a higher number in the population being unemployed and potentially in danger of the loss of their residence through eviction or foreclosure.

- The SPEA emphasizes APG’s proximity to the greater Baltimore metropolitan area as a basis for minimizing some of the potential impacts of the assessed workforce reduction. While this statement is true and may have a beneficial impact on those reduced from APG, the SPEA fails to take into account how this region would be able to absorb the reductions of the two installations surrounding it: APG and Fort Meade. The SPEA should equally acknowledge the potential cumulative effects of significant layoffs at two of the three largest employers in the State of Maryland, who are only fifty miles from each other. Any population or socioeconomic impacts to the region as a result of the SPEA recommendations for APG will also be felt as a result of the SPEA recommendation for Fort Meade. The combination of these actions could have a devastating impact on the region, particularly across many of the socioeconomic subcomponents. While this issue is mentioned in the SPEA on page 4-52, lines 10-24, the focus on Baltimore County, the one county as being identified as common between the two installations, significantly underestimates and does not sufficiently analyze the shared workforce, educational, and socioeconomic resources across wider shared region.
Additional APG Background Information

Over its 97-year history, Aberdeen Proving Ground evolved into a hub of research, development, test, and evaluation activity for the joint services. As APG approaches its 100 year anniversary, not only has the installation grown larger over the past several years, its visibility among military bases has increased, and is considered a “megabase.” Aberdeen Proving Ground is now one of the most diversified military installations in the United States and the work that takes place at this 72,000-acre complex touches almost every aspect of U.S. military operations.

The recent growth from BRAC 2005 represents APG’s largest expansion since World War II, bringing the number of jobs on post to almost 22,000. Another 6,000 positions off Post were also brought to the region, which sees approximately $6.5 billion in annual economic activity generated by payroll and local contract execution. Contracting activity awards exceeded $16 billion this year. Recently released APG contracting figures shows the economic significant of APG activities. The following figures represent contracting actions during FY14 (October 2013 through present):

- Total contracting actions for the United States: 23,795
- Total obligations for the United States: $8,563,629,245
- Contracting Actions with Maryland Businesses: 2,070
  - Contracting Obligations for Maryland Businesses: $717,081,963
- Small Business Contracting Actions for Maryland Businesses: 1,110
  - Obligations for Maryland Small Businesses: $239,867,675

Home to the world’s leaders in research, development, testing, and evaluation of materiel, APG military and civilian personnel profoundly impact the way that wars are fought. The missions of APG fall into six primary categories: research and development, test and evaluation, medical, cybersecurity, chemical and biological defense, and C4ISR (Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance).
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Section 3

Public Forum Held—A Community Call to Action
Preparing for the Response to the SPEA
Monday, August 4, 2014

As research for this response, the Army Alliance and the CSSC collaborated in increasing public awareness in the APG community regarding the release of the draft SPEA and the public comment period. This was accomplished through a combination of journal articles, newspaper articles, and funded public notices that culminated in a jointly sponsored public meeting on Monday, August 4, 2014 at the local high school a few miles from the gates of Aberdeen Proving Ground. The purpose of the Public Forum was to inform them of the SPEA and how it fit into the Department of Defense and Army’s budget and force structure reduction areas of concern. This forum was similar to the former seven BRAC Town Halls that had been led by the Harford County Executive from 2005 to 2011 to keep citizens updated on the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Action Plan that was being implemented by the region.

The meeting was led by the Army Alliance and CSSC and was supported by Harford County Government with County Executive David R. Craig and Aberdeen Mayor Michael Bennett addressing the crowd. The evening was a “packed house” attended by approximately 280 people (including community leaders, elected officials, Congressional staffers, business owners and interested citizens) who were eager to learn about the SPEA process. Cecil County was represented by County Executive Tari Moore who also attended. The forum presentation informed this supportive defense community about the SPEA and its possible impacts. The five member community panel then responded to thoughtful and direct questions from the audience. Panel members included the State of Maryland’s Director of Office of Military
Affairs, a defense contractor, Army Alliance Board President, and the Chair of the Harford County Economic Development Advisory Board.

Our Section 2, “Response to the SPEA”, incorporated much of what the attendees provided that evening or submitted by community members after the Public Forum. We expect that many of them will provide their individual comments to the SPEA as well. The Army Alliance and CSSC have encouraged input both to this response, as well as the Army directly, while providing information about the difference between a SPEA and the BRAC process and to encourage respondents to keep their comments relevant to the SPEA. Many attendees at the Forum have signed a “Declaration of Support” for Aberdeen Proving Ground and those signatures are submitted in Section 4 of this document. Additionally, the Declaration was made available for a short period of time in the public libraries and government offices in Harford and Cecil Counties. In total, over 600 signatures of concerned citizens have been included. On the following pages are copies of the presentation shown at the Public forum, the handouts provided, and various media resulting from the event.

These comments are carefully prepared to be responsive to the SPEA and the NEPA process. We are very mindful of the summary dismissal of many responses to the original PEA with the phrase “Thousands of commenters expressed concern about ...” and recognize that such comments fit in the later political and decisional stages of the overall process.
The audience was informed that they will have an opportunity to participate in the Army’s Listening Session during the next several months and we are awaiting announcement of that date.

Public Forum participants each received an electronic follow-up survey from CSSC on August 5th. According to respondents, 100 percent felt attendance at the Forum was a good use of their time. Knowledge of the SPEA process prior to the Forum was evenly divided with 50 percent at least somewhat familiar to very familiar and 50 percent who were somewhat unfamiliar or had not heard of SPEA before the Forum. Participants clearly recognized their role in community engagement. In fact, 100 percent of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that “a unified APG community who voices its concerns in an informed and appropriate way could help to minimize the overall negative impacts to Aberdeen Proving Ground.”
Public Forum Held—A Community Call to Action
Preparing for the Response to the SPEA
Monday, August 4, 2014

PowerPoint Presentation

Please find the presentation from our Public Forum on the following pages.
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A CALL TO ACTION
Public Forum for Proposed Job Losses at Aberdeen Proving Ground

MONDAY, AUGUST 4, 2014
6 - 8 PM
Aberdeen High School

Sponsored by:
Army Alliance, Inc.
Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor (CSSC)
Public Meeting

Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) for Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment
David Craig
Harford County Executive
Mike Bennett
Mayor, City of Aberdeen
Jim Richardson
Director, Harford County Economic Development
Why This Meeting?

- Information – how the federal economic situation may impact APG and local economy
- Context – how the SPEA fits into the bigger set of actions
- Preparedness – understand the facts
- Action – so we and you can make the right response at the right time
Action Tonight

- Make yourself knowledgeable about the proposed action and supporting documents
  - The palm card has links and contact information
- Study the talking points (next chart)
- Sign the “Declaration of Support”
- Educate your neighbors
- Individual comments to SPEA are welcome
- A formal response will be developed and submitted by Army Alliance prior to August 25
Talking Points

• NOT a BRAC, part of formal process for troop reduction
• Beginning of an ongoing dialogue with the community
• Our region is opposed to the methodology - How did we get on the list contrary to the SPEA’s own guidance?
• We recognize that there will be cuts. APG has unique capabilities in research and development that keep the Army & Joint Services “lean and mean.” Concerned that the proposed cuts are out of balance
• We want any cuts to be proportionate for APG taking into account its critical missions and capabilities
• Negative economic impact of the proposed cuts
• Call to Action – Sign the Declaration; submit comments
• Become an informed defense community
Jill McClune
President, Army Alliance

Army Alliance, Inc.
Context

• Federal budget limitations
• Long range planning – Force Structure 2020
• DoD must cut forces to meet budget
  – Guidance/2013 PEA: 72,000 soldiers & civilians
  – Guidance/2014 SPEA: 142,000 soldiers & civilians
Preparedness
(understand the facts)

• Not yet planned cuts to APG workforce but the SPEA considers the “what if” of losing
  – Soldiers: 1,000
  – Civilians: 3,272
• Total potential losses at all 30 installations are more than process requires
• This report assesses what may come later
• For now:
  – Focus on the *environmental* facts
  – The political facts will come into play later
Environmental Documentation

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- Army Environmental Command has Army lead
- Environmental Assessment (EA)
  - Qualitative analysis, used to determine if more quantitative analysis is needed
- Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA)
  - Used for a broad review of similar actions at multiple times & locations. Big picture
  - Avoid the charge of piecemeal or incremental actions
  - Still have site specific documents later
- Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA)
  - To update original PEA when significant changes to original assumptions occur
Two Environmental Assessments

• 2013 PEA
  – Done, complete. Considered 21 installations with significant troop populations
  – Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) signed April 4, 2013. APG not included

• 2014 Supplemental SPEA
  – SPEA publicly released June 26, 2014
  – Comments due August 25, 2014
Output of SPEA

• Assessment of a potential cut in workforce at APG, but is not a final decision or implementation plan
• Documents environmental impacts; used to guide decision makers, who consider multiple factors
• This is a programmatic Environmental Assessment (EA) – considers broad, overall action. Will need site specific site analyses for any final decisions
Why the “Supplemental?”

• Changes in federal budget guidance and release of 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review
  – Current numbers require cuts exceeding 2013 projections
  – Needed to take into account more installations – 9 additional locations assessed for possible cuts

• Dramatic impact to Army due to potential workforce reductions
  – Possible cuts needed grew from 72K (PEA) to 142K (SPEA)
  – Possible troop strength counts reducing from 562k to 490k to 450k to 420k with potential Sequestration in 2016
How does APG fit in?

• PEA considered 21 locations
• SPEA considers original 21 + additional 9 locations (total of 30)
  – Potential to lose 1,000+ (soldiers and civilians)
  – For an APG type installation the analysis assumes losing 70% active component + 30% civilian workforce
  – Note that all 30 locations combined exceed the potentially required cuts
9 Installations Added to Analysis

- Joint Base San Antonio - Ft Sam Houston, TX
- Ft Meade, MD
- Ft Huachuca, AZ
- Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD
- Ft Belvoir, VA
- Ft Jackson, SC
- Ft Leavenworth, KS
- Ft Rucker, AL
- USA Garrison Hawaii (Ft Shafter), HI
Additional Installations?

- SPEA criteria excluded depots, arsenals, ammo plants (e.g. Army Materiel Command) or installations used primarily for test & evaluation (T&E)
- Exception made for APG which should have been excluded because primarily T&E
- Rationale to include in SPEA based on the number of troops at APG (1,428 Soldiers)
- Question: Why?
So, how do we respond?

- Recognize what we are responding to – an environmental assessment
- Therefore, comments must address environmental matters
- Except as they relate to the SPEA process itself, comments about military strength, community relations, loss of investment, etc., \textit{no matter how passionate}, will be noted but filed. These matters are better suited to the future listening sessions
Potential Comments

- Comment and inquire about the exception that added APG to the list.
- SPEA ignores 10% of APG workforce living in Delaware. (considers only Harford, Cecil, Kent, Baltimore Counties)
- The “cookie cutter” formula of 70% cuts to soldiers and 30% to civilians is disproportionate to APG’s mission and structure. Why aren’t other civilian dominated organizations analyzed also?
Action

- Address the *environmental* document now
- Community Listening Sessions to be held--
  October 2014 through March 2015
- Address the decision process once it begins.
  Decision is due June 2015
- Process questions:
  - Need clarity why APG was included against criteria
  - APG soldiers mostly 20th CBRNE. Unique skill set, not typical troop unit
- Environmental comments
  - 10% of APG’s workforce lives in DE; why not included as area of interest?
  - Information missing or inaccurate in the various category summaries
Who is responding?

- Army Alliance coordinating consolidated response in its role as community advocate
- Please sign the “Declaration of Support”
- Individuals may respond directly if they wish
Why must we respond?

• It will become a part of the official record and “facts” in it used as the basis for other actions
• Demonstrates community awareness and support for APG and its missions
• Note that the BRAC 2005 Commission complained in its report about problems with the data used in the analysis
How will we respond?

• Politely, factually, but energetically
• We envision pointed supported questions on process and fact based comments to certain factors as part of the community response
• This isn’t the time for “political fireworks”
  – Too may unknowns
  – Too little detail
  – Many other changes to happen before 2020
• But important to get on the record
Eric McLauchlin
Chairman, Economic Development Advisory Board

Harford County
Maryland’s Economic Engines

- Fort George G. Meade
- University System of Maryland
- **Aberdeen Proving Ground**
- Johns Hopkins University
- Johns Hopkins Hospital & Health System
- National Institutes of Health
- Walmart
- University of Maryland Medical System
- Medstar Health
- Giant Food
- U.S. Social Security Administration

Number of Employees in Maryland
Jobs & Migration

Total Harford County Employment

Source: MD DLLR
### Harford County Income Tax Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Income Tax Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$145,483,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$154,144,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$163,121,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$164,337,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$161,364,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$154,181,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$166,483,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$179,177,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$183,317,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Harford County Treasury
## Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>$46,242</td>
<td>$48,451</td>
<td>$50,740</td>
<td>$52,029</td>
<td>$50,221</td>
<td>$50,046</td>
<td>$50,575</td>
<td>$51,371</td>
<td>$51,071</td>
<td>+10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$61,546</td>
<td>$65,041</td>
<td>$67,989</td>
<td>$70,482</td>
<td>$69,193</td>
<td>$68,933</td>
<td>$70,095</td>
<td>$71,169</td>
<td>$72,999</td>
<td>+18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford County</td>
<td>$65,381</td>
<td>$69,253</td>
<td>$72,092</td>
<td>$76,620</td>
<td>$75,364</td>
<td>$71,848</td>
<td>$77,095</td>
<td>$76,220</td>
<td>$80,441</td>
<td>+23.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source – American Community Survey, Census.com
The APG Story

3rd Largest Employer in Maryland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projected from BRAC</th>
<th>Actual 1/1/14</th>
<th>Projected 2017 Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APG Employment</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Employment Growth</td>
<td>10,000-18,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>10,000-12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A Office Space Needs</td>
<td>2 Million SF</td>
<td>1.4 Million SF</td>
<td>1.9 Million SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>$20 Billion</td>
<td>$13 Billion</td>
<td>$15 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Contracting

Federal Dollars awarded to Harford County Businesses

- 2013 - $511 million
- 2012 - $787 million
- 2011 - $647 million
- 2010 - $371 million

Source: FEDMINE.US
Retail Growth
Select Listing

Aaron Rents
Gino’s
Planet Fitness
JCPenny
Carrabbas
The Mill at Blackhorse
Texas Roadhouse
CVS
Firestone

Sonic
Home Goods
DSW
Kirklands
Chick-fil-A
Auto Zone
XO by Saxons
Old Navy
Joe's Crab Shack
Panera Bread

PNC Bank
Wegmans
Accents Jewelry
Wild Birds Unlimited
Pet Valu
Lemon N Ginger
Salon/Spa by Debbie
Noodles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Electronics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alion Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altus Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARINC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquate Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenge Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowhead Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravura Information Technology Sys. (BITS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRTRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrow Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camber Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGI Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent Technical Services (CTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Technologies Corp. (CTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Matrix Solutions, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Contract Mgmt Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC Dynamics Research Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Solutions Products, ESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENSCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environics USA, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOIR Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter Government Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fastenal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Skies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Dynamics C4 Sys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarsat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus Research Group, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAD, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Solutions, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinQuest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed Martin Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockwood Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacB Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManTech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvin May Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission 1st Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITRE Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modus Operandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motile Robotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netcentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nexagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NextGen Federal Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noblis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northrop Grumman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTEC Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Fusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis Engineering Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primal Innovations, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QED Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QinetQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantum Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quviolant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raytheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoundTable Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre Systems, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shonborn-Becker Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigmatech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SmartFix Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTERA Defense Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC – Scientific Research Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alliances Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVICE Metrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse Research Center (SRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systek - Systems Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telcordia Technologies, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telford Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trideum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Solutions International (USI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Falcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VetTCorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViaSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRC Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-BRAC Success

• Re-construction and expansion of Highway infrastructure:
  – Rt. 715 to APG Gate
  – Rt. 40 and Rt. 715 interchange
  – Rt. 7 and Rt. 40 interchange
  – Rt. 22 from I-95 to APG Gate
• APG STEM Outreach Center Facility
• Enhanced STEM programming within Harford and Cecil County Schools
• Increase in defense contractors from 28 Pre-BRAC to 138 Post-BRAC
• **Overall Economic Growth in the CSSC region tied to APG expansion**
BGen (Ret) Mike Hayes
Director
Military & Federal Affairs
Maryland Department of Business & Economic Development
Brian Simmons
Board Member, Army Alliance, Inc.

Army Alliance, Inc.
Q & A
Summary & Closing
Public Forum Held—A Community Call to Action
Preparing for the Response to the SPEA
Monday, August 4, 2014

Public Forum Handouts

Please find the palm card handout distributed at the Public Forum on the following pages.
INFORMING THE COMMUNITY
At Risk at Aberdeen Proving Ground
4,300 JOBS
1,000 MILITARY AND 3,300 CIVILIAN JOBS

CAUSE FOR CONCERN
• Department of Defense must cut workforce to meet budget
• An environmental public report released on June 26, 2014 potentially affects jobs at APG

REPORT
Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) for Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment
(APG is on pages 3 – 46)

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW
1. This is NOT a BRAC
2. Part of a formal process for troop reduction to reach expected 2020 end strength limitations
3. Beginning of ongoing dialogue with the community
4. The region is opposed to the methodology - How did we get on the list contrary to the SPEA’s own process?
5. We recognize that there will be cuts. APG has unique capabilities in research and development and this strongly reverses the typical military-civilian ratio at APG. The proposed cuts have unintended adverse impact on developing the technology needed to keep the troops fighting effectively.
6. Negative Economic Impact of the proposed cuts
7. Call to Action: “Sign the Declaration of Support”/submit comments; Become an informed defense community
A CALL TO ACTION
Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA)

Sign the Declaration of Support this evening

Send public comments before August 25 to:
usarmy.ibsa.aec.nepa@mail.mil or
U.S. Army Environmental Command
ATTN: SPEA Public Comments
2450 Connell Rd (Bldg. 2264)
Joint Base San Antonio-Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-7664

If interested, you can also send your concerns to your Congressional Delegation before August 25 to:
Senator Barbara A. Mikulski, 202.224.4654
http://www.mikulski.senate.gov/contact/
Senator Benjamin Cardin, 202.224.5424
http://www.cardin.senate.gov/contact/
Congressman C.A. “Dutch” Ruppersberger, 202.225.3061
http://ruppersberger.house.gov/contact-dutch
Congressman “Andy” Harris, 202.225.5311
https://harris.house.gov/

POINTS TO EMPHASIZE IN THE CALL TO ACTION:
Comments MUST address environmental matters or raise questions of process.
• Comment/inquire about exception that added APG to the SPEA list
• SPEA ignores 10% of APG workforce living in Delaware
• “Cookie cutter” formula of 70% cuts to soldiers and 30% to civilians is wildly disproportionate to APG’s mission and structure. Why aren’t other civilian dominated installations also analyzed?
• A cut of this magnitude can only be accomplished by directly reducing the APG’s RDT&E workforce and capability; one of the highest Army priorities
• The environmental advantages of a smaller APG footprint proposed in the SPEA directly reduces APG’s RDT&E capability and appears to be in direct opposition of the APG BRAC 2005 goals

FORMAL RESPONSE:
Send public comments before August 25 to cssc@harfordcountymd.gov for inclusion in community response.
This Page Intentionally Left Blank.
Public Forum Held—A Community Call to Action
Preparing for the Response to the SPEA
Monday, August 4, 2014

Related Media

Please find on the following pages the following media articles that were published regarding APG and the SPEA and our Public Forum:

2) Aegis, 25 July 2014, Harford leaders fear up to 4,300 jobs could be lost at Aberdeen Proving Ground
3) The Patch, 30 July 2014, Army Considers 4,300 APG Job Cuts; Harford Issues ‘Call to Action’
4) Press Release, Army Alliance and CSSC, 5 August 2014, Army Alliance Hosts Crowd of 250 at Information Session on Proposed Job Losses at Aberdeen Proving Ground
5) ABC News, Baltimore Channel 2, 4 August 2014, 4,300 jobs could be in jeopardy on the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. In addition, we received associated local television coverage which can be seen at http://www.abc2news.com/news/region/harford-county/more-then-4300-jobs-could-be-on-the-chopping-block-at-aberdeen-proving-ground.
6) Baltimore Sun, 5 August 2014, Harford residents urged to get informed about potential job cuts at Aberdeen Proving Ground
7) Aegis, Editorial, 8 August 2014, Aberdeen Proving Ground needs to be able to stand on its merits (Editorial)
9) Cecil Whig, 24 August 2014, Senior APG Commander: Base has ‘a bright future’
This Page Intentionally Left Blank.
Public Forum to Discuss Proposed Aberdeen Proving Ground Job Cuts Set for Aug. 4

JULY 23, 2014 BY DAGGER NEWS SERVICE 29 COMMENTS

From the Army Alliance:

(Aberdeen, MD)—The Army Alliance, in partnership with the Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor (CSSC), requests community participation in an information session and public forum on proposed job losses at Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD. This event will serve as a ‘Community Call to Action’ with 4,300 military and civilian jobs at stake. The forum will be held on Monday, August 4, 2014, at Aberdeen High School Auditorium, 251 Paradise Road in Aberdeen, from 6:00PM-8:00PM.

APG is one of nine Army installations selected for potential troop and personnel reductions, representing nearly a third of existing staff levels. The Department of the Army has completed a Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) for Army 2020 force structure realignment, which was released on June 26, 2014.

Final decisions have not yet been made as to which installations will be selected for reductions in soldiers and Army civilians. This is a result of the current federal budget constraints and the resulting reduction of the Army’s active duty from 570,000 to 490,000 troop numbers. Sequestration could further reduce the number to 420,000. Fort Meade is the only other Maryland installation impacted by the current SPEA. They are the only two installations impacted on the East Coast.

The Army Alliance and CSSC encourage maximum participation at the Community Call to Action forum from public officials, citizens and business leaders to continue an ongoing dialogue about protecting APG’s unique mission capabilities and its skilled workforce.

“While this is not a BRAC activity, it is a process in which we must remain engaged as informed citizens to ensure relative stability to proportioned reductions,” says Army Alliance President Jill McClune.

Following introductory remarks by Harford County Executive David Craig and City of Aberdeen Mayor Michael Bennett, the forum will host a panel of state and local leaders who will provide more detailed information regarding the findings of the SPEA report and discuss the possible impacts to the Greater APG community throughout the Corridor. A Q & A session will follow.

The panel will be moderated by James Richardson, Harford County Economic Development Director, and feature the following speakers:
- BG Gen. J. Michael Hayes, USMC (Ret), Managing Director, Office of Military & Federal Affairs, MD Department of Business & Economic Development;
- Jill McClune, President, Army Alliance
- Eric McLauchlin, Esq., Attorney at Law, Shaffer, McLauchlin & Stover, LLC, and Chair of Harford County Economic Development Advisory Board; and
- Brian M. Simmons, Army Alliance Board of Directors

“The SPEA public comment period will conclude on August 25, 2014, and the forum provides an opportunity to educate the community on the findings and develop a unified community response,” said Karen Holt, Regional Manager, CSSC.

Reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities will be provided upon request; please notify Eva Hanley in advance at 410-273-5708.
Harford leaders fear up to 4,300 jobs could be lost at Aberdeen Proving Ground

BY BRYNA ZUMER, bzumer@theaegis.com

4:45 p.m. EDT, July 25, 2014

Aberdeen Proving Ground could possibly lose up to 4,300 jobs, as a recent Army assessment put stark numbers on what had been a more vague threat, and Harford County is mobilizing to prevent it.

The Army Alliance, a Harford County-based group that advocates for the installation, is joining other military stakeholders to let the public know about the impending danger to jobs on post and that such losses usually translate to more reductions among employers off-post.

A public forum to discuss the threat, which is being labeled a Community Call to Action, will be held from 6 to 8 p.m. Aug. 4 at Aberdeen High School.

Related

Harford County still waiting on a base-driven boom in Aberdeen

Preparing for another BRAC, before it's a done deal

Aberdeen Proving Ground not well poised for BRAC evaluation [Editorial]

Harford, military officials worried about layoffs, BRAC uncertainty at Aberdeen Proving Ground

APG contracting dollars fell 13% last year

The Army's 2020 Force Structure Realignment had previously suggested cuts to the national force, but a more recent report released June 26, called the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment, or SPEA, shows active-duty Army personnel could be cut from 570,000 to 490,000 overall, with sequestration further reducing the number to 420,000.
The cuts, which could hit any of nine installations nationwide, affect two along the East Coast: APG and Fort Meade.

At APG, the assessment is being interpreted to mean there could be 1,000 fewer military jobs and 3,300 fewer civilian jobs, Karen Holt, regional manager of the Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor, said Thursday.

Such a reduction would also mean 1,800 possible jobs lost by Harford County residents, as more than half of the APG employees live in Harford, according to Jim Richardson, the county's economic development director.

"That is a pretty big fiscal impact," Richardson said. "That would be like closing down Upper Chesapeake [Medical Center]."

The SPEA report includes a public comment period that runs through Aug. 25. Richardson and Holt said they hope to get the community involved so the Army knows how important APG jobs are to the area.

Holt noted that community involvement and public forums made a difference in 2005, when a major BRAC process was getting started and ultimately affected APG to the good.

"I think when you see a future challenge, it again just reinforces how coming together and staying on track is the way forward for APG," Holt said, adding that residents or community stakeholders may even consider signing a statement in support of the Army's activities in Harford.

"I think the real intent is to look at creating a unified community response," she said.

Richardson said other studies have been done about the Army's figure, but none laid out the numbers as specifically as this one.

"This is the first study that we have seen where there was an actual number put out and where they are actually asking for public comment," he said.

The SPEA report is called a "pre-discussional document," but Richardson said: "Nevertheless, my opinion is you really have to respond to something like this."

"We want to make sure APG and Harford County are well-represented in this regard," he said.

"That type of reduction will clearly impact the mission of APG," he added. "In my opinion, that is not a good decision because of the sensitivity and the nature of the work that is being done on APG."

Richardson said the plan is to address the issue in a respectful manner and to show the decision the Department of Defense is making would be a big one.

"We have had a lot of debate, internally, about how to address this," he said. "I am trying to be respectful to the Department of Defense but, again, this is huge."
"Our goal on the [forum on the 4th] is not to complain," Richardson added about the call to action. "We want to show how important APG is to Harford County."
Army Considers 4,300 APG Job Cuts; Harford Issues 'Call to Action'

Military personnel to join Aberdeen, Harford County leaders at upcoming forum about proposal.

By Elizabeth Janney (Patch Staff) Updated July 30, 2014 at 10:29 am 4

The public is encouraged to rally around Aberdeen Proving Ground at an upcoming meeting entitled "Call to Action" about potential job cuts at the military post in Harford County.

In response to budgetary constraints coming down from the Department of Defense, the Army last month issued recommendations for realigning its operations by 2020. It intended to reduce its forces from 562,000 to 490,000 with a 2013 plan but now intends to scale back to approximately 440–450,000 because of fiscal constraints, according to its proposal contained in the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment.

The proposal recommended trimming 4,300 jobs over the next six years at the proving ground, where it said there were 12,335 permanent party soldiers and Army civilians in 2013.

Approximately 3,021 additional jobs would be lost as a result of the Army cuts, according to the proposal, which said more than 9,000 jobs were part of the base’s “total working population,” which includes students and trainees, contractors, civilians and other military service providers.

In all, the Army estimated approximately 7,321 jobs would be lost.

That could cause a ripple effect for Harford County, where Aberdeen Proving Ground is the largest employer, according to the Harford County Office of Economic Development. The next largest employer is Harford County Public Schools, with more than 5,000 employees, which may also be affected.

Since students at APG go off post for their education, schools that students from the proving ground attend would experience “minor to significant impacts” because of declining enrollment, and may lose federal dollars they would otherwise have been eligible for due to military connections, according to the proposal. The document outlined those with the largest attendance: Roye Williams, Churchville and Meadowvale elementary schools; Aberdeen, Havre de Grace and Bel Air middle schools; and Aberdeen, Havre de Grace and Patterson Mill high schools. There were several others as well.

Not all impacts from the job cuts would be negative, according to the proposal. Wildlife would be less disturbed with habitats having “more time to recover” between testing, the Army said, facilities would require less maintenance due to less testing, runoff would be reduced because new construction would not occur and traffic congestion would be eased in the area.

Harford County’s Director of Economic Development Jim Richardson will moderate a panel discussion on Aug. 4 at Aberdeen High School designed to educate the public about the Army’s proposal.

Following introductory remarks by Harford County Executive David Craig and Aberdeen Mayor Michael Bennett, these officials will discuss the proposal and its possible impacts on greater Aberdeen: Managing Director of the Office of Military and Federal Affairs in the Maryland Department of Business and
Economic Development Brig. Gen. J. Michael Hayes (retired U.S. Marine Corps); Army Alliance President Jill McClune; Harford County Economic Development Advisory Board Chair Eric McLauchlin, Esq.; and Army Alliance Board of Directors member Brian M. Simmons.

The Chesapeake Science and Research Corridor and Army Alliance are hosting the “Call to Action” forum to educate the public about the proposal from 6–8 p.m. on Monday, Aug. 4, at Aberdeen High School, 251 Paradise Road, in Aberdeen.
PRESS RELEASE
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: August 5, 2014
POC: Jill McClune, Army Alliance President, (410) 273-1187
Jim Richardson, Harford Co. Economic Development Director, (410) 638-3059
Karen Holt, Regional Manager, Chesapeake Science & Security Corridor, (410) 273-5708

Army Alliance Hosts Crowd of 250 at Information Session on Proposed Job Losses at Aberdeen Proving Ground

(Aberdeen, MD)—The Army Alliance, in partnership with the Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor (CSSC), hosted an information session and public forum on possible job losses at Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD on Monday evening. A crowd of 250 attended the “Community Call to Action” at Aberdeen High School after learning over 4,300 military and civilian jobs could potentially be cut.

Harford County Executive David Craig and City of Aberdeen Mayor Michael Bennett welcomed citizens to the forum. “This is not just a big Proving Ground,” said County Executive Craig. “It’s a research and development center with the training and technology to equip our soldiers, sailors, and airmen in support of their mission while allowing us to enjoy the freedoms we have.”

Mayor Bennett also noted the strategic value and critical role APG brings to our nation’s defense. “We are fully committed to maintaining our partnership and continuing to keep APG strong and support its mission and its workforce,” said Bennett.

A panel of state and local leaders provided detailed information regarding the findings of the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) report that was released in late June, and discussed the possible impacts to the Greater APG community throughout the region.

Jim Richardson, Economic Development Director for Harford County and moderator for the evening’s panel stated, “This process is a marathon, not a sprint. We need your participation to tell APG’s story in response to this SPEA.” He also clarified by prefacing the context of these actions. “This is not a BRAC activity, but part of a formal process for troop reduction. Tonight is the beginning on an ongoing dialogue with the community.”

1362 Brass Mill Road • Belcamp, MD 21017 • 443.327.6389 • www.armyalliance.org
This event served as a “Community Call to Action” with business and political leaders along with concerned citizens attending to learn more about the potential impacts and to sign a “Declaration of Support” that is part of the formal response to the U.S. Army Environmental Command.

Jill McClune, Army Alliance President and panel member, reviewed the Department of the Army’s Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Army 2020 force structure realignment process, and the requirements the Army has at hand to make a significant reduction in troop numbers. The Supplemental (SPEA) has compounded the potential job loss by recommending additional cuts that could force impacts on the civilian workforce as well.

“Our military at APG has a very unique set of skills,” said Jill referring to the 20th CBRNE team, who is deployable to address chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive offenses. “We recognize that there will be cuts,” commented Army Alliance President Jill McClune. “APG has unique capabilities in research and development and the SPEA report doesn’t recognize that the typical military-civilian ratio is strongly reversed at APG. Thus the “cookie cutter” approach to proposed cuts could have an unintended adverse impact on developing the technology needs to keep the troops fighting effectively,” McClune said.

APG is one of nine Army installations selected for potential troop and personnel reductions in this supplemental round, joining a total of 30 identified installations. The potential cuts at APG represent nearly a third of existing staff levels.

Although the assessment focuses on environmental elements, socio-economic is one of the factors. “A significant socio-economic impact will result from this SPEA action,” said Eric McLauchlin, panel member and Chair of Harford County’s Economic Development Advisory Board. “Growth in our region didn’t happen by accident but rather by an organized, measured approach to expansion at APG. This regional economic momentum has resulted in economic prosperity during difficult times,” stated McLauchlin, who noted the influx of more than 110 defense contractors, a median household income more than twice the national average, income tax revenue that has grown by more than $38 million annually, and that APG is Maryland’s third largest workforce center by population. “A 4,000 position cut would reduce our progress by half,” he added.
Final decisions have not yet been made as to which installations will be selected for reductions in soldiers and Army civilians. This is a result of the current federal budget constraints and the resulting reduction of the Army’s active duty from 513,000 to 450,000 troop numbers. Sequestration could further reduce the number to 420,000. Fort Meade is the only other Maryland installation impacted by the current SPEA. They are the only two installations impacted on the East Coast.

“Maryland is blessed with a congressional delegation that is in tune with the SPEA process and works diligently to protect Maryland and its workforce,” said BG En Mike Hayes, Managing Director of the State’s Office of Military Affairs and a forum panel member. “Aberdeen Proving Ground is well represented within the Maryland Military Installation Council (MMIC) giving the region a voice in support of local defense efforts,” he added. He acknowledged the opportunity to take a look at the superb capabilities in the Edgewood chem-bio community and augment these aspects that could bring more to Aberdeen Proving Ground.

Brian Simmons, Army Alliance Board Member and panel member stated, “This partial reduction at APG is incredibly difficult to quantify. It’s a given that the socioeconomic impact is significant, so our focus needs to be centered on helping the Army. What our community says does matter.”

“The Army has to go through this process and we want to help them with the facts about our defense community,” said Jill McClune in closing. “APG is the answer to a smaller Army when you consider the research, development, testing and evaluation (RDT&E) capacity and capabilities our installation has to offer.”

A Declaration Statement of Support for Aberdeen Proving Ground was signed by attendees as they left the public forum; a unified response will be drafted by the Army Alliance.

The SPEA public comment period will conclude on August 25, 2014. Declaration signing will continue through August 20th at four locations between 8AM-5PM: CSSC Office at 2021-E Pulaski Highway in Havre de Grace, Harford Business Innovation Center (HBIC) at 1362 Brass Mill Road in Belcamp; Harford County Economic Development Office at 220 S. Main St in Bel Air, and Cecil County Economic Development at the Cecil County Administrative Offices, 200 Chesapeake Blvd, Suite 2700 in Elkton.

Copies of the presentation materials are available at www.apg-cssc.com, under “spotlight.”

1362 Brass Mill Road • Belcamp, MD 21017 • 443.327.6389 • www.armyalliance.org
ABERDEEN, Md. - About 250 people packed into Aberdeen High School in Harford County Monday night with the same goal, to get answers.

"I wanted to find out what was actually going on," said Inez Tyson.

Patricia Parker, another attendee, added, "I'm trying to find out what the thinking is in what they're trying to do with APG, what kind of changes they're trying to make, and what kind of reductions they're looking at potentially."

A panel of experts from the Army Alliance and Chesapeake Science & Security Corridor explained in detail to the crowd the Department of Defense will make massive cuts to staffing nationwide to meet federal budget requirements. Aberdeen Proving Ground is one of 30 installations being assessed at the very early stages of the process.

"The budget situation is particularly difficult at the moment. All installations are going to be impacted in some form or another," said Army Alliance President Jill McClune. "We want the community to be involved, and comment, and begin a dialogue that probably will progress over a number of years."

Officials said APG could see a potential loss of 4,300 military and civilian jobs by 2017. Those numbers were released at the end of June. Currently, the Army is only looking at the environmental impact of the installation.

"It's all speculative in the sense that this is an assessment. This is going to be input for a decisions. This is not a decision," McClune said.

At the end of the meeting, people were asked to sign a declaration supporting the APG, and many folks walked away feeling much better about the situation.
"I think it's a work in progress and I don't think anything to be anxious over just yet," Tyson said.

"I'm certainly being thoughtful about it, not overly concerned yet, but certainly being sure that the leadership knows the community is engaged," said Dave Lockhart.

"Everybody's got a neighbor at APG, or a babysitter whose family's at APG, we are all connected to this post and having anything jeopardized is detrimental," Parker said.

The Army Alliance is working to put together a single community response to the study by August 25. The final decision is not expected until next June. Click HERE for more information.
Harford residents urged to get informed about potential job cuts at Aberdeen Proving Ground

More than 250 people filled the Aberdeen High School auditorium Monday evening for a community forum about potential cuts to the Army's workforce at Aberdeen Proving Ground. (DAVID ANDERSON | AEGIS STAFF / Baltimore Sun Media Group / August 4, 2014)

Aberdeen Senior High School, 251 Paradise Road, Aberdeen, MD 21001, USA

BY DAVID ANDERSON, daanderson@baltsun.com

6:30 a.m. EDT, August 5, 2014

While potential cuts of up to nearly 4,300 military and civilian jobs at Aberdeen Proving Ground are far from a done deal, Harford County leaders stressed the need Monday evening for local residents to get an early start on letting the Army know about the impact any such cuts will have on the region's largest employer and on their community.

"We need you to sign this declaration [of support], we need you to submit your comments, and we need you to become an informed defense community," County Executive David Craig told an audience of more than 250 people sitting in the auditorium of Aberdeen High School for a community forum about
how Aberdeen might be impacted by the next round of military base closings and downsizing in the face of a smaller national defense budget.

Aberdeen Mayor Michael Bennett pledged his support, and the support of the Aberdeen City Council, to an Army post that has been his city's neighbor since 1917.

"We fully understand the strategic value and the critical role that APG brings to our national defense," Bennett said.

The post currently employs 22,000 military and civilian personnel. Development and testing of military hardware, which has been APG’s mission since it was founded during World War I, is still carried on at the 72,000-acre installation; however, many current activities are in the areas of communications and cyber warfare, the result of the last round of base realignments between 2005 and 2011.

Jim Richardson, Harford County's economic development director, served as moderator for Monday's Community Call to Action, hosted by the Army Alliance and the Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor.

"We need you to understand the facts and how these facts may or may not impact Aberdeen Proving Ground," Richardson told the audience.

"You need to know this information so we can make the right response at the right time; this is a marathon, not a sprint," he added.

Four panel members provided more details on why the Army is considering APG for cutbacks as military officials work to meet cuts of up 142,000 Army troops and civilian employees by 2020, as mandated by federal budget constraints, the ending of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the potential for a second budget sequestration, or automatic cuts to federal agency budgets in 2016.

Panel members were Jill McClune, president of the Army Alliance; Eric McLauchlin, chairman of the Harford County Economic Development Advisory Board; retired Marine Corps Brig. Gen. Michael Hayes, who is managing director of the Office of Military and Federal Affairs in the Maryland Department of Business and Economic Development; and Brian Simmons, a member of the Army Alliance's board of directors.

Simmons is also 1975 graduate of Aberdeen High School and a recently-retired 33-year veteran civilian employee of the Department of the Army.

"Even though I'm from Aberdeen, helping the Army would be my highest goal," he said after the forum.

McClune said the Army is currently going through a Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment of nine military facilities throughout the U.S. Aberdeen Proving Ground and Ft. George G. Meade are two Maryland installations that could be affected by the review, she said.

McClune and her fellow panel members stressed that the public must assist local advocates in showing the Army how a reduction in the workforce would have a negative environmental impact at APG.
"A consolidated, well thought out report, where they can get all the information in one place, could have the strongest benefit for us," McClune said.

Panel members and county officials encouraged audience members to sign a Declaration of Support on their way out.

Public comments on the Army assessment process can be made through Aug. 25. Visit armyalliance.org/ for more information.

The Army Alliance, headquartered in Belcamp, is a regional nonprofit organization that works to promote APG as a "key national defense asset and an economic driver," and strengthen the relationship between the post and local institutions and community groups, according to its website.

The Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor, headquartered in Harford County, is a regional partnership of jurisdictions in Maryland, Delaware and Pennsylvania affected by APG, which works to oversee the implementation of the 2005-2011 BRAC process and expansion of the post during that period, according to the organization's website.

Both organizations and the county government, through Richardson and his staff, were instrumental in working with the Army during the 2005-11 BRAC round in which Aberdeen gained thousands of jobs. Those efforts have been recognized nationally.
AEGIS

Aberdeen Proving Ground needs to be able to stand on its merits [Editorial]

Editorial from The Aegis

12:02 p.m. EDT, August 8, 2014

The prospect of Harford County’s economy losing in excess of 4,000 military and defense contracting jobs associated with various activities at Aberdeen Proving Ground is as unsavory a scenario that could be visited on the local economy.

Such a scenario, however, is exactly what’s possible in the coming years.

For just shy of a century, Aberdeen Proving Ground has been a place where many generations of people have found good, steady jobs with enviable benefits packages.

Harford residents urged to get informed about potential job cuts at Aberdeen Proving Ground

Preparing for another BRAC, before it's a done deal

Aberdeen hopes to avoid another 'absolutely horrible' sequestration, leader of Harford Army Alliance says

Harford, military officials worried about lay-offs, BRAC uncertainty at Aberdeen Proving Ground

Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, USA

So long has APG been on the local economic scene that it had come to be regarded almost as a natural resource. Over the years, there had been reductions in force, known like just about everything in the armed forces by its acronym RIF, but only about a decade ago did anyone ever give serious consideration to the possibility of a total revamping of the U.S. armed forces in such a way as to make
the post much smaller or eliminate it completely. Another acronym long since eclipsed RIF as the economic creature under the bed at APG: BRAC. Inexplicably, BRAC is the acronym for the U.S. Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, as BCRC never seems to have caught on.

The idea behind BRAC is reasonable: The economic value of military installations prompts voters and the people they elect to advocate for the retention of even outdated and unnecessary installations. The commission was established by Congress to make decisions about what military functions were needed and where, based solely on military and defense needs, not on political clout.

Historically, APG had been a range for testing tanks and artillery, but in the years since 1917 when the post opened, many other more massive, and remote, test ranges have come into being. When the BRAC commission last made a major review of the nation's facilities, it was feared APG might not make the cut.

Though the munitions testing component did end up shifting away from Aberdeen, that round of BRAC changes brought an infusion of research and development positions to the post. The result was a net increase in jobs at APG.

Now another review of military installations is anticipated, and fears that APG could see a reduction in its payroll have been rekindled. Earlier this week, more than 250 people turned out for a session to review what could be done to stave off such a change.

It's a natural and reasonable reaction. People need steady jobs, and when jobs are threatened by governmental policy changes, it seems reasonable on a certain level to lobby against those policy changes.

On another level, however, it is perfectly reasonable to ask if defense policy should be decided not by whether it is effective at securing the nation, but by whether it employs enough citizens.

It's a question that troubled one of the greatest men of war to have served on the side of freedom, Dwight D. Eisenhower. As commander of Allied forces in Europe during World War II, he coordinated D-Day, presided over the liberation of France and helped bring about the destruction of the Nazi regime. As president, he concluded the Korean War in such a way as to preserve the non-communist South Korea.

He also gave a particularly eloquent farewell address at the conclusion of his second term as president in which he warned against allowing the American republic to become too consumed with its own military might, and the related economic booms. The late president's words often are cited simplistically, sometimes as though he had been advocating for a return to the pre-World War II era when armies were raised and military production ratcheted up only in times of war.

His comments are a good deal more pragmatic. He recognized that threats posed in the world necessitated the maintenance of a high level of readiness. His warning was more against allowing that need to become all consuming.
The section of the speech dealing with the issue follows:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex.

The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or our democratic processes.

We should take nothing for granted.

Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

He would go on in the speech to caution against allowing scientific advances in the name of defense to dominate the nation's efforts at scientific discovery and against allowing the situation to arise wherein "a government contract becomes, virtually, a substitute for intellectual curiosity."

The whole of the speech, which has elements that are both uplifting and steeped in a sense of foreboding, can be read, with changes marked in Eisenhower's own hand, at http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/research/online_documents/farewell_address.html

The prospect of the local economy losing 4,000 jobs because of changes in defense policy as outlined through the BRAC process is indeed frightening. The ripple effects could well affect plenty of people who have no direct economic relationship with APG.

Still, the post is a military installation and needs to be managed as such, not as a federal make-work program. If we want a government whose policy is to directly employ a lot of people, well, that's an entirely different kind of discussion.

If APG ends up facing cuts as a result of any new round of BRAC cuts, it's worth remembering not only Eisenhower's words, but also the harsh reality that the last round of jobs added at APG came as the result of cuts and closures at military installations elsewhere in the country. This situation reflects another view of defense and warfare much more ancient than those expressed by Eisenhower, namely the Biblical notion that those who live by the sword also die by the sword.
Leader touts value, potential of Md. Army post

ASSOCIATED PRESS • | AUGUST 22, 2014 | 3:26 PM

ABERDEEN, Md. (AP) — The new senior commander at Aberdeen Proving Ground said Friday that stronger ties between the Army installation and the surrounding community could help avert large job cuts at the sprawling research and weapons-testing post near Baltimore.

Maj. Gen. Bruce T. Crawford told reporters he's reaching out to small businesses and inviting the private sector to consider Aberdeen a partner in job creation.

Crawford, who arrived in May, also said it's important for the civilian population to express support for military missions and gratitude for those serving their country, whether in uniform or as civilian Defense Department workers.

"They need to know that you're with them through thick and thin and they need to know that you trust them and that you still believe in them," Crawford said.

An Army report last month raised the possibility that Aberdeen could lose up to 4,300 military and civilian jobs by 2020 due to cuts in budget and force size. About 21,800 people work at the installation, including about 13,000 in the Communications-Electronic Command led by Crawford. The unit includes a software engineering center that manages 70 percent of the Army's computer software, he said.

Crawford touted the command's 3,000 workers with engineering degrees, including some with doctorates. He said their expertise is available to private industry looking to modernize the computer systems that protect their intellectual capital.

"We can't be connected enough now, whether it's at home or at work or our ability to defend those networks," Crawford said. "We are piece of the broader enterprise — those that have the job of defending networks — but we are an important piece."

Karen Holt of the Chesapeake Science and Security Corridor, a group formed by Harford County to help the region accommodate growth from a 2005 military realignment, said she was excited about Crawford's initiatives.

"I think small business is certainly an area of interest across our community," she said.
Web URL: http://washingtonexaminer.com/article/feed/2159053
Senior APG commander: Base has 'a bright future'

By Jacob Owens jowens@cecilwhig.com | Posted: Sunday, August 24, 2014 8:29 pm

ABERDEEN — A new senior commander at Aberdeen Proving Ground told reporters on Friday that he sees big potential for growth at the military installation and isn’t worried about possible effects of sequestration.

U.S. Army Maj. Gen. Bruce Crawford, who took command of the U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command (CECOM) 95 days ago at the installation that boasts 22,000 military and civilian employees, said that he believes the base had made great progress over the past decade. He noted that it boasts more than 3,000 Ph.Ds and engineers, many of whom have highly technical degrees, roughly the equivalent of a medium-sized city. Those figures also don’t include the hundreds, if not thousands, of contractors that work near the base as well, he said.

“To be completely honest, I think APG stands on its own merit,” said Crawford, who organized Friday’s atypical roundtable meeting with reporters to increase transparency at the base. “When you look at the size of the installation and the amount of intellectual capital here, I’m not concerned about playing defense from the next (Base Realignment and Closure), but rather I want to make sure we’re playing offense.”

Crawford said that part of that offense includes seeking out projects that are not typical of APG, including the three-year Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor, or JLENS missile defense program.

“One of my priorities is sustained relevance to posture us for the future,” he said. “We’ve done some great things here in the past five or 10 years, but what are we doing five or 10 years from now? I’m not worried about the changing landscape of APG, I think we’ve turned that into a positive.”

Potential cuts

In June, the Department of the Army released a Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) that identified APG as a potential target for position reductions to reach the Army’s 2020 force structure realignment plan.
Crawford noted that the decision to reduce up to 4,300 positions isn’t final and was encouraged that the discussion wasn’t behind closed doors as it was in the past.

"I applaud our leadership for openly talking about it," he said. "Instead of just saying 5 percent across the board, I think the leadership is sharing with the community."

Public comment on the assessment is due by today and a community engagement meeting is being scheduled for the first week of December. Crawford said that the Army will take full consideration of local comments on the potential reductions.

When asked where reductions would be made on the installation if Army leaders do decide to make cuts at Aberdeen, Crawford that in his opinion, "everything here is important, but the decision will be informed by the community."

**Small business growth**

Crawford said that he believes APG also has to leverage small business growth in order to posture itself toward the future. He added that he intends to host a small business development seminar in the coming months in order to better explain how businesses can secure government contracts.

"If you’re looking to bridge the gap between old and new, why not bring your business to Aberdeen and examine what we have here on this installation?" he said. "There’s something magical happening here."

Alice Williams, the command’s chief associate director for small business programs, said that the Army works to ensure that a balance of small and large businesses receive contracts. She added that APG has acted on 1,110 Maryland small business contracts, which were worth about $240 million.

Crawford said that small business is a weekly topic of conversation with his commanding officer, noting its importance.

**Budget effects**

The commander also said that he hoped to reduce stress on his workforce, including uncertainty of position longevity, by increasing communication between senior officers and staff.

"Ultimately, we will not be able to maintain the numbers that we have," he said. "We all know that after every major conflict the Army has to right-size itself, but what’s different now is the dignified way that we will downsize."

In the past two months, the Army has notified nearly 1,300 captains and more than 500 majors that they will have to leave the service by next spring as part of that budget-driven downsizing. Crawford said that what has made that process different this time is that no list of names was released by the Army and efforts are being made to move those officers to civilian positions within the Army.

Crawford announced that CECOM has launched the Trust to Transition program, which has contacted
those officers with degrees in relevant fields to try to find civilian placements under the command or at an industry partner. So far, officials are working with 11 captains on potential placements at CECOM sites worldwide, Crawford said.

**Blimp program arrives**

He also said that he was excited to welcome the JLENS program to APG from Utah on Aug. 18, because it has a national security impact and brings 110 troops with it. Crawford said that there are construction and safety considerations being worked through with the U.S. Corps of Engineers before the aerostats will be seen in regional skies.

U.S. Army Col. Gregory McClinton explained that they recently broke ground at the first launch pad site in Baltimore County with an aim to open on Dec. 1 and a second launch pad shortly thereafter. The $18 million contract for site construction was awarded to a Maryland firm, officials noted.

Many of the project’s soldiers will come from Advanced Individual Training as well as Utah, McClinton said. The project will also bring approximately 30 contracting jobs.

While the project has been controversial with some residents due to concerns about surveillance from the aerostats, Crawford said that he must continue to reassure the public about its intent.

"I need to make sure I am out in the community talking about what JLENS is and what it is not," he said, reaffirming that it the aerostats are not for surveillance but only to detecting low-flying missiles, drones or planes.
Section 4

Community Contributions

On the following pages please find the following additional documents of showing community support for our concerns regarding some of the SPEA findings and general support for APG.

1) Letter from Harford County Executive David Craig, Cecil County Executive Tari Moore, and Baltimore City Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake
2) Letter from Harford County Community College President, Dennis Golladay, Ph.D.
3) Copy of Declaration follows. In the hardcopy equivalent of this submission, we have provided the original Declaration signature pages. We collected 622 total signatures of interested citizens from the APG surrounding communities.
August 22, 2014

U.S. Army Environmental Command
ATTN: SPEA Public Comments
2450 Connell Road, Bldg. 2264
Joint Base San Antonio-Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-7664

To Whom It May Concern:

The proposed actions sighted in the June 2014 Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) for Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment and the direct implications to Aberdeen Proving Ground are of grave concern to the jurisdictions that comprise the Chesapeake Science & Security Corridor (CSSC).

The third largest workforce center by population in the state of Maryland, Aberdeen Proving Ground is a critical employment center for our region. In fact, 83 percent of APG’s workforce calls Harford County, Cecil County and Baltimore City home.

Much collaboration has occurred since 2005 to create the strong, supportive infrastructure to nurture the scientific and technical community that now thrives in the greater APG region. Commercial, residential, government, industry and higher education have rallied and delivered – within an unprecedented timeframe- to provide the fundamental cultural and professional environment in and around the installation that was envisioned by DOD through the colocation of the more than ninety tenants currently at APG.

A cut of the magnitude proposed jeopardizes the technical talent required for these missions, as well as the community’s ability to support this specialized workforce. We, as a unified region, would have liked to have participated in the process prior to the public comment for an environmental assessment, which does not adequately take into account the real socio-economic impacts in reducing the APG workforce by nearly one-third.

We find the methodology used to assess a largely civilian-supported installation in the same manner as an Army operational installation inappropriate. The result of these reductions will have a severe, negative economic impact on a nationally-recognized, model defense community.

On behalf of the CSSC region, we request that you reconsider your proposed force reductions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, and prevent further impacts to APG’s critical research and development role. Please help us keep our defense community Army Strong!

Respectfully submitted,

David R. Craig
Harford County Executive

Tari Moore
Cecil County Executive

Stephanie Rawlings-Blake
Baltimore City Mayor

2021 Pulaski Highway, Suite E    ●    Havre de Grace, MD 21078    ●    410-273-5708
www.apg-cssc.com
August 20, 2014

U.S. Army Environmental Command
ATTN: SPEA Public Comments
2450 Connell Road (Building 2264)
Joint Base San Antonio-Fort Sam
Houston, Texas 78234-7664

RE: Response to Invitation for Public Comment; Impacts of Possible Force Reductions at Aberdeen Proving Ground

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for providing the citizens of Harford County, and particularly Harford Community College, the opportunity to comment on the impacts of possible force reductions at Aberdeen Proving Ground. I have reviewed with great interest many of the documents made available to the public and recognize the great effort put forward to assess impacts in all areas that would touch surrounding communities. A review of the document, Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEAR), was of particular interest, since it specifically addresses affected environment and environmental impacts for Aberdeen Proving Ground if a reduction in force were implemented.

The following comments are offered for your consideration. We recognize that decisions to reduce the forces at any installation will be made based on mission-related criteria and will have serious environmental and socioeconomic impacts on those communities. Our concerns regarding the impact in our community are twofold:

1) Why has Aberdeen Proving Ground been added to the list of installations under review? This installation was not on the list of those assessed in 2013 because, since the 2010 BRAC, Aberdeen Proving Ground is now a civilian dominated organization, focusing on testing, research, and development. The majority of the enlisted soldier population on our post is working at the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and Explosives (CBRNE) Command, and their work supports these efforts. APG has unique capabilities in research and development that spread far beyond this immediate region. Their work is critical to the safety and security of the nation.
2) The current formula of 70% cuts to soldiers and 30% to civilians outlined in the SPEA is disproportionate to APG’s mission and structure. A reduction at this level would be debilitating to the work being done there to support our soldiers and protect our citizens.

The tenants at Aberdeen Proving Ground have been outstanding supporters of all levels of education, and their presence in this community has greatly advanced the national goal of increasing interest in our young people to pursue careers in STEM areas. Harford Community College has entered into four Education Partnership Agreements with tenants at APG for the purpose of encouraging and enhancing study in scientific disciplines. Many of these efforts would ultimately be compromised if a reduction in force took place.

Thank you for providing Harford Community College the opportunity to comment on the Army 2020 force structure realignment. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me at 443-412-2475.

Sincerely,

Dennis Golladay, Ph.D.
President
DECLARATION

We, the citizens of the area surrounding Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, have reviewed the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) for Army 2020 Force Structure Realignment, and upon review declare our support for Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) and our concern for deficiencies in the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment (SPEA) methodology.

For nearly 100 years, APG, Harford County, and the surrounding area have worked together for the common good of the nation’s defense and APG has become the Army’s technology center. BRAC 2005 capitalized on that advantage and strengthened APG’s standing, effectiveness, and contribution by consolidating many C4ISR, Chemical-Biological defense, development and testing, and other functions at APG. The community and State of Maryland responded and met their responsibilities for the “outside the gate” support needed. Together we completed the BRAC actions in September 2011, successfully.

We recognize that economic and budget pressures, expressed in formal budget guidance to the Department of Defense and Army, require reducing the size of the Army and that many if not all installations will experience strength losses of some kind. We are concerned that the SPEA has certain logical inconsistencies and factual omissions that could taint future deliberations. The BRAC 2005 Commission criticized inconsistencies and lack of coordination in the data presented and we are concerned that similar omissions in the SPEA will taint future actions. Our concerns with the SPEA include:

- APG is included in the SPEA as an exception to the guidance without any rationale other than to note it was done. This is an affront to transparent communication and the ability to make effective public comments.

- The primary source of military spaces at APG is the 20th CBRNE Command. It is a vital component of the nation’s defense against weapons of mass destruction and provides support while deployed in hostile areas as well as support to civil authorities in the homeland. Ongoing world events demonstrate the continued need for the 20th’s capabilities and it is not wise to consider them in this analysis, without rationale.

- According to the SPEA, a reduction in civilian spaces is tied to the reduction in military forces and the results show a direct numerical relationship. That logic is inappropriate for APG because of the extreme inversion of the military-civilian ratio. APG is a very technical installation with mostly civilian structure. Applying the same calculation methodology to both APG’s large civilian workforce and its small number of military generates a back-door offense. This puts APG at a disadvantage in future considerations, especially with other high-civilian installations who have even fewer military positions and thus were spared the opportunity to contribute to the current potential reductions.