HIGH ENDOATMOSPHERIC DEFENSE INTERCEPTOR (HEDI)

TECHNOLOGY TESTING PROGRAM

MAY 1989

U.S. ARMY SDC

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL
U.S. ARMY STRATEGIC DEFENSE COMMAND
P.O. BOX 15280, ARLINGTON, VA 22215-0280

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CSSD-RM

5 JUL 1989

MEMORANDUM FOR WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

SUBJECT: High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) Technology Testing Program

1. Enclosed for your use and information is the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) Technology Testing Program Environmental Assessment and the associated "Finding of no Significant Impact" (FNSI). The HEDI environmental assessment is the latest environmental analysis document to be released as part of the overall Strategic Defense Initiative Program.

2. Questions regarding this document or requests for additional copies, should be addressed to:

U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command
CSSD-H-SSP
Post Office Box 1500
Huntsville, Alabama 35807

FOR THE COMMANDER:

WAYNE T. FUJITO
Colonel, GS
Chief of Staff

2 Encls
1. HEDI Environmental Assessment
2. HEDI FNSI

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC DEFENSE COMMAND

AGENCY: United States Army Strategic Defense Command

COOPERATING AGENCY: Strategic Defense Initiative Organization

ACTION: Technology testing of the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI).

BACKGROUND: Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), the Department of Defense (DOD) Directive on Environmental Effects in the United States of DOD Actions, and Army Regulation 200-2, the United States Army Strategic Defense Command (USASDC) has conducted an assessment of the potential environmental consequences of technology testing of the HEDI developed by the USASDC for the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization. A no-action alternative was also considered.

SUMMARY: The HEDI is a technology that would employ ground-based missiles to intercept and destroy hostile submarine-launched and intercontinental ballistic missiles in the terminal portion of their trajectory. The HEDI vehicle would consist of a two-stage launch vehicle (booster) and a kill vehicle with a conventional warhead.

The HEDI technology test program will be conducted in two parts. Each part will test a particular aspect of the technology and provide information and data necessary to make decisions for advancing to the next phase of testing. The first part, which includes the Kinetic Kill Vehicle Integrated Technology Experiment (KITE), will consist of a number of test activities to be conducted at nine different testing sites culminating with a series of flight tests at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico. These activities are categorized as analyses, simulations, component/assembly testing, and flight testing. Part two includes the HEDI Experimental Test Vehicle (XTV) development, which is expected to conclude with two flight tests at the U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll. The specifics of the HEDI XTV testing activities have been broadly defined. If substantive revisions are made, then further environmental analysis will be conducted as the program progresses. This Environmental Assessment, submitted in accordance with applicable directives and policies and made available to the public, provides information on the potential environmental effects of conducting the testing activities described and known at this time.

Technology testing would involve four types of tests: analyses, simulations, component/assembly tests, and flight tests. The locations of test activities for the HEDI are:

INSTALLATION	TEST TYPE
California	
McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company	Analysis, Simulation, Component/Assembly Tests
Vandenberg Air Force Base/Western Test Range	Analysis Tests
Colorado	
National Test Facility, Falcon Air Force Base	Analysis, Simulation Tests
Maryland	
Naval Surface Warfare Center	Analysis, Simulation Tests
New Mexico	
Sandia National Laboratories	Analysis, Component/ Assembly Tests
White Sands Missile Range	Analysis, Simulation, Component/ Assembly, Flight Tests
Republic of the Marshall Islands	
U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll	Analysis, Component/ Assembly, Flight Tests
Tennessee	
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Base	Analysis, Simulation Tests
Utah	
Hill Air Force Base	Analysis, Component/ Assembly Tests

To determine the potential for significant environmental impacts of the technology testing of the HEDI, the magnitude and frequency of the tests that would be conducted at the proposed test locations were compared to the current activities at those locations.

To assess impacts, the activity was evaluated in the context of the environmental considerations for air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazardous waste, infrastructure, land use, noise, public health and safety, socioeconomics, and water quality. As a result of that evaluation, consequences were assigned to one of three categories: insignificant, mitigable and nonsignificant, or potentially significant.

Environmental consequences were determined to be insignificant if no serious concerns existed regarding potential impacts of the potentially affected area. Consequences were deemed mitigable and nonsignificant if concerns existed but it was determined that all of those concerns could be readily mitigated through standard procedures or by measures recommended in existing environmental documentation. If serious concerns were identified that could not be readily mitigated, the activity was determined to represent potentially significant consequences.

FINDINGS: No significant impacts would result from analyses, simulations, and component/assembly testing of the HEDI KITE. Mitigable and nonsignificant impacts will occur resulting from the HEDI XTV flight testing at the U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands, and from the HEDI KITE flight testing at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico. Analyses, simulations, and component/assembly testing of the HEDI KITE will have insignificant environmental consequences at all of the test locations identified. Flight tests at the U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands, will have mitigable and nonsignificant environmental consequences for infrastructure and socioeconomics (housing). Potential infrastructure impacts that will be mitigated by construction of a proposed desalination plant are impacts on water supply. Potential infrastructure impacts that will be mitigated by participation in water conservation procedures, continued wastewater monitoring, and participation in a wastewater treatment effectiveness study are impacts on the wastewater treatment system. Potential socioeconomic (housing) impacts that will be mitigated by the construction of new housing units and the retention of trailers beyond their planned phase-out date are impacts on an anticipated housing shortage. Potential impacts from solid and hazardous waste will be avoided by requiring HEDI XTV contractors to manage their waste in accordance with appropriate Federal requirements.

Flight tests at the White Sands Missile Range will have mitigable and nonsignificant environmental consequences for biological and cultural resources. Potential biological resource impacts that will be mitigated by avoidance are impacts on threatened and endangered plant and animal species. Potential cultural resource impacts that will be mitigated by avoidance and/or data recovery are impacts on historic and prehistoric archaeological sites. Overall, no significant impacts would result.

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS: _____

POINT OF CONTACT: A copy of

High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor
Technology Testing Program,
Environmental Assessment,
May 1989

is available from

U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command
Attn: Dru Barrineau, CSSD-H-SSP
P.O. Box 1500
Huntsville, AL 35807-3801

Dated 9 Jun 89

Robert D. Hammond
Lieutenant General, USA
Commander
U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command

Lead Agency:	United States Army Strategic Defense Command
Cooperating Agency:	Strategic Defense Initiative Organization
Title of Proposed Action:	Technology Testing of High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor Technology
Affected Jurisdictions:	White Sands Missile Range, NM; U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands; Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Base, TN; Hill Air Force Base, UT; National Test Facility, Falcon Air Force Base, CO; Naval Surface Warfare Center, MD; Sandia National Laboratories, NM; Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA/Western Test Range; and the prime contractor facility, McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, Huntington Beach, CA.

PROPONENT: William B. Ingler DATE: 7 June 89

for ALAN D. SHERER
Project Manager
High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor

APPROVED BY: Robert D. Hammond DATE: 9 June 89

ROBERT D. HAMMOND
Lieutenant General, USA
Commander
U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT UNLIMITED
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION US Army Strategic Defense Command 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) CSSD-H-SSP	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) P.O. Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. / PROJECT NO. / TASK NO. / WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)
High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) Technology Testing Program Environmental Assessment (U).

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
HEDI Environmental Assessment Team, Mr. Dru Barrineau, Chairman.

13a. TYPE OF REPORT	13b. TIME COVERED	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day)	15. PAGE COUNT
	FROM _____ TO _____	31 MAY 1989	244

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Environmental Assessment, High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI), Interceptor technology.
24			
22	02		

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)
This Environmental Assessment documents the results of an analysis of the potential for and magnitude of impacts from technology test activities of the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI).

20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS	21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Mr. Dru Barrineau	22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (205) 895-3632 22c. OFFICE SYMBOL CSSD-H-SSP

DD Form 1473, JUN 86 *Previous editions are obsolete.*

24 Environmental Impacts
22/02 Interceptors

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), announced by President Reagan on March 23, 1983, initiated an extensive research program to determine the feasibility of developing an effective ballistic missile defense system. The technological progress that has been made on the SDI research program since 1983 has advanced at an unexpectedly fast pace, and is still accelerating. Recognizing that no strategic defense system could be deployed all at once, the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization is using an evolutionary approach to strategic defense known as the concept of phased, or incremental, development/ deployment. This concept addresses the question of how to deploy strategic defenses in the event a decision is made in the future. It does not constitute a decision to develop or deploy.

The High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) is one of the many technologies being considered in the SDI technology research program and has the potential to support the requirements for the strategic defense system. The purpose of this Environmental Assessment (EA) is to analyze the environmental consequences of testing activities for the HEDI technology test program in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing the Act, Department of Defense Directive 6050.1, and Army Regulation 200-2.

The HEDI is a technology that would employ ground-based missiles to intercept and destroy hostile submarine-launched ballistic missiles and intercontinental ballistic missiles during that portion of flight that puts the target in the high endoatmosphere (the terminal portion of an attacking missile trajectory). The HEDI vehicle would consist of a two-stage launch vehicle (booster) and a kill vehicle with a conventional warhead. The basic thrust of the efforts already accomplished has been to assess the operational utility of HEDI in the context of a complete strategic defense system.

The HEDI technology test program will be conducted in two parts. Each part will test a particular aspect of the technology and provide information and data necessary to make decisions for advancing to the next phase of testing. The first part, which includes the Kinetic Kill Vehicle Integrated Technology Experiment (KITE), will consist of a number of test activities to be conducted at nine different testing sites culminating with a series of flight tests at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico. These activities are categorized as analyses, simulations, component/assembly testing, and flight testing. Part two includes the HEDI Experimental Test Vehicle (XTV) development, which is expected to conclude with two flight tests at the U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll. The specifics of the HEDI XTV testing activities have been broadly defined. If substantive revisions are made, further environmental analysis will be conducted as the program progresses. This EA, submitted in accordance with applicable directives and policies and made available to the public, provides information on the potential environmental effects of conducting the testing activities described and known at this time.

In particular, this EA examines the proposed sites for testing activities. For each site, the assessment evaluates potential impacts on the environment. To assess the significance of any impact, a two-step methodology has been utilized. The first step was the application of assessment criteria to identify test activities deemed to present no

potential for significant environmental consequences. If a proposed activity was determined to present some potential for impact, no matter how slight, the second step in the methodology was undertaken. This step consisted of evaluating the activity in terms of potential for significant impacts on a number of broad environmental attributes, such as air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazardous waste, infrastructure, land use, noise, public health and safety issues, socioeconomics, and water quality.

Based on the application of this methodological approach, the following determinations on the environmental consequences of HEDI technology testing were made:

- McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, Huntington Beach, California - insignificant consequences
- Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Base, Tennessee - insignificant consequences
- Hill Air Force Base, Utah - insignificant consequences
- National Test Facility, Falcon Air Force Base, Colorado - insignificant consequences
- Naval Surface Warfare Center, Maryland - insignificant consequences
- Sandia National Laboratories, New Mexico - insignificant consequences
- U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands - mitigable and nonsignificant consequences
- Vandenberg Air Force Base, California/Western Test Range - insignificant consequences
- White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico - mitigable and nonsignificant consequences.

HEDI XTV tests at the U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands, will have mitigable and nonsignificant environmental consequences for infrastructure and socioeconomics (housing). Potential infrastructure impacts that will be mitigated by construction of a proposed desalination plant are impacts on water supply. Potential infrastructure impacts that will be mitigated by participation in water conservation procedures, continued wastewater monitoring, and participation in a wastewater treatment effectiveness study are impacts on the wastewater treatment system. Potential socioeconomic (housing) impacts that will be mitigated by the construction of additional housing units and the retention of trailers beyond their planned phase-out date are impacts on an anticipated housing shortage.

HEDI KITE technology tests at White Sands Missile Range will have mitigable and nonsignificant environmental consequences for biological and cultural resources. Potential biological resource impacts that will be mitigated by avoidance are impacts on threatened and endangered plant and animal species. Potential cultural resource impacts that will be mitigated by avoidance and/or appropriate recovery and documentation of data are impacts on historic and prehistoric archaeological sites.



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

LIST OF TABLES

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing the Act (40 CFR 1500-1508), Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 6050.1, and Army Regulation (AR) 200-2, which implements these regulations, direct that DOD and Army officials take into account environmental consequences when authorizing or approving major Federal actions in the United States. Accordingly, this Environmental Assessment (EA) analyzes the potential environmental consequences of technology testing activities for a proposed High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI). Because the proposed action would involve the U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll (USAKA), Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), the Compact of Free Association (166) and related agreements between the RMI and the United States also apply.

HEDI is one of the technologies being considered in the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program. The tests and evaluations associated with the technology test program would be in compliance with the Antiballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Conduct of the test activities for HEDI would not indicate that HEDI would be developed or deployed, nor would it preclude the possibility of testing or advancing other technologies in the acquisition process.

This section describes the purpose and need for the action, the proposed HEDI technology test program and alternatives, and the related environmental documentation. Section 2.0 describes the affected environment at installations where the testing activities would be conducted. Section 3.0 assesses the potential environmental consequences of the proposed action at these installations, and Section 4.0 discusses measures that would be taken to minimize impacts at affected installations.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The SDI, announced by President Reagan on March 23, 1983, initiated an extensive research program to determine the feasibility of developing an effective ballistic missile defense system. Subsequently, the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization (SDIO) was established to plan, organize, coordinate, direct, and enhance the research and testing of technologies applicable to strategic defense.

The acquisition process for defense programs is divided into distinct phases that are separated by major milestone decision points. They are: Milestone 0 - Program Initiation/Mission-Need Decision (Concept Exploration), Milestone I - Concept Demonstration/Validation Decision, Milestone II - Full-Scale Development Decision, Milestone III - Full-Rate Production Decision, Milestone IV - Logistics Readiness and Support Review, and Milestone V - Major Upgrade or System Replacement Decision. Each of these decision points establishes program goals that the Program Manager is expected to meet and the information required for the next decision point.

Central to the conduct of the SDI research program and determination of feasible technologies that could be applicable to an effective ballistic missile defense system are the Concept Exploration and Demonstration/Validation activities. As part of the

acquisition process, Concept Exploration activities assess such things as program alternative tradeoffs, performance/cost and schedule tradeoffs, and the operational utility of the prototype concept. Demonstration/Validation activities then examine operational suitability and effectiveness by testing to determine the technology's ability to meet the specified requirements. These activities would provide the necessary information required for future acquisition decisions regarding a Strategic Defense System (SDS).

The technological progress that has been made on the SDI research program since 1983 has advanced at an unexpectedly fast pace, and is still accelerating. Recognizing that no SDS could be deployed all at once, the SDIO is using an evolutionary approach to strategic defense known as the concept of phased, or incremental, development/ deployment. This concept addresses the question of how to deploy strategic defenses in the event a decision is made in the future. It does not constitute a decision to develop or deploy. In September 1987, some technologies were advanced into the Demonstration/Validation phase under this approach because they were judged to be mature enough in concept definition to warrant further evaluation. They are the Boost Surveillance and Tracking System (BSTS), Space-Based Surveillance and Tracking System (SSTS), Space-Based Interceptor (SBI), Exoatmospheric Reentry Vehicle Interception System (ERIS), Ground-Based Surveillance and Tracking System (GSTS), and Battle Management/Command, Control, and Communications (BM/C^3). EAs were prepared for these six technologies in the SDI Demonstration/Validation program in August 1987 (10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16). An SDI Demonstration/Validation Program Environmental Assessments Summary (17) was also prepared. In March 1989, an EA was prepared for Ground-Based Radar (GBR) (9). In May 1989, the public comment period ended and environmental requirements were satisfied. This was in preparation for the advancement of GBR to the Demonstration/Validation phase.

1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE ACTION

The HEDI technology is presently in the Concept Exploration phase, which determines the operational utility of the concept in an SDS. Activities have included study of flight vehicle stability, the vehicle propulsion system, the control system, the infrared seeker, the conventional warhead, and cooling and thermal protection techniques.

The HEDI is a technology that would employ ground-based missiles to intercept and destroy hostile submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) when the attacking missile is reentering the atmosphere (the terminal portion of an attacking missile trajectory) (Figure 1-1). The HEDI vehicle would consist of a two-stage launch vehicle and a kill vehicle (KV) with a conventional warhead. The proposed test activities for the HEDI are intended to resolve critical technical issues to demonstrate the ability to conduct intercepts of ballistic reentry vehicles (RVs) high within the atmosphere.

Conduct of the test activities for HEDI does not preclude the possibility of testing or advancing other technologies in the acquisition process, nor is it a decision that indicates that HEDI or an SDS will be developed and deployed. Further advancement and testing of HEDI in the acquisition process will be supported by additional



EXPLANATION

1. HEDI – HIGH ENDOATMOSPHERIC DEFENSE INTERCEPTOR
2. ICBM – INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE
3. SLBM – SUBMARINE-LAUNCHED BALLISTIC MISSILE

Functional Concept of the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor

Figure 1-1

environmental analysis and documentation in compliance with NEPA. The purpose of this EA is to analyze the environmental consequences of testing activities for the HEDI technology development program in compliance with all pertinent regulations and agreements.

1.3 PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action is implementation of the HEDI technology test program. This program will be conducted in two parts. Each part will test a particular aspect of the technology and provide information and data necessary to make decisions for advancing to the next phase of testing. The first part, which includes the Kinetic Kill Vehicle Integrated Technology Experiment (KITE), will consist of a number of test activities to be conducted at nine different testing sites and will culminate with a series of flight tests at White Sands Missile Range (WSMR), New Mexico. Part two of the technology testing includes the HEDI Experimental Test Vehicle (XTV) development, which is expected to conclude with two flight tests at USAKA. Since many of the specific details of the HEDI XTV effort are not yet defined, the discussion of this effort will be programmatic in nature. Further environmental analysis will be conducted as the HEDI XTV planning progresses and new information is identified.

This EA addresses the HEDI technology test program only. Any decision to advance beyond this program will be supported by further environmental analysis under NEPA. In addition, this EA will be reevaluated if the HEDI program changes.

1.3.1 Part I - HEDI KITE

This part of the HEDI technology test program is intended to demonstrate whether the HEDI KITE can meet the following specific requirements:

- Safely and accurately launch a booster vehicle
- Track an infrared (IR) target flare, providing aero-optical measurement data
- Intercept a surrogate RV.

The HEDI KITE test activities are categorized as analyses, simulations, component/assembly testing, and flight testing. Table 1-1 delineates the various activities and the locations associated with each activity; the test locations are shown in Figure 1-2. Test activities will involve evaluating the technology for KV intercept of a target in the high endoatmosphere. This phase of the technology test program will focus on three specific test protocols conducted at WSMR, each test more complex and more difficult than the preceding one. This flight testing at WSMR will be conducted over a 3-year period, beginning in 1989. An optional fourth flight may be conducted if a further demonstration is necessary and/or as a test of emerging technology. Flight one (KITE I) will test the ability to safely and accurately launch the booster vehicle, a two-stage SPRINT booster, to obtain cooling measurement data, and to demonstrate nonnuclear warhead detonation. In flight two (KITE 2), the HEDI seeker will track an IR target flare to collect aero-optical measurement data. Flight three (KITE 3) will be an actual intercept test, featuring an HEDI KV engaging a surrogate RV.

Table 1-1. HEDI KITE TEST ACTIVITIES AND LOCATIONS

TEST ACTIVITIES	ANALYSIS	SIMULATIONS	COMPONENT/ASSEMBLY	FLIGHT	LOCATIONS
Basic flight test	X			X	White Sands Missile Range, NM
Second flight test using infrared target flare	X			X	White Sands Missile Range, NM
Third flight test using target reentry vehicle	X			X	White Sands Missile Range, NM
ALL THREE FLIGHT TESTS					
Refurbish SPRINT booster	X		X		Sandia National Laboratories, NM
Assemble kill vehicle	X		X		White Sands Missile Range, NM
Evaluate window cooling system	X			X	White Sands Missile Range, NM
Evaluate reception of pre-launch intercept data	X		X		White Sands Missile Range, NM
Evaluate launch support equipment	X	X	X		White Sands Missile Range, NM

Table 1-1. HEDI KITE TEST ACTIVITIES AND LOCATIONS

TEST ACTIVITIES	ANALYSIS	SIMULATIONS	COMPONENT/ASSEMBLY	FLIGHT	LOCATIONS
THIRD FLIGHT TEST ONLY					
Refurbish target rocket motor systems	X		X		Hill AFB, UT
Assemble target reentry vehicle	X		X		Sandia National Laboratories, NM
Manufacture air vehicle and test launch control equipment	X	X	X		McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, Huntington Beach, CA
Perform wind tunnel testing of flight components	X	X			Arnold Engineering Dev. Ctr., TN
Validate jet interaction	X	X			Arnold Engineering Dev. Ctr., TN
Evaluate window cooling system	X	X			Naval Surface Warfare Center, MD
Use of infrared target tracking system	X				White Sands Missile Range, NM
	X				U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, RMI
	X				Vandenberg AFB, CA/ Western Test Range
Simulate exercise test mission	X	X			National Test Facility, Falcon AFB, CO



EXPLANATION

1. NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER
2. ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEV. CENTER, ARNOLD AFB
3. NATIONAL TEST FACILITY, FALCON AFB
4. SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES
5. WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE
6. HILL AFB
7. McDONNELL DOUGLAS SPACE SYSTEMS CO.
8. VANDENBERG AFB
9. WESTERN TEST RANGE
10. KWAJALEIN ISLAND, U.S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL
11. MECK ISLAND, U.S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL

0 150 300 600
Kilometers

0 100 200 400
Miles

High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor Test Facilities

Figure 1-2

In preparation for the flight tests, the following activities, also shown in Table 1-1, will be performed:

- Refurbishment, modification, and testing of existing SPRINT Stage I and II propulsion and control assemblies

- Assembly of the HEDI KITE vehicle, which involves attaching the KV to the two-stage, modified SPRINT Propulsion and Control Assembly (PACA) on the launch pad located at Launch Complex 37, WSMR

- Evaluation of the window cooling system, which involves ensuring that the cooling system can dissipate the heat generated on the window during flight to ensure that the HEDI seeker can acquire and track the target

- Evaluation of the reception of prelaunch intercept data, which is a test of the ability of the overall system to receive sufficient target data to allow the accurate ground launch of the HEDI KITE

- Evaluation of launch support equipment, which involves testing the equipment required to safely launch the HEDI KITE. The equipment provides the necessary environmental or missile conditions for operators and/or range safety officers.

Unique to the third flight test (KITE 3) will be two additional activities:

- Refurbishment of an existing rocket motor to prepare it for assembly/integration as the HEDI target launch vehicle

- Assembly of the target vehicle, involving fabrication of a target RV with an enhanced IR signature.

The remaining technology test activities shown in Table 1-1 will be conducted prior to or concurrent with the WSMR flight tests. These activities will include:

- Manufacture of the KV, its ground support equipment, including its electronic test equipment, and the actual fabrication of hardware

- Wind tunnel testing of flight components, involving placing either a full-sized or reduced model of the test object in the tunnel and moving air past the object. This testing simulates high-speed flight and allows testing of aerodynamic characteristics using sensors and high-speed photography

- Validation of jet interaction, which evaluates the maneuvering capability of the HEDI KV under extreme conditions

- Evaluation of the window cooling system, which ensures that the cooling system can dissipate the heat generated on the window during flight. This is necessary to ensure that the IR seeker can acquire and track the target

- Utilization of the Infrared Instrumentation System (IRIS), involving flying the IRIS on board a Learjet to gather IR signature data on actual RVs and their associated objects

- Simulation of the exercise test mission, which involves developing and using computer programs that will simulate the expected test scenario before actual hardware testing.

The following sections describe more fully the types of test activities that will take place and the pertinent information regarding each test location.

1.3.1.1 Analyses

Analysis activities for the HEDI program will consist of evaluating data generated by the other test program activities. By necessity, this analysis will occur after each testing phase. Analysis is a scientific exercise conducted to determine the cause or reasons for simulated or real phenomena noted during testing and/or evaluation. This analysis will be used to eliminate potential problems and/or to enhance positive results. HEDI KITE analyses are scheduled at all of the locations where test activities will be conducted (Table 1-1) and will be undertaken by the staff that routinely performs these test program activities. No additional personnel will be required for any analysis activity.

In addition to the evaluation of data generated by test program activities, the analyses will also involve the collection of data utilizing the IRIS tracking system at WSMR and USAKA, RMI. While at USAKA, the IR target tracking system will take advantage of targets of opportunity launched out of Vandenberg Air Force Base (AFB), California. IRIS will also be utilized during the HEDI KITE tests at WSMR. The data collection tests are described in more detail below.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

Use of the IR target tracking system is scheduled at WSMR. Utilization of the IRIS tracking system will involve flying the IRIS on board the Learjet on the day of each of the flight tests to gather IR signature data from the target (KITE 2 and 3 launches) at WSMR. The IRIS is an airborne/radiometric system capable of acquiring, tracking, processing, and recording data within the HEDI seeker bandwidth and will be flown on board a Learjet 35 to gather data pertinent to HEDI seeker development. Prior to each flight, an Operations Requirement (OR) Report will be filed with WSMR for approval. Approximately 11 transient personnel will be needed for IRIS for the duration of the KITE 2 and 3 tests. Existing facilities will be used, and aircraft fuel will be handled in accordance with the safety plan for WSMR.

U.S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL

Utilization of the IRIS is also scheduled at USAKA. The system will also be flown on board a Learjet 35 staged at USAKA. The aircraft will be serviced and maintained within an existing hangar at USAKA. Approximately six to ten targets of opportunity will be observed by IRIS each year during technology testing for the HEDI KITE

program. Prior to each target of opportunity mission, an OR Report will be filed with USAKA for approval from the applicable offices (i.e., safety, security, etc.). Approximately 11 transient personnel will be needed for IRIS activities approximately 4 months per year. No additional facilities need to be constructed. Aircraft fuel will be handled in accordance with the safety plan for USAKA.

VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE/WESTERN TEST RANGE

Utilization of the IRIS to obtain IR signature data will involve the use of targets of opportunity launched from Vandenberg AFB. Because these launches are regularly scheduled and routine for Vandenberg AFB, no additional personnel will be required for HEDI activities. Vandenberg AFB routinely launches several types of missiles, among them the PEACEKEEPER, MINUTEMAN, and Titan. Any combination of these missiles may be launched during the technology testing timeframe and personnel requirements will vary. As an example, MINUTEMAN launches require approximately 55 persons (195).

1.3.1.2 Simulations

HEDI technical and operational requirements will be verified by component subsystem-system level tests and computer simulations. Simulation involves testing a physical entity (machine, system component, etc.) by developing a computer model of that entity or by using a special simulation facility such as a wind tunnel.

Emphasis will be placed on building the qualifications history and databases from the component level to permit cost-effective element testing. Table 1-1 delineates the location of each simulation. HEDI KITE launch support equipment simulations are scheduled at WSMR. Equipment and flight test simulations will be conducted at the McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company (MDSSC) facility in Huntington Beach, California. Wind tunnel testing of flight components and jet interaction/validation simulations are scheduled at the Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), Arnold AFB, Tennessee, and wind tunnel tests are scheduled at the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC), White Oak, Maryland, to validate aero-effects and window/forebody cooling performance. Exercise test mission simulations incorporating data from HEDI are scheduled at the National Test Facility (NTF), Falcon AFB, Colorado. These simulation activities are described in more detail below.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

The launch support equipment simulation tests at WSMR will be conducted in an existing facility, the Launch Control Center at Launch Complex 37, in conjunction with flight tests for KITEs 1, 2, and 3. These tests will simulate use of the launch control equipment; flight simulation tests are expected to run for a few months. Approximately 30 additional contractor personnel will be present for these simulation tests (20).

MCDONNELL DOUGLAS SPACE SYSTEMS COMPANY

The launch control equipment simulations at MDSSC's Huntington Beach installation will be conducted in existing facilities, the System Integration Laboratory in Building 14, where flight simulation tests will be performed using computer models. Approximately five persons will be involved in these simulation tests (26); no additional personnel will be required.

ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The wind tunnel testing of flight components and jet interaction/validation simulations at AEDC will be conducted in existing facilities (the von Karman facility). These tests involve placing either a full-sized or reduced model of the KV in the wind tunnel and moving air past it. Flight component testing simulates high-speed flight and allows testing of aerodynamic characteristics using sensors and high-speed photography. Jet interaction/validation simulations involve the evaluation of the maneuvering capability of the KV. During these tests, a gas generator, used to raise the temperature in the wind tunnel, will emit a small quantity of the combustion products of butane and liquid oxygen (i.e., carbon dioxide, water, and carbon monoxide). Apart from the liquid oxygen, which is produced on site, and the butane, which is purchased locally, no additional material will be required for these tests. Wind tunnel tests usually require several weeks to set up and evaluate but last only a matter of seconds when actually conducted. AEDC employs approximately 3,800 persons (44); approximately 500 work in the von Karman facility on similar test programs. Of these 500 personnel, 3 or 4 will work on HEDI KITE activities; an additional 20 to 30 contractor personnel will be involved in the HEDI KITE tests (49).

NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER

The wind tunnel tests at the NSWC at White Oak, to validate aero-effects and window/forebody cooling performance, will be conducted in an existing facility, Hypervelocity Wind Tunnel No. 9. This wind tunnel is a high Reynolds number facility for aerodynamic testing of weapons and vehicles, including the critical low-altitude flight regime of advanced interceptors and full-scale reentry bodies. The tests will involve placing either a full-sized or reduced model of the KV in the wind tunnel and moving nitrogen past it at high speed. High-pressure (138,000 kilo pascals [20,000 pounds per square inch]) nitrogen will be passed through a nozzle over the test object to a low-pressure chamber. This testing simulates high-speed flight and allows testing of the window/forebody cooling system and the validation of aero-effects using sensors and high-speed photography. Other than the nitrogen used as the working fluid in the wind tunnel test, no additional material will be required for the tests. Although the wind tunnel tests last only a matter of seconds, the entire process - including preparatory work beforehand and evaluation afterward - will take 2 to 3 months. Eight to ten full-time staff members are engaged in wind tunnel tests at Wind Tunnel No. 9. Three or four additional personnel are expected as observers during the tests (98, 102, 103).

NATIONAL TEST FACILITY, FALCON AIR FORCE BASE

The computer simulations at Falcon AFB, which serves as a repository for all SDIO technical information, will be part of a larger, overall SDI simulation effort. This effort will take advantage of data from all of the SDI technologies. These simulations will take place in the existing interim facility (the Consolidated Space Operations Center) and the new NTF, but will not involve or require any building modifications to the Consolidated Space Operations Center. When the new NTF, which is still under construction, is fully operational, it will employ approximately 2,700 of Falcon AFB's potential workforce of 6,000 employees (75, 76, 78, 83, 85). Other than these already-scheduled people, no additional personnel will be required.

1.3.1.3 Component/Assembly Tests

Component/assembly testing, which is necessary for the preparation of the actual flight test hardware, includes all aspects of site activation. The basic concept of component/assembly testing is to control the physical conditions under which hardware is tested. Tests are typically conducted in controlled environments, and data are collected regarding the performance of an individual hardware item and/or how it reacts to a specific environment. The scope of the tests may range from single components to major subassemblies.

The majority of the HEDI KITE component/assembly tests (Table 1-1) will be conducted at WSMR. These will involve assembling the KV, evaluating the reception of prelaunch intercept data, and evaluating the launch support equipment. HEDI KITE component/assembly tests involving the refurbishment of the target rocket motor systems used in KITE 3 are scheduled at Hill AFB, Utah. Target vehicle component/assembly tests for KITE 3 and refurbishment of the SPRINT booster rocket for KITEs 1, 2, and 3 are scheduled at Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Air vehicle and ground equipment component/assembly tests will be conducted at MDSSC's Huntington Beach installation for all three KITE launches. These component/assembly activities are described in more detail below.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

The component/assembly tests at WSMR will involve evaluating the launch support equipment (equipment installation and checkout, calibration, and maintenance) and prelaunch intercept data reception, which will be conducted in the Launch Control Center at Launch Complex 37, and assembling the KV with the SPRINT booster, which will be conducted in the KV Missile Assembly Building (MAB). These component/assembly tests will be conducted in existing facilities at WSMR. Approximately ten additional contractor personnel will be required for these component assembly tests (20).

HILL AIR FORCE BASE

The component/assembly tests at Hill AFB will involve the refurbishment of the M56A1 rocket motor(s) to prepare them for assembly as the ARIES target delivery system for the KITE 3 target, and will take place in existing facilities that are

routinely used for this type of activity for other projects. Refurbishment involves: overhauling the nozzle control unit; X-raying the motor for voids; verifying that all "O"-rings are present; leak testing, which involves using nitrogen gas at 207 kilo pascals (30 pounds per square inch) to adhere to a 30-milliliter (1-ounce)-per-year leak criterion; inspecting for cracks; electrical checks; checking the raceway cables; checking the insulator to boot gap; ultrasonic imaging of components (if necessary); and Computerized Axial Tomography scanning (if necessary). Solvents are used in quantities of less than 30 milliliters (1 ounce) in the refurbishment area to clean the nozzle and explosive safety quantity distances (ESQDs) have been established around the missile maintenance area (52, 53). This procedure is a routine operation at Hill AFB. Approximately 15 personnel (53) are involved in the refurbishing process, which takes place in the refurbishing bays of Building 2114. No additional personnel or modifications to existing facilities will be required (53).

SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES

Simultaneous with the ARIES activities at Hill AFB, a target vehicle upper stage will be fabricated at the Sandia National Laboratories. The target vehicle will be assembled in Building 808 of Technical Area I. Vibration testing (Building 6560) and centrifuge testing (Building 6520) will take place in Technical Area III. Additional tests involved in the component/assembly activities will take place in remote testing areas of the facility. These tests will include two types of X-band radar cross-sectioning (Buildings 9970-C and 9972) and antenna pattern measurements (Building 9970). This type of testing and assembly is within Sandia's routine operations and no additional personnel will be required (111).

In addition to the target vehicle testing and assembly, Sandia National Laboratories will also refurbish the SPRINT booster rockets for KITEs 1, 2, and 3. This refurbishment, which is a routine operation for Sandia National Laboratories, involves both rocket stages. First-stage refurbishment consists of removing the fairing, thrust vector controls, nozzle, and igniters; X-raying the motor; modifying the electrical wiring and performing electrical continuity tests; plugging the thrust vector ports on the nozzle; and reassembling the motor and nozzle with the new fairing. As part of the first-stage nozzle and air vane control section assembly, a small amount of asbestos putty is used for sealing joints. Existing putty will be removed and replaced with new putty. Handling and disposal of asbestos putty will be performed by Sandia National Laboratories in accordance with applicable Federal and state regulations (110). Second-stage refurbishment consists of removing the nozzle, air vane control fins, and igniters; X-raying the motor; modifying the electrical wiring and performing electrical continuity tests; installing modified air vane control fins from MDSSC's Huntington Beach installation; and reattaching the nozzle. After the two stages have been refurbished, they will be reassembled. This process, which takes approximately 3 months, requires four Sandia personnel and an additional two or three MDSSC personnel (119). Refurbishment of the SPRINT booster rocket will take place in the SPRINT Assembly Building (Building 6736) in Technical Area III in accordance with Sandia's standard safety procedures (114).

MCDONNELL DOUGLAS SPACE SYSTEMS COMPANY

The air vehicle and ground equipment component/assembly tests will be conducted at MDSSC's Huntington Beach, California, installation. The fabrication and assembly of the KV and the wiring and fitting check for the entire missile will be performed in the existing fabrication building (Building 39). The launch control equipment will be assembled and tested in the Subsystem Integration Laboratory's simulation center. MDSSC employs approximately 10,000 people at its Huntington Beach installation, of whom 230 will be involved in HEDI KITE operations (26). The actual component assembly tests will involve 12 to 15 personnel. No additional personnel will be required.

1.3.1.4 Flight Tests

Flight and validation testing (Table 1-1) is that portion of the program that involves real-world conditions. In the case of HEDI KITE, it will involve the actual launch and control of the total interceptor weapon at WSMR. The flight validation tests are described in more detail below.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

The HEDI KITE flight test program at WSMR will consist of three flight tests. These tests will focus on the resolution of critical technology issues supporting the development of a conventional high endoatmospheric missile system capable of intercepting SLBM and ICBM RVs during their reentry into the Earth's atmosphere. Tests will occur annually, beginning in 1989, and will be scheduled to minimize potential impact on the San Andres National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) (Figure 1-3), in coordination with the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish.

For each KITE flight, an OR Report must be submitted to the National Range Operations Division. The OR Report is prepared by the range user to identify requirements directly related to the conduct of a particular test or series of identical or similar tests. This report provides specific details of the flight trajectory, measurement requirements, and support requirements, such as timing, recovery, and real-time displays. The OR Report is coordinated with the appropriate divisions at WSMR and approved prior to conducting the tests.

Each flight is designed to obtain function and performance data on designated key issues and related interceptor equipment. Flight one (KITE 1) will be a basic test of the ability to safely and accurately launch the booster vehicle. The booster vehicle (the first- and second-stage rocket motors from a SPRINT missile) will be launched along a trajectory with an azimuth of 330 degrees (Figure 1-3) from Launch Complex 37. This trajectory was selected based on evaluations made early in the HEDI KITE planning stages using the following criteria: fulfilling technical operational requirements, avoiding populated areas and the White Sands National Monument, and containing debris within WSMR. The trajectory was approved by the WSMR Safety Office and the WSMR Master Planning Board.



HEDI KITE Trajectory and Test Facilities Site Plan

Figure 1-3

The HEDI KITE 1 flight will be terminated by detonation of the HEDI warhead (Figure 1-4). Prior to the flight termination, the HEDI KV will have separated from the SPRINT PACA, which will land along the trajectory shown in Figure 1-3. At the time of the KITE 1 flight launch, the HEDI KV will weigh 365 kilograms (806 pounds). Of that weight, approximately 81 kilograms (178 pounds) are the warhead and other expendables, such as cooling gases, KV control fuels, etc. These expendables will be consumed either in flight or by the detonation of the HEDI warhead. The balance of the weight is debris from the explosion. The SPRINT second stage and shroud separation points and warhead detonation point (at 15,240 meters [50,000 feet]) are also shown in Figure 1-4.

Debris will be handled in accordance with WSMR's existing prescribed policies, responsibilities, and procedures for the security, recovery, and disposition of classified, unclassified, and hazardous test material impacting on and off the range (WSMR Regulation 70-8). Any debris that impacts in the White Sands National Monument will be cleaned up to the satisfaction of the Superintendent of the White Sands National Monument, in accordance with the Master Special Use Agreement between the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army (260). If debris falls in the San Andres NWR, the Manager of the Refuge will be contacted before any attempt is made to recover the debris and will be invited to accompany recovery personnel if recovery is deemed necessary.

Flight two (KITE 2) will be an experiment in which the HEDI seeker will track an IR target flare to measure seeker performance. The target flare will be fired from the vicinity of the Small Missile Range (Figure 1-3) using a 155-mm Howitzer, whereas the HEDI KITE 2 vehicle (a first- and second-stage SPRINT missile plus the HEDI KV) will be launched from Launch Complex 37 along the same trajectory as KITE 1 (Figure 1-3). The debris will also impact along the same trajectory as the KITE 1 flight test debris but will cover a smaller area. The debris will be handled in the same manner as debris from KITE I.

Flight three (KITE 3) will be an actual intercept test, featuring a HEDI KV engaging a surrogate RV (attached to an ARIES booster), which will be launched from Launch Complex 36, just west of Launch Complex 37 (Figure 1-3). The latter test will include evaluation of the seeker system, fusing performance, and overall evaluation of the performance of the conventional warhead. The HEDI KV will be launched from Launch Complex 37 along the same trajectory as KITE 1 (Figure 1-3). Debris will impact along the same trajectory and will be handled in the same manner as debris from KITE 1. An optional fourth flight may be conducted if a further demonstration of KITE 3's performance is necessary and/or as a test of emerging technology. If required, the test will be essentially identical to HEDI KITE 3 with respect to trajectory, debris impact areas, etc.

Two types of cameras, tracking and fixed, will be used during technology testing to monitor all three of the HEDI KITE flight tests at WSMR. The tracking cameras will be placed on existing camera stands along the flight trajectory and will not require new construction. There will be 23 fixed cameras (Figure 1-5) at 11 sites. Construction



HEDI KITE WSMR Flight Tests

Figure 1-4



Typical Camera Stand

Figure 1-5

will be required at the 11 fixed-camera sites shown in Figure 1-6. Of these 11 sites, 7 (Sites 1 through 7) will be manned and thus will require only timing circuits, which will be connected with surface field cables to avoid trenching and land disturbance. The cables will be removed after each test flight. The start and timing circuit cables for three of the four unmanned sites (Sites 10, 11, and 12 in Figure 1-6) will be buried in trenches to the nearest cable head, involving a total of 489 meters (1,604 feet) of trenching. All of this work will take place in previously disturbed areas. The general location of Camera Site 9 is known and, at most, Camera Site 9 will require 489 meters (1,604 feet) of cable trenching in relatively undisturbed terrain. Every effort will be made to minimize the distance of required cable burial.

Trenching will be accomplished with the use of a Caterpillar D7 or D8, which needs a 3-meter (10-foot) right-of-way, but the plow will disturb a path only 46 centimeters (18 inches) wide where the cable is actually laid. The trenching will take approximately 2 days and involve a crew of two. If new camera mounds are required, construction will consist of blading and compacting the contiguous soil to conform to the following approximate dimensions: 4.6 meters (15 feet) wide, 6 meters (20 feet) long, and 1.5 meters (5 feet) high. New rights-of-way (approximately 3 meters [10 feet] wide) may have to be created to access any new camera mounds. However, the rights-of-way, except at Site 9, would be located in areas that have been previously disturbed to some degree.

Maximum use will be made of existing camera mounds and stands and existing rights-of-way for access for cable routing. Wherever possible, common use of rights-of-way for access and cable routing will be made. Any new camera mounds will be left in place after the HEDI KITE flight tests to minimize environmental disturbance.

The WSMR Optics Branch, in coordination with the HEDI Project Office, will determine the precise final locations of the fixed camera sites, the vehicle access routes, and the communication cable routes. These locations will be selected with the assistance of a biologist and an archaeologist/cultural resource specialist to avoid disturbance of any sensitive plants and any historic or prehistoric archaeological sites and historic buildings.

To support flight test activities at WSMR, 1 additional full-time contractor individual will be required for the technology testing period, and 30 to 40 additional contractor personnel would be at WSMR on temporary duty from approximately 6 months before until 1 month after each of the HEDI KITE flight tests.

1.3.2 Part II - HEDI XTV

The HEDI XTV part of the HEDI technology test program has as its objective the development and testing of the interceptor hardware and software necessary to demonstrate endoatmospheric, nonnuclear kill of strategic RVs at near-tactical engagement velocities. The HEDI XTV effort will involve hardware improvements to the KV and development of a new booster to replace the SPRINT booster used in the HEDI KITE tests.



Fixed Camera Site Locations

Figure 1-6

Many of the specific details of HEDI XTV testing are not known at this time, primarily because the exact type of booster to be used has not yet been determined. The type of booster and the locations for booster testing will be determined as a result of the competitive procurement process conducted by the prime contractor to select a booster subcontractor. This selection is expected to be made in early 1990. The discussion of HEDI XTV testing in this document will be programmatic in nature, describing the general nature of activities planned and drawing comparisons to similar activities in the HEDI KITE testing. Further environmental analysis will be conducted as the planning progresses and new information is identified. In those cases where specific details are already available, such as for launch facility construction at USAKA, detailed discussion is provided in this document.

The HEDI XTV test activities can be categorized as analyses, simulations, component/ assembly testing, and flight testing. This testing will focus on two specific test protocols conducted at USAKA. These flight tests will involve HEDI XTV launches from Meck Island, USAKA, over a 2-year period beginning in 1993. Flight one will test the ability to safely and accurately launch the new booster vehicle. Flight two will also test the ability to track and home in on a target vehicle at near-tactical velocities.

1.3.2.1 Analyses

Analysis activities for the HEDI XTV effort are similar to those previously described for HEDI KITE. They involve evaluation of data generated by other test program activities after each test is conducted. Analyses will be scheduled at all of the locations where HEDI XTV test activities will occur and will be undertaken by the staff that performs the test program activities.

Additionally, the collection of data utilizing the IRIS target tracking system at USAKA to observe targets of opportunity launched out of Vandenberg AFB will be continued during the HEDI XTV effort to support continuing development of HEDI seeker capability. This activity was discussed in Section 1.3.1.1.

1.3.2.2 Simulations

Simulation activities for the HEDI XTV effort are expected to begin in 1991 and will be similar to those planned for HEDI KITE and previously described.

Launch control equipment simulations are expected to be conducted at MDSSC's Huntington Beach installation, as performed for HEDI KITE; launch support equipment simulation tests are anticipated at USAKA in conjunction with the flight tests from Meck Island. Exercise test mission simulations will be scheduled at the NTF at Falcon AFB as part of a larger, overall SDI simulation effort. Again, this activity will be similar to that planned for HEDI KITE and described in Section 1.3.1.2.

Wind tunnel testing of the new booster and/or of the improved KV may be required. Existing facilities at either AEDC or NSWC will be utilized to conduct these tests. Facilities at both of these government installations will be used for HEDI KITE testing and HEDI XTV wind tunnel testing would be similar to that discussed for HEDI KITE components in Section 1.3.1.2.

1.3.2.3 Component/Assembly Tests

Component/assembly fabrication for the HEDI XTV effort is expected to begin in the last quarter of 1991. The scope of the testing may range from tests on single components to those on major subassemblies. In general, the same types of tests will be required as were discussed for HEDI KITE.

The majority of the HEDI XTV component/assembly tests will involve evaluating ground support and launch equipment performance, KV assembly and readiness evaluations, and validating prelaunch intercept data reception. Some of these tests are expected to be conducted at MDSSC's Huntington Beach installation; most will be conducted in conjunction with prelaunch activities at USAKA.

Component/assembly testing of the new booster will include a series of static test firings. Although these tests could be accomplished at several government installations already utilized for test firings, they may also be accomplished at existing facilities of the booster subcontractor. This will be determined at the time of subcontractor selection.

Component/assembly testing will also be required to support use of a target for the second XTV test flight. The location of testing of the target itself will be determined as a result of a U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command (USASDC) competitive procurement for determining a targets contractor. The nature of the tests will be similar to those described for HEDI KITE at Sandia National Laboratories.

The target launch vehicle will be either a MINUTEMAN I launched from Vandenberg AFB, California, or a Strategic Target System (STARS) vehicle launched from the Pacific Missile Range Facility at Barking Sands, Hawaii. If a MINUTEMAN I is used, component assembly tests involving the refurbishment of MINUTEMAN I rocket motors will be required at Hill AFB. If a STARS launch vehicle is used, tests will be required at Hill AFB for the first- and second-stage rocket motors and at either Sandia or Barking Sands for the third-stage rocket motor. In either case, rocket motor refurbishment discussed in Section 1.3.1.3 for HEDI KITE will be representative of the type of activity required. Site-specific activities at the target launch site will be described and analyzed in subsequent environmental documentation once the launch site and type of target launch vehicle is determined.

1.3.2.4 Flight Tests

Flight and validation testing is that portion of the HEDI XTV effort that will involve the actual launch and control of the total interceptor at Meck Island, USAKA. The two planned flights for the HEDI XTV effort differ in that the second flight will involve use of a target vehicle while the first flight is basically planned as a test of the new booster. Activities at USAKA will be essentially the same for each flight and will be typical of previous USAKA flight tests.

Missile booster sections and other flight hardware will be transported to USAKA by Military Airlift Command flights into Bucholz Airfield on Kwajalein Island. Materials

will be off-loaded from aircraft in controlled areas ("hot spots"), operated according to USAKA safety procedures, and moved on designated roadways to the cargo pier. Barges will be used to transport the missile components to Meck Island, where the components will be stored in the MAB in preparation for each flight. USAKA policies restrict the number and types of boosters that may be stored on Meck Island at any one time. The type of booster to be used for the HEDI XTV effort is expected to use a 1.3 explosive class solid propellant rather than the 1.1 explosive class solid propellant used in earlier SPRINT boosters previously launched from Meck Island. The 1.3 explosive class will be less hazardous than the SPRINT 1.1 explosive class. The propellant and ordnance storage areas utilized will comply with quantity-distance building separation standards. Transportation, storage, assembly, and launch activities will be carried out according to DOD 6055.9-STD, Ammunition and Explosives Safety Standards, and USAKA Regulation 385-75, Explosives Safety. Sites for flight test activities have been reviewed and approved by the DOD Explosives Safety Board (129) based on the 1.1 explosive class propellant. The ESQDs and launch safety procedures will be adequate for the storage, handling, and normal launch operations, and in the unlikely occurrence of a booster conflagration.

Missile assembly, and other prelaunch and launch activities for HEDI XTV flight tests will be typical of the activities routinely conducted for previous USAKA test programs. Missile assembly operations will include lifting missile components onto assembly stands, surface preparation and cleaning using solvents, mechanical assembly of components, and testing. The contractor will be responsible for handling, treatment, storage, and disposal of any waste materials including any hazardous and toxic materials (e.g., explosives, liquid propellants, battery packs, cleaning fluids) utilized at the launch complex, in accordance with applicable USAKA safety standards and applicable Federal environmental standards. Positioning of the assembled missile on the launch pad will be scheduled to minimize exposure to the harsh USAKA environment.

Launch activities will be conducted with strict control of both the immediate area of the launch and the much larger area of Kwajalein Atoll, the broad ocean area (BOA) northeast of the atoll, and the airspace affected by the launch activities. Personnel on Meck Island will either be moved off the island or required to be in designated shelters for protection against the effects of propellant combustion, in accordance with USAKA Regulation 385-4. Commercial aircraft and ocean vessels will be notified in advance of launch activities by Notice to All Airmen (NOTAM) and Notice to Mariners (NOTMAR), respectively, so that alternate routes can be used during the flight tests. This notification affects primarily the BOA where the flight will occur and where spent booster cases and debris are calculated to fall. The launch azimuth for both HEDI XTV test flights is expected to be approximately 18 degrees, as shown in Figure 1-7.

The type of booster to be used for the HEDI XTV effort is expected to be solid propellant. The primary emission products expected in that case would be aluminum oxide, hydrogen chloride, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, water, hydrogen, and nitrogen. The primary debris would be expected to consist of steel, titanium, and aluminum fragments, plus spent booster casings.



HEDI XTV
Launch Azimuth
USAKA

Figure 1-7

A large variety of sensing, tracking, and safety instrumentation is available at USAKA to support the HEDI XTV flight tests. Instrumentation that would potentially be used includes the GBR to be located at Building 1500 on Kwajalein Island, the USAKA link to the Global Positioning System, cameras located on Meck Island in support of ERIS, meteorological rocket launches from Kwajalein or Omelek islands, and the Kwajalein Range Safety System. All instrumentation utilized that emits electromagnetic energy would be operated within existing USAKA safety standards. The potential use of the GBR to augment USAKA tracking and range safety instrumentation during HEDI XTV launches would require GBR operation below its normal minimum elevation of 2 degrees above the horizontal. This minimum beam elevation was established to ensure safety of personnel from adverse effects of electromagnetic radiation. The operation of GBR with its main beam below the normal minimum elevation does not adversely affect its range safety operation and it has been previously analyzed. The following operational constraints have been imposed for such operation: only the Full-Field-of-View antenna will be used and the radar will operate at a low-duty cycle of no greater than 0.2 percent so that resulting power densities will not exceed permissible exposure limits. Initial indications show that these operating procedures for controlling possible human exposure will reduce any impact of the GBR electromagnetic fields on possible fuel hazards or inadvertent detonation of electroexplosive devices or ordnance.

Full discussion of the potential effects of electromagnetic radiation, safety standards, and an analysis of GBR operations on USAKA are presented in the Ground-Based Radar Environmental Assessment (9), which is incorporated by reference. This EA specifically addressed the potential use of GBR at elevations of less than 2 degrees and concluded with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI).

Construction of facilities on Meck Island to support the HEDI XTV flight tests began in August 1988 and is scheduled for completion in November 1989. The early construction effort was required because safety constraints of other programs launching from Meck Island would affect HEDI construction in later years and because some facilities were planned for joint use with other programs with earlier test schedules. Construction of Meck Island facilities is supported by other environmental documentation, which is described in Section 3.0 and incorporated by reference.

HEDI XTV facilities at Meck Island (Figure 1-8) will be used on an alternate basis with the SBI program. Construction for the HEDI/SBI programs includes a new MAB, modification of an existing launch station (a 1-meter [3-foot]-thick concrete slab in an area now covered by asphalt), a launch equipment room and payload assembly building, and a new KV fueling area. The HEDI/SBI MAB is shielded by a new reinforced concrete blast wall. The site includes a small area of fill on the northeast side of the island and a seawall approximately 76 meters (250 feet) long and 3-5 meters (10-15 feet) high. Extensive renovations at the Meck Island Control Building provide space for HEDI/SBI launch control and the technical support.

A number of new facilities on Meck Island are being constructed for joint use by the HEDI/SBI and ERIS programs (Figure 1-9). These include a new water storage tank (0.95-million-liter [250,000-gallon] capacity, open concrete) to store rainwater that is collected from the runway catchment area and the roof of the Meck Island Control



New Facilities for HEDI XTV, Meck Island, USAKA

Figure 1-8





EXPLANATION

MMH FUEL STORAGE	NEW FACILITIES (BOLD)
GUARD HOUSE	RENOVATED FACILITIES (ITALICS)

0 30 60 150
Meters

0 150 300 600
Feet

SDI Construction and Renovation, HEDI-SBI-ERIS Facilities, Meck Island, USAKA

Figure 1-9

Building; a new breakwater, enlarged pier, and waiting shelter ("Small Craft Berthing Facility"); a camera transformer vault; a guardhouse; a freshwater pump house; two camera towers; and a new monomethylhydrazine (MMH) fuel storage building and associated 23-meter (75-foot) asphalt pavement. Support facilities on Meck Island that are undergoing rehabilitation include the dining hall, guardhouse, freshwater filtration/treatment plant, septic tank/leach field systems, and a camera tower.

The Meck Island power plant has been reactivated and renovated. Earlier programs utilizing Meck Island required nine 1,500-kilowatt diesel units; the new programs do not require as much power. Five new 565-kilowatt units have been installed, replacing the existing nine 1,500-kilowatt units.

A new 557-square-meter (6,000-square-foot) warehouse and associated driveway are being constructed on Kwajalein Island just north of Lagoon Road adjacent to Building 1010 (Figure 1-10).

The HEDI XTV activities at USAKA will require an estimated support staff of 56 accompanied personnel and 8 unaccompanied personnel. An additional 25 transient engineers and technicians will be required to support flight tests. All personnel will be housed on Kwajalein Island. An additional 130 family housing units and 400 unaccompanied personnel housing (UPH) units meeting Army housing standards are scheduled for completion in 1992. Many of the 254 trailers, substandard by current Army standards, will be retained to accommodate additional personnel. HEDI XTV activities will not create new jobs available to the Marshallese population.

A 568,000-liter-per-day (150,000-gallon-per-day) desalination plant will be constructed on Kwajalein Island in 1990 to increase the capacity of the freshwater supply provided by the water catchment and lens well systems. The HEDI XTV program will participate in water conservation procedures, continued monitoring, and a wastewater treatment effectiveness study to ensure that the wastewater treatment plant continues to meet effluent standards.

1.4 ALTERNATIVES OTHER THAN THE PROPOSED ACTION

No other alternative locations were considered reasonable for the proposed action because it was desired to maximize use of existing facilities in order to minimize cost and the potential environmental impacts of new construction. Similarly, maximum utilization of targets of opportunity was desired.

MDSSC was selected as a result of the competitive procurement process. They proposed use of their Huntington Beach, California, facility for HEDI KITE testing, because it is routinely utilized for similar fabrication, assembly, and test activities.

AEDC and the NSWC were chosen as locations for wind tunnel testing of flight components and window/forebody cooling, respectively, because of the capabilities and availability of existing facilities and staff routinely engaged in this type of testing.

Hill AFB was chosen as the site of target rocket motor refurbishment to take advantage of ongoing refurbishment programs there.





0 120 240 600
Meters

0 400 800 2000
Feet

Reference: US Army Kwajalein Atoll (Draft) Master Plan 1988

Location of New HEDI/ERIS Warehouse, Kwajalein Island, USAKA

Figure 1-10

Falcon AFB was the only reasonable site for simulation activities because of previous SDIO selection of the NTF as the focal point for all SDIO integrated simulations. The selection of Sandia National Laboratories for component/assembly of the target vehicle and SPRINT booster refurbishment was based on the availability of existing facilities and staff routinely utilized for similar activities.

Vandenberg AFB was selected for targets of opportunity and USAKA for IRIS data collection activities based on the ability to satisfy HEDI requirements while taking advantage of existing government programs.

WSMR was selected for the HEDI KITE flight tests oased on three primary factors. First, by utilizing a national test range within the bounds of the Continental United States (CONUS), costs can be significantly reduced. Second, WSMR is the only national test range within the CONUS that possesses adequate range space to perform the HEDI KITE flight tests. Third, WSMR has significant instrumentation capabilities and experience in similar test programs that are unique among CONUS test ranges. Specifically, WSMR optics, telemetry receiving stations, real-time computers, and radars are superior to those found on other test ranges. Additionally, SPRINT missiles have been tested at WSMR in the past, providing valuable experience for testing the HEDI KITE modified SPRINT boosters. Other test programs featuring missile intercepts in similar test configurations have been performed previously at WSMR, and the range also has an established capability to support the target delivery scenarios that are essential to a successful HEDI KITE flight test program. Based on these factors, WSMR was chosen as the most reasonable site for HEDI KITE flight tests.

USAKA was selected for HEDI XTV flight tests based on the requirement for representative target and interceptor trajectories. No CONUS test range has adequate space to accommodate HEDI XTV testing at realistic ranges and with the target representation necessary to achieve HEDI XTV objectives. No other non-CONUS test range has the existing instrumentation, infrastructure, and experience to accommodate HEDI XTV testing. Within USAKA, siting at Meck Island allowed new construction to be minimized by rehabilitation of existing facilities and joint use of new facilities with other programs. Moreover, USAKA is one of only two ranges recognized in the ABM Treaty for the field testing of land-based ABM components and systems. Because HEDI will be tested as an ABM system, the tests must take place at either USAKA or WSMR. For HEDI XTV, USAKA provides the only ABM-recognized range that allows for realistic and safe testing.

1.5 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The no-action alternative is to continue with present activities without conducting the planned testing activities at this time. Failure to conduct the planned test activities would result in a restructured, delayed, and more costly program. This is not a desirable option, inasmuch as the no-action alternative would preclude the timely evaluation of the HEDI technology and risk the loss of important information required for future decisions regarding the SDS.

2.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The test activities of the HEDI technology test program and the installations where they would be conducted were identified in Section 1.0. Section 2.0 describes the environmental setting of each installation in terms of physical and operational characteristics, permit status, and previous environmental documentation. Specific physical characteristics include installation size, support and test facilities, and environmental and public health and safety conditions. Operational characteristics include the socioeconomic variables of staffing, payroll, and housing; the characteristics of the surrounding communities; and the infrastructure characteristics of electricity, solid waste, sewage treatment, transportation, and water supply. Referenced permits are those that relate to air quality, water quality, and hazardous waste. Previous environmental documentation includes records of environmental consideration, EAs, and environmental impact statements (EISs).

For each of the installations that will be used in the program, available literature, such as EAs, EISs, and base master plans, was acquired and data gaps (i.e., questions that could not be answered from the literature) were identified. To fill the data gaps, all of the installations were visited, and follow-up telephone calls were made to installation personnel. Information collected through site visits and telephone interviews, and other appropriate references, are presented in Section 7.0, References. The following subsections describe the environmental setting of each of the installations where technology test activities are planned.

Ten broad environmental attributes were considered and addressed to provide a context for understanding the potential effects of the proposed action and to provide a basis for assessing the significance of any potential impacts. The data presented are commensurate with the importance of the potential impacts, with attention focused on the key issues. These ten areas of environmental consideration are (1) air quality, (2) biological resources, (3) cultural resources, (4) hazardous waste, (5) infrastructure, (6) land use, (7) noise, (8) public health and safety, (9) socioeconomics, and (10) water quality.

Several of these broad environmental attributes are regulated by Federal and/or state environmental statutes, many of which specifically set standards (see Appendix A). These Federal- and/or state-mandated standards provide a benchmark that aids in determining the significance of environmental impacts under NEPA. Where mandated standards do not exist, qualitative evaluations were made. The ten areas of environmental consideration are discussed briefly below.

Air Quality - Air quality at each installation was reviewed with particular attention paid to background ambient air quality compared with the primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards and whether the installation was located in an attainment or nonattainment area. Existing air emissions sources at each installation were evaluated to determine compliance with the emissions standards contained in the associated state implementation plan. Possible new air emissions sources, such as those associated with expansion of facilities and new construction, were evaluated using the New Source Performance Standards (see Appendix A).

Biological Resources - Existing flora and fauna at each installation were reviewed, with particular attention paid to the existence of any protected species and Federal- or state-listed threatened or endangered species, to determine if there were any significant biological resources in proximity to the facilities that could be affected by test activities.

Cultural Resources - Existing cultural and historical resources at each installation were reviewed, with particular attention paid to known National Register of Historic Places sites and Native American sacred sites, to determine if there were any significant cultural resources in proximity to the facilities that could be affected by test activities.

Hazardous Waste - Existing hazardous waste management practices and the record of compliance were reviewed to determine the installation's capability to handle any additional wastes and to determine any potential problems with hazardous waste use, handling, treatment, or disposal.

Infrastructure - Electricity, solid waste, sewage treatment, water supply, and transportation are examples of infrastructure requirements that ultimately limit the capacity for growth. Capacity and current demand were examined for each installation.

Land Use - Base master plans, environmental management plans, and other documentation were reviewed to determine any known conflicts between existing facilities and any planned expansions that could be affected by HEDI test activities.

Noise - Existing environmental documentation was reviewed to determine if noise concerns were an issue at any of the installations.

Public Health and Safety - Existing environmental documents were reviewed to determine if public health and safety concerns were an issue at any of the installations.

Socioeconomics - Key socioeconomic indicators (population, housing, employment, and income data) for the supporting region of each installation were examined to evaluate the potential consequences of increased population, expenditures, and employment.

Water Quality - Water quality concerns at each location were identified and the installation's record of compliance with permits was examined.

The following sections present a brief description of each installation where HEDI technology test activities are planned. The text emphasizes the affected environment, i.e., the nature of the environmental characteristics that may be changed by the proposed action, and includes detailed information only where it is relevant to understanding the potential impacts. Appendix B contains tables with more detailed descriptions of each installation's physical and operational characteristics, permit status, and additional environmental information.

2.1 McDONNELL DOUGLAS SPACE SYSTEMS COMPANY

MDSSC's (formerly McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Company) Huntington Beach installation is in Orange County, California, in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, just southeast of Long Beach (Figure 2-1). This installation is a commercial/industrial operation that existed at the time the HEDI contract was awarded. Approximately 10,000 people are employed at the installation, some 230 of whom will be involved in HEDI activities (26). The facilities in which these 230 individuals will work already exist, support many other activities (governmental and commercial), and require no modification or refurbishment for the HEDI activities.

This installation possesses all applicable Federal, state, and local permits and authorizations necessary for installation operation as part of the conditions of the current contract in support of the HEDI technology test program (24). There are no known Federal- or state-listed threatened or endangered species, and there are no recorded historic or archaeological sites. Installation infrastructure is supported by the adjacent municipalities and demand is well within capacity. Land use is in accordance with Huntington Beach's zoning plan. Noise is not an issue, and no public health and safety issues have been identified (27).

2.2 ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

AEDC at Arnold AFB is approximately 96 kilometers (60 miles) southeast of Nashville, Tennessee, and approximately 11 kilometers (7 miles) southeast of Manchester, Tennessee (Figure 2-2). AEDC is the nation's largest complex of wind tunnels, jet and rocket engine test cells, space simulation chambers, and hyperballistic ranges. The wind tunnels are routinely used to test missile components and assemblies in an environment that simulates high-speed flight (32). A description of AEDC and its environment is presented in Table B-1, Appendix B.

AEDC complies with Federal standards for air quality, water quality, and hazardous waste (33, 37, 40, 46, 48). Three Federally listed endangered species exist on the base, and there are two designated wetland areas (19, 40). No significant cultural resources have been identified (29, 33, 40, 41, 47). Installation infrastructure demands are all within capacity (29, 35, 36, 43, 47) and land use is in accordance with the Base Master Plan (33). Although sometimes in excess of safety levels within the test areas, noise is appropriately confined and mitigated (29, 33, 37, 40); no potentially significant public health and safety issues have been identified. The surrounding communities in Coffee and Franklin counties have a combined population of 74,000 (6, 8).

2.3 HILL AIR FORCE BASE

Hill AFB is 8 kilometers (5 miles) south of Ogden, Utah (Figure 2-3). The base furnishes logistics support and system management for MINUTEMAN and PEACEKEEPER



Location Map of McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, Huntington Beach, California

Figure 2-1



Location Map of Arnold Engineering Development Center at Arnold Air Force Base, Tennessee

Figure 2-2



Location Map of Hill Air Force Base, Utah

Figure 2-3

missiles, laser and electro-optical guided bombs, F-4 and F-16 aircraft, air munitions, aircraft landing gear, and photographic and aerospace training equipment. The base also manages the Utah Test and Training Range (2). A description of Hill AFB and its environment is presented in Table B-2, Appendix B.

The installation complies with Federal standards for water quality and air quality, although Hill AFB is located within a nonattainment area for ozone and carbon monoxide (61, 71). The base was placed on the National Priorities List on October 9, 1984, for potential threat of hazardous substances (65). The listing currently cites ten areas of hazardous waste disposal that cover a total area of 22 hectares (54 acres). The base is participating in the Installation Restoration Program (IRP), which identifies, evaluates, and controls the migration of hazardous contaminants from hazardous waste sites (64, 65). Two Federally listed threatened and two endangered species occur in the area; one of the endangered species (the bald eagle) has been sighted at the base (55, 70). No known cultural resources exist (71). Facility infrastructure is generally adequate (66, 70, 71), and land use is in accordance with the Base Master Plan (52). Noise levels are consistent with air base operations with specified attenuation goals (52, 68); no significant public health and safety issues have been identified. The surrounding communities in Davis and Weber counties have a combined population of 340,000 (6, 7).

2.4 NATIONAL TEST FACILITY, FALCON AIR FORCE BASE

The NTF is under construction at Falcon AFB (78) in El Paso County, Colorado, about 19 kilometers (12 miles) east of Colorado Springs (Figure 2-4). An interim facility is operating out of the existing Consolidated Space Operations Center, also at Falcon AFB. The present mission of the Consolidated Space Operations Center is to provide support for military space operations through communications centralization and data link operations (12).

The Consolidated Space Operations Center was built to house the Satellite Operations Center and the Space Shuttle Operations Center (76). The former performs command, control, and communications service functions for orbiting spacecraft. The latter conducts DOD Shuttle flight planning, readiness, and control functions. The interim NTF is located at the Consolidated Space Operations Center because adequate support facilities are available (77). The permanent location of the NTF will be next to the Consolidated Space Operations Center; construction should be complete in late 1989 (75). A description of the NTF, Falcon AFB, and its environment is presented in Table B-3, Appendix B.

Falcon AFB, including the Consolidated Space Operations Center and the NTF, is in compliance with Federal standards for air quality, water quality, and hazardous waste (75, 78, 79, 80, 82). No known threatened or endangered species exist on the base and no significant cultural resources have been identified (78). Installation infrastructure demands overall are within capacity (75, 78, 79, 82) and no land-use or zoning conflict issues have been identified. Noise levels are within acceptable limits, and no significant public health and safety issues have been raised (75 78,



Location Map of National Test Facility at Falcon Air Force Base, Colorado

Figure 2-4

80). The surrounding communities in El Paso County have a combined population of 380,000 (6,7).

2.5 NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER

The NSWC is in White Oak, Maryland, just north of Washington, DC (Figure 2-5). The center provides technical support for ship combat systems, ordnance, naval mines, and strategic systems. In developing and acquiring combat systems with their sensors, weapons, and control subsystems, the center uses a diverse, complex mix of facilities to support research and development projects (88). A description of the NSWC and its environment is presented in Table B-4, Appendix B.

The NSWC complies with Federal standards for air quality, water quality, and hazardous waste (90, 94, 99, 100). There are no known Federal- or state-listed threatened or endangered species, and there are no recorded historic or archaeological sites (104). Installation infrastructure is supported by the adjacent municipalities and demand is well within capacity (87, 94, 96); land use is in accordance with the Base Master Plan (93). Noise is not an issue because testing areas are dispersed and buffered by a thick hardwood forest (104); no public health and safety issues have been identified (91). The surrounding communities in the metropolitan area have a combined population in excess of 3 million (6, 8).

2.6 SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES

The Sandia National Laboratories is on Kirtland AFB, adjacent to and south and east of Albuquerque, New Mexico (Figure 2-6). The laboratory facilities comprise five technical areas where research and development of weapons systems, limited assembly of weapons system components, and other related activities are conducted (110). A description of Sandia National Laboratories and its immediate environment is presented in Table B-5, Appendix B.

Sandia National Laboratories complies with Federal standards for water quality, hazardous waste, and air quality, although the installation is located within a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide (108, 110, 121). No threatened or endangered species or cultural resources are known to exist on the installation (107, 108, 117). Infrastructure demands are within capacity (107, 108, 110, 116, 118, 123) The installation has no noise problems, but the potential for fire, explosions, release of toxic and radiological materials, aircraft crashes, electrical failures, and high-power microwave emissions has been identified as a public health and safety issue at Sandia National Laboratories (107) The surrounding communities in Bernalillo County have a combined population of 475,000 (6,7).



Location Map of Naval Surface Warfare Center, Maryland

Figure 2-5



Location Map of Sandia National Laboratories, New Mexico

Figure 2-6

2.7 U.S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL

Kwajalein Atoll is within the Ralik Chain in the western part of the RMI, in the west-central Pacific Ocean southwest of Hawaii (Figure 2-7). The Marshall Islands were previously administered by the United States under a strategic trust established by the United Nations (138). The Compact of Free Association between the United States and the RMI (U.S. Public Law 99-239) was bilaterally implemented by the signatories on October 21, 1986. The Compact created the sovereign nation of the RMI. Additionally, the Compact provides, in Section 161, that the United States, in the conduct of its activities in the RMI, will in some cases comply with standards substantively similar to those set forth in certain environmental laws, in particular, the Endangered Species Act, Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Ocean Dumping Act, Toxic Substances Control Act, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

Kwajalein Atoll consists of a very large interior lagoon (2,850 square kilometers [1,100 square miles]) surrounded by approximately 100 component islands/islets. USAKA includes 11 leased islands (Kwajalein, Roi-Namur, Ennylabegan, Meck, Gagan, Gellinam, Omelek, Eniwetak, Legan, Ennugarret, and Illeginni) and a Mid-Atoll Corridor (Figure 2-7). This corridor and the islands/islets it includes have certain restrictions on access during range up-time for safety reasons. All USAKA-leased islands, except Ennugarret, have facilities on them. U.S. citizen populations are located on Kwajalein and Roi-Namur islands. Marshallese resident populations are located on several islands within the atoll; however, all are outside the Mid-Atoll Corridor.

The primary mission of USAKA is to support missile flight testing for DOD research and development efforts. Technical facilities on USAKA include multiple launch facilities and numerous supporting elements, such as tracking radar, optical instrumentation, satellite communications, and telemetry stations (139). A description of the installation and its environment is presented in Table B-6, Appendix B.

Air quality is currently not a problem because of the constant tradewinds, the island's low profile, and the few sources of air pollutants. Sources of air pollutants include the small number of motor vehicles, power plants, aircraft operations, missile launches, and waste incineration. Estimates show localized problems in the vicinity of the power plants and the burn pits on Kwajalein Island.

One Federally listed endangered species, the hawksbill turtle, one threatened species, the green sea turtle, and one rare species, the giant clam, have been observed in Kwajalein Atoll (172). In compliance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the Endangered Species Act, the activities at USAKA have been coordinated with Federal agencies including the National Marine Fisheries Service (see Appendix C). There are some known prehistoric sites on Kwajalein Island, and the original island (excluding 83 hectares [205 acres] of added fill) is listed as a World War II battlefield on the National Register of Historic Places (145, 147, 155). The Kwajalein Battlefield is, as well, a National Historic Landmark (144).



Location Map of U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands

Figure 2-7

Current USAKA solid and hazardous waste-handling practices are deficient in some areas. Studies have been initiated to assess waste management practices. A Waste Management Plan is being prepared for USAKA and a draft of the Present Practices and Corrective Actions Report has been issued. Once the waste management plan is completed, it will be one of several instruments used to bring USAKA into compliance (142).

The installation infrastructure demands of both Kwajalein and Meck islands are within capacity (130, 139, 155, 172, 187, 191), except for wastewater treatment on Kwajalein Island. The wastewater treatment plant on Kwajalein Island is currently operating near hydraulic capacity but is meeting required effluent standards. Land use is in accordance with the installation's Draft Base Master Plan (155).

The principal existing noise sources on Kwajalein Island are aircraft operations and power plant operations, particularly the diesel engine generators of Power Plant No. 1, which are not equipped with exhaust silencers. Similarly, the principal noise sources on Meck Island are the diesel engine generators and helicopters. Noise is generally not a problem except in the vicinity of the power plant on Kwajalein Island.

Public health and safety hazards have been identified for Kwajalein and Meck islands, and include explosive storage and launch facilities, the electronic environment (radio frequency [RF] radiation), and aircraft zones for Kwajalein Island (155); and facility separation distances for Meck Island.

In early data contacts and during the April 1989 site visit, potential concerns were identified regarding HEDI's effect on the marine biological resources off Meck Island, cultural resources on Kwajalein Island, water supply and wastewater treatment on Kwajalein Island, and housing on Kwajalein Island. Consequently, additional background information regarding these topics is presented in the following sections.

2.7.1 Biological Resources (Marine)

Meck Island is a heavily disturbed, 22.3-hectare (55-acre) island on the lower windward perimeter of Kwajalein Atoll, bordered by Eniwetak Passage to the north and shallow rubble flats to the south. The island was relatively undisturbed until the period between 1964 and 1969, when it was completely graded. Using dredged coral, 7.3 hectares (18 acres) of landfill were created for runway and seawall construction. Most of the island is bordered by seawalls constructed of reef caprock limestone and concrete debris.

The lagoon intertidal and subtidal zones, including the lagoon terrace and slope, have been completely altered by past dredging, filling, dumping of surplus equipment, and seawall construction activities. Areas not destroyed by dredging or filling were nearly destroyed as a result of dredging-induced sedimentation and siltation. The only shallow marine areas around Meck Island that have not been extensively altered, or have at least recovered to a great extent, are at the north and south ends of the island. However, the lagoon waters abutting the metal and concrete scrap dump at the extreme south side of the island also show evidence of biological disturbance. Both

areas are shallow intertidal reef flat but have different exposures and wave energy (156).

Water quality parameters measured in April 1989 were within the normal range for Kwajalein Atoll. Lagoon and ocean water temperatures averaged 28.9 degrees C (84 degrees F) (Table D-5, Appendix D), salinity about 33.4 parts per thousand, and dissolved oxygen between 6.8 and 8.9 parts per million. The warmest water temperature reading, 33.4 degrees C (92.1 degrees F), was recorded in isolated tide pools on the seaward reef flat during low tide. Sea turtles, although known to occur widely throughout Kwajalein Atoll, were not observed in the vicinity of Meck Island.

Lagoon - The lagoon side of Meck Island consists of a harbor near the southern end, a large fill area in the central portion that has many facilities, and a man-made sand beach near the northern end. The harbor is a dredged area with a cargo/personnel pier, a marine ramp, and a new breakwater. The entire harbor basin is dominated by rock, coral rubble, and, in places, a loose, unconsolidated silt and sand bottom. Except for the man-made sand beach and harbor, the entire lagoon shoreline is riprap (156).

As observed in April 1989, the algal community of the harbor basin was composed of patchy, silt-laden growths of green algae (Halimeda opuntia), brown algae (Ralfsia sp.), and one species of an unidentified blue-green algae (Table D-1, Appendix D). Fewer algal species were seen in the harbor basin than in any other marine habitat surveyed on Meck Island (132).

The diversity and density of corals in the harbor basin were extremely low. Only five species (representing four families) were recorded within the harbor basin (Table D-2, Appendix D). They included small colonies of hard corals (Porites lutea, Pocillopora meandrina, and Pocillopora damicornis). The latter two species are often regarded as pioneer species because they are frequently the first corals to become established in areas previously disturbed. The other two corals recorded (Millepora dichotoma and Pavona varians) were observed on steel girders supporting the fuel pier and are thus not truly representative of the harbor basin biota. Overall coral coverage in the harbor basin was low, about 0.1 percent (132).

Only 21 species of fish, representing 14 families, were observed (Table D-3, Appendix D). The paucity of fish is not unusual considering the absence of coral reef habitat. The majority of the fishes were observed on the south side of the harbor, where vertical escarpments provide topographic relief. The harbor waters accounted for several species that were not observed elsewhere in the vicinity of Meck Island. These included the eagle ray (Aetobatus narinari), a school of carangid (Trachinotus blochii), goby (Ptereleotris heteropterus), and many (unidentified) blennies. The most numerous species included rabbitfish (Siganus argenteus) (found around the upper reaches of the water column near the cargo and fuel piers) and a type of surgeonfish (Acanthurus triostegus). The basin also harbored an unusually large number of triggerfish (Rhinecanthus rectangulus and R. aculeatus) and a sizable population of lizardfish (Synodus variegatus) (132).

Seven species of invertebrates, including several types of sponges, were observed (Table D-4, Appendix D). Three species of echinoderms (holothurians) were present (Bohadschia argus, Holothuria atra, and Thelenota ananas). The only specimen of T. ananus observed during the Meck Island marine surveys was more than 0.7 meter (2 feet) long, and was the largest noncoral invertebrate recorded in the harbor basin (132).

The intertidal fauna of the limestone rock (revetment), concrete rubble, and limited sandy shorelines fronting the harbor was dominated by the neritid snail (Nerita polita) (found only in the supratidal zone) and the shore crab (Grapsus tenuicrustatus) (132).

Seaward Reef Platform - The northern end of the ocean reef flat is the only area that has not been quarried. It is relatively narrow and has a superficial development of surge channels that approach the beach. The channels are probably formed by high intensity wave action on this area facing the Eniwetak Passage (156).

Six quarries, dredged in 1964-1965, are on Meck's outer ocean reef flat. The quarries were designed as a series of cells parallel to the shoreline, roughly rectangular in shape and decreasing in size toward the north. The edges were left jagged and irregular to create a more complicated, heterogeneous habitat. Some armor stone blocks remain in some of the quarries, resulting in a varied relief. The overall effect is a diverse habitat and biota quite unlike that on the surrounding reef flat (156).

The results of biological surveys conducted in April 1989 in three of the reef flat quarries showed that these man-made quarries provide an important, if not unique, habitat for a diversity of algae, corals, fishes, and invertebrates. The distribution of biota in each quarry is patchy because of varied topography and coral habitat (132).

The total of 17 species of algae recorded during these surveys were found only in the wave-protected reaches of each quarry. Not reflected in the list of algae (Table D-1, Appendix D) were at least five other macrothallic algae that could not be identified because heavy fish grazing has reduced some stands to only holdfasts. Many additional species would be present along the wave-exposed seaward margins (132).

Corals (including hydrozoans and anthozoans) were represented by at least 8 families and 35 species (Table D-2, Appendix D). General coral coverage across a typical mid-section of the quarries ranged between 3 and 5 percent. Topographic relief was provided by remnants of former reef cap limestone or boulders remaining after dredging operations. Coral patches in areas of significant topographic relief often showed more than 50 percent coverage. Represented corals included attached colonies - reflecting recruitment over the past 20 to 25 years, since the mining of the quarries - and unattached colonies presumably deposited into the quarry basins by storm wave action. Acroporids and faviids dominated the represented coral fauna with seven species from each family recorded, followed by pocilloporids and poritids, with five and three species recorded, respectively. The largest coral (hydrozoan) colony recorded (Millepora dichotoma) was about 2 meters (6 feet) in diameter. Numerically, Montipora digitata and various branching and table Acropora were the

most abundant species. Colonies of the soft coral (Sinularia) were well represented, with some colonies exceeding a meter in diameter (132).

Fish were fairly abundant, represented by at least 21 families and 81 species (Table D-3, Appendix D). In general, greater degrees of topographic relief or coral coverage resulted in greater diversity and density of represented fishes. Wrasses (labrids) and surgeonfishes dominated the fish fauna, with 18 and 13 species recorded, respectively. Damselfishes (pomacentrids) and butterflyfishes (chaetodontids) accounted for 11 and 7 species, respectively. Both numerically and in terms of biomass, a species of surgeonfish (A. triostegus) was the most common species represented in all quarries surveyed. Rabbitfish (Siganus argenteus) were exceptionally abundant along the landward margin of the middle quarry, and schools of more than 500 individuals were recorded. The largest fishes recorded were the jack (Caranx melampygus) (usually recorded as a "pair") and the grouper (Epinephelus hexagonatus), a bottom dweller (132).

The invertebrate fauna was represented by a total of 22 species (Table D-4, Appendix D), the largest and most conspicuous of which were echinoderms. Most numerous in areas of mixed sand and coral rubble, these included Actinopyga echinites, A. mauritiana, and Bohadschia argus. The rocky margins of the quarries harbored sizeable populations of the burrowing urchin (Echinometra mathaei) and the black urchin (Echinostrephus aciculatus). Gastropods were represented by various cowries, strombids, cone snails, and large numbers of trochids (Trochus niloticus), which were present in densities of approximately 3 to 5 per square meter in some areas. Both T. iniloticus and the various represented strombids (Lambis truncata, L. corcata, and Strombus luhuanus) are popular subsistence seafoods in the Marshall Islands (132).

High Intertidal Zone of the Reef Platform - The high intertidal zone exhibits very low biological diversity and density because during low tide periods the reef platform is exposed and temperatures can be very high. A temperature of 33.4 degrees C (92.1 degrees F) was recorded in several pools during the survey (Table D-5, Appendix D).

The entire intertidal reef flat is dominated by a low algal turf comprising several species of blue-green algae (Table D-1, Appendix D). In the April 1989 survey, small tidepools at the toe of the seawall were colonized by juvenile surgeonfish (A. triostegus), moray eels (Echidna nebulosa), and a school of about two dozen juvenile fish that could not be identified. There were few invertebrate species and these were found only in the larger solution pools and cracks in the reef platform caprock, which provided some degree of protection from predators. At least three species of cowries (Cypraea moneta, C. depressa, and an unidentified species) were observed on the platform in limited numbers and may represent wave-tossed specimens thrown onto the reef flat from the adjacent offshore quarries. Small hermit crabs (Calcinus and Clibanarius) were also observed. Although corals were not observed on the reef platform fronting the HEDI/SBI MAB facility, small Porites microatolls were found in a reef flat pool about 100 meters (328 feet) south of the HEDI/SBI MAB seawall (132).

Shoreline crabs (Grapsus tenuicrustatus and Pachygrapsus planifrons) were the largest and most conspicuous of the intertidal invertebrates found along the mixed coral and concrete rubble shoreline abutting either side of the HEDI/SBI MAB seawall (Table D-4, Appendix D). Small hermit crabs (Clibanarius and Coenobita) were also abundant. The new concrete seawall provided a supratidal habitat for several hundred snails (Nerita plicata) which were found from immediately above the high-water mark to the top of the seawall (132).

In compliance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the Endangered Species Act, the HEDI XTV project followed the procedures established at USAKA for coordination with appropriate Federal agencies. The marine biological assessment was discussed with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Office. This correspondence is included in Appendix C.

2.7.2 Cultural Resources

Archaeological and historic resources on Kwajalein Island date from circa 350 BC. Although little archaeological and cultural exploration has been done on the island, it is possible that both prehistoric period resources (350 BC to 1500 AD) and historic period resources (1500 AD to present) may be present (Figure 2-8). Possible prehistoric resources include permanent living sites, subsistence sites, and temporary occupation-exploitation sites (155). Possible historic resources could include sites and artifacts from various Spanish explorers of the 16th century, and from the German and Japanese occupation periods of 1870 to 1914 and 1914 to 1944, respectively. The main study areas that have been examined for archaeological resources are located on the present taxiway and aircraft maintenance hangar sites, and along a saltwater-lined trench that parallels Ocean Road. Some of the archaeological and historical findings on Kwajalein Island are shown in Figure 2-8 and described in Table 2-1. The Kwajalein Island Battlefield is listed on the National Register of Historic Places because of its military significance in World War II (145, 147, 155) and is also listed as a National Historic Landmark (144).

Since 1944, the island has been considerably enlarged by dredging and filling at its west and north ends and along its lagoon side; therefore, there is no potential for cultural resource impacts on these parts of the island. There is no potential for new cultural resource impacts on Meck Island because most of the island has been disturbed previously. The natural configuration of the island has been completely altered by the removal and addition of soil; the entire lagoon side has been built up and most of the island has been bulldozed. No evidence for subsurface cultural deposits has been found (143) and no native domiciles or remnants of native culture remain on the island (171).





EXPLANATION

- ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDY SITES
- HISTORIC SITES
- NEW LAND CREATED BY DREDGING AND FILLING

0 120 240 600
Meters

0 400 800 2000
Feet

References: Modified from US Army Kwajalein Atoll (Draft) Master Plan 1988
National Register of Historic Places Inventory Nomination Form/ Kwajalein Island Battlefield, 1984

Existing Archaeological and Historic Resources, Kwajalein Island, USAKA

Figure 2-8

TABLE 2-1. KWAJALEIN ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

ARCHAEOLOGICAL

1. From a cultural layer, two charcoal samples that date back to A.D. 40 to 355 and to 140 B.C. to A.D. 255, respectively.
2. Charcoal flecks.
3. Faunal remains (possibly those of a turtle).
4. Possible remnants of a taro swamp.
5. A shell weaving implement.

Source: Shun and Athens, 1987:7-12.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

1. A Japanese cemetery built in 1969--a reminder of Kwajalein's Japanese defense.
2. 7th Infantry Division landing monument/ammunition storage bunker--one of the few Japanese fortifications that still stands on Kwajalein. It is a monument to the 7th Infantry Division landing.
3. Ammunition storage bunker (adaptive reuse as weather satellite antenna)--a uniquely structured ammunition bunker (a vault constructed with a case-matted window in the ammunition room).
4. Beach defense fire control post pillbox--this is the only example of a fire control post on Kwajalein. The structure possibly could have been moved to this locale at an earlier time.
5. 25 mm AA gun emplacement.
6. Two 3" M-9 field guns (Rock Island arsenal, 1943).
7. Island Memorial Chapel--built in 1944-1945. The chapel, along with the commander's house and a shed of the Richardson Theater, are the only three structures that have survived since that period under American presence. The chapel has been dedicated to the men who gave their lives in the fight for Kwajalein.
8. Richardson Outdoor Theater--of the structure, the stage and screen/restroom elements date from 1945.
9. "Bunker Hill," 12.7 cm AA dual purpose type 89 gun position--some believe that this flag raising site marked the final victory of Kwajalein, although this has not been confirmed.
10. Bucholz Army Airfield Runway--current runway marks the approximate position and location of the previous Japanese runway, taxiway, and apron.
11. Commander's house, Building 241.
12. "Japanese Air Shelter" at fuel tank farm.
13. Marina Beacon Flagpole.
14. "Warehouse Shop" Butler-type building (S-1309).
15. Cargo Pier--built by the Japanese in 1944.
16. Quonset Hut (S-1336).
17. Quonset Hut (S-1337).
18. Ocean View Club, "Snake Pit"--built in 1945.
19. Shipboard gun, static display.
20. Boy Scout Clubhouse (no longer in existence).
21. Zeus Missile.
22. Bucholz Monument--this monument has been erected for PFC Bucholz, who died during the battle on Kwajalein on February 4, 1944.
23. Tinker's Grave and Monument.

Source: Duane Denfeld, 1981:22-32.

2.7.3 Infrastructure

Water Supply - Fresh water is readily available during the rainy season (normally June through November); however, during the dry season, fresh water consumption exceeds the amount of rainfall obtainable from catchments. In order not to deplete the supply of stored water from which day-to-day needs are drawn, it is necessary to obtain fresh water by extracting it from lens wells on Kwajalein Island. Projects are planned to improve water treatment capabilities and allow supplemental water supplies through desalination. Meck Island has a water storage capacity of 2.85 million liters (750,000 gallons) supplied by catchment and supplemented by supplies barged from Kwajalein Island when required.

Wastewater Treatment - The wastewater system for Kwajalein Island consists of a gravity collection system, nine pump stations, a secondary treatment plant, and an outfall extending into the lagoon. The treatment plant has a design capacity of 1.7 million liters per day (450,000 gallons per day). During the period between September 1988 and February 1989, wastewater flow averaged 1.8 million liters per day (465,600 gallons per day), thus exceeding the nominal plant capacity (142). The treatment plant is reaching its hydraulic capacity; however, the organic loading of the plant appears to be at only 70 percent of the design organic capacity.

2.7.4 Socioeconomics (Housing)

Because USAKA is dedicated to military missions and populated by U.S. residents, the normal concept of describing the surrounding community's ability to support and absorb project-related immigration is not valid. Military and contractor personnel and their dependents are not allowed to reside on Kwajalein Island unless approved housing is available. Family housing units on Kwajalein Island are located in the northeastern one-third of the island. Family units include 254 temporary trailers that were installed in 1962 and 1968, 128 permanent concrete-block structures that comprise 289 single and multifamily dwelling units built in the mid-1950s, and 136 new units completed in March 1989. Many of the old trailers were scheduled for replacement by the new units; however, they will be used through 1992 in order to accommodate unaccompanied personnel.

There are 434 UPH units on Kwajalein Island located in nine two- and three-story walkup buildings. A mid-1988 USAKA report indicated that there were 763 unaccompanied personnel living in facilities that were intended for 434 persons (based on recently adopted standards of Army Regulation 210-11).

In 1988, improvements began on the old Kwajalein Lodge to modernize accommodations for 122 transient personnel. Construction is scheduled for completion by late 1989. Future housing construction will seek civilian third-party contractors to develop housing on a build-lease basis.

Construction of new housing units on Kwajalein Island for the families of U.S. personnel was addressed in a 1986 study by the U.S. Army (174), and the first phase of construction of 136 additional housing units was completed in early 1989. Another

130 housing units and 400 UPH units are scheduled to be completed by 1992 to replace some of the 254 substandard trailers.

Housing on Meck Island is provided by the construction contractor during the construction period only.

2.8 VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE/WESTERN TEST RANGE

Vandenberg AFB is on the coast of California about 89 kilometers (55 miles) north of Santa Barbara (Figure 2-9). The third largest air base in the United States, it occupies approximately 39,800 hectares (98,400 acres) along 56 kilometers (35 miles) of Pacific coastline within Santa Barbara County (214). Vandenberg AFB is the Strategic Air Command's pioneer base and the headquarters of the 1st Strategic Aerospace Division and the Space and Missile Test Organization (214). Facilities house DOD, government, and civilian contractor personnel and provide the necessary support for missile test launches. Existing launch facilities are scheduled to test launch intercontinental ballistic missiles, including the MINUTEMAN, PEACEKEEPER, and Atlas (205). Approximately 17 to 28 missiles are launched into the Western Test Range annually (195). A description of the installation and its environment is presented in Table B-7, Appendix B.

The Western Test Range includes a broad area of the Pacific Ocean that extends offshore from Vandenberg AFB on the coast of California (Figure 2-10) to the Indian Ocean. The range functions as the test area for space and missile operations. It includes a network of tracking and data-gathering facilities throughout California, Hawaii, and the South Pacific, supplemented by instrumentation on aircraft (218, 219, 238). Only that portion of the range affected by a launch is usually activated; activation consists of instructing ships and airplanes to stay out of the affected area and either sheltering or evacuating people living in the activated area. Launch and spacecraft operations are monitored and supported by the Air Force Satellite Control Facility, the Consolidated Space Operations Center, and the MILSTAR Satellite Communication system.

Vandenberg AFB complies with all Federal standards for air quality, water quality, and hazardous waste (231, 232, 236, 239). Recently, all of northern Santa Barbara County (where Vandenberg AFB is located) was declared a nonattainment area for ozone and particulate matter (233). There are five Federally listed endangered and two threatened animal species on the base; there are no Federally listed threatened or endangered plants (206). Many designated wetlands are present on the base (195). Over 600 known cultural resources, mostly archaeological sites, exist on the base (206); of these, one is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and others may qualify (223).

Installation infrastructure demands are within capacity (195, 202, 206, 227, 228, 230, 236); however, water is supplied by on-base wells from two aquifers that are currently being overdrawn (206). Land use is in accordance with the Base Master Plan. Noise levels have not been identified as a problem, although they are monitored



Location Map of Vandenberg Air Force Base, California

Figure 2-9



Location Map of Western Test Range

Figure 2-10

closely; no significant public health and safety issues have been identified. The surrounding communities in Santa Barbara County have a combined population of almost 340,000 (6,7).

2.9 WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

WSMR is in the Tularosa Basin of south-central New Mexico (Figure 2-11). The range is approximately 161 kilometers (100 miles) long and 64 kilometers (40 miles) wide and has the largest land area of any military reservation in the U.S. It is bordered on the west by Las Cruces and on the east by Alamogordo. El Paso, Texas, is 64 kilometers (40 miles) to the south.

WSMR has been in operation since 1945. It is a national range that supports missile development and test programs for the Army, Navy, Air Force, National Aeronautical and Space Administration (NASA), and other government agencies. The range is equipped with a network of highly accurate optical and electronic data-gathering instruments that are essential for valid, valuable testing (267). Sophisticated computer systems process and correlate the data to provide scientists and range users with timely, reliable performance records (267).

WSMR has more than 1,000 precisely surveyed instrumentation sites and approximately 700 of the most modern types of optical and electronics instrument systems, including long-range cameras, tracking telescopes, ballistic cameras, radars, and telemetry. Both mobile and fixed radars and optical systems are in use. Since 1945, a total of 36,622 launches have been made, 331 in the first half of 1988 (275). A description of this installation and its environment is presented in Table B-8, Appendix B.

WSMR complies with Federal standards for air quality, water quality, and hazardous waste (257, 275). Installation infrastructure demands are within capacity (257, 275), although some concerns have been expressed over the declining water table (257). Water supply in the long term is of some concern because the water table in the headquarters area is declining as a result of groundwater pumping. Land use is in conformity with the installation's Master Plan. Noise concerns have been identified, but administrative controls have been implemented, and most noise does not affect areas accessible to the public. Fires, noise, potential ionizing radiation, RF radiation, and exposure to radioactive materials have been identified as public health and safety issues (257, 288). The surrounding communities in Dona Ana and Otero counties, New Mexico, and El Paso County, Texas, have a combined population of 750,000 (7).

Potential impacts on threatened and endangered species and cultural resources have been identified as a concern during technology testing for HEDI KITE. Consequently, more detailed information relevant to understanding these potential impacts is provided in the following sections.



Location Map of White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico

Figure 2-11

2.9.1 Biological Resources

WSMR contains a large area of native plant communities, which forms a valuable habitat for many desert, grassland, and mountain species. Several unique and endemic plants and animals are found within the Tularosa Basin, including one plant with a distribution limited to two small canyons on WSMR. This section discusses the vegetation and habitat observed within the project areas that could be affected by HEDI KITE activities. A review of the protected species found at WSMR, along with those that might be found within the project area, is presented in Appendix E.

The proposed locations for installation of HEDI facilities and the potential impact area under the KITE trajectories were inspected in October 1988 to identify the presence of biological resources. The wildlife biologist for WSMR and the wildlife biologist for the San Andres NWR accompanied the HEDI KITE environmental review team to the potential impact areas.

Four principal natural communities are present: mesquite hummocks, creosote bush scrub, a diverse shrub grassland, and pinyon juniper woodland. The desert communities occupy the camera site locations identified in Figure 1-6 (Section 1.0) and most of the area under the expected HEDI KITE trajectory. Shrub-grassland and pinyon juniper communities are under the trajectory at the higher elevations in the San Andres Mountains and the foothills on the southeastern edge of this range.

Mesquite hummocks, partially covered with blown sand, form the dominant vegetation at all camera sites near Launch Complex 37. Although this community has already been disturbed by historic grazing practices and more recent construction activities at WSMR, a number of annual and perennial native plants are present, particularly snakeweed (Gutterezia sarothrae), four-winged saltbush (Atriplex canescens), sunflowers (Helianthus), desert aster (Macheranthera linearis), and desert marigold (Baileya pleniradiata). Areas recently disturbed contain invasive plants such as Russian thistle (Salsola kali) and coyote melon (Cucurbita foetidissiam). It was estimated that 20 percent of the mesquite hummock area near Launch Complex 37 was vegetative cover. No protected plant species are known to be present in the area, although it is possible that the dune unicorn plant (Proboscidea sabulosa) and the sand prickly pear (Opuntia arenaria) may be present. These species, however, were not observed during the field inspection of the camera stand locations.

The wildlife habitat in the mesquite-snakeweed community supports a number of common desert species. The vertebrate species observed during the site inspection were the mourning dove (Zenaida macroura), sage sparrow (Amphispiza belli), side-blotched lizard (Uta stansburiana), and antelope ground squirrel (Ammospermophilus leucurus). The area around Launch Complex 37 does not provide unique or essential habitat for any of the protected wildlife known to be present at WSMR.

A relatively undisturbed creosote bush scrub plant community occupies the northernmost camera site (Site 9). Dominant species include creosote bush (Larrea tridentata), peppergrass (Lepidium montanum), and a variety of perennial grasses, such as dicranocarpus (Dicranocarpus parviflorus), beardgrass (Bothriochloa

barbinoides), and poverty grass (Aristida purpurea). During the field inspection, golden crownbeard (Verbisina encelioides) and crownseed (Pectis papposa) were flowering. The amount of total vegetative cover was low, estimated at 15 to 20 percent. None of the protected plants known to be present at WSMR have suitable habitat within the creosote bush scrub community at the northern camera sites.

Like the mesquite-snakeweed vegetation, the creosote bush scrub community provides habitat for common desert wildlife. This very widespread desert community is noted for its variety of reptiles and nocturnal mammals, although the diversity of birds, amphibians, and fish is much lower than that in habitats with more water. Protected species from this community include occasional migrant bands of Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni), which are present for short periods during the spring and fall in substantial numbers, and possible colonies of the black-tailed prairie dog (Cynomys ludovicianus). In addition, the trans-Pecos rat snake (Elaphe subocularis) may be present.

The outer edges of the debris impact area (Figure 2-12) under the trajectory include the foothill and mountainous ecological communities. The foothill zone has a diverse shrub-grassland plant community, sometimes termed footslope grassland (257). In 1988, the amount of summer rainfall was greater than normal, and the grassland aspect of this foothill community near the target area was very well developed. Especially abundant during the field inspection were bush muhly (Muhlenbergia porteri), spike dropseed (Sporobolus contractus), sideoats (Bouteloua curtipendula), blue grama (Boueloua gracilis), poverty grass, Plains bristlegrass (Setaria macrostachya), silver bluestem (Andropogon saccharoides), and a number of other plants. The varieties of dominant shrubs were also very diverse and included little leaf sumac (Rhus microphylla), peppergrass, false tarragon (Artemisia dracunculus), and four-winged saltbush. Perennials constituted more than 50 percent of the total vegetative cover; this was the most productive vegetation observed within the HEDI KITE project area. A small possibility exists that several protected plant species may be present in the foothill plant associations, although no listed threatened or endangered species are expected. The plant species that may occur include Alamo beard tongue (Penstemon alamosensis), Organ Mountains evening primrose (Oenothera organensis), and curl-leaf needlegrass (Stipa curvifolia).

The shrub-grassland community provides very good wildlife habitat for most vertebrates, although there are few water sources. Oryx (Oryx gazella) are common, and signs (scat, browsed plants) of this introduced game species were observed. Red-tailed hawk (Buteo jamaicensis), mourning dove, side-blotched lizard, and patch-nosed snake (Salvadora hexalepis) were the vertebrates observed on October 6, 1988.

This community provides good foraging habitat for birds of prey that nest in the adjacent mountains, including the golden eagle (Aquila chrysaetos) and prairie falcon (Falco mexicana). The trans-Pecos rat snake and gray vireo (Vireo vicinior) are protected species that might be found in the shrub-grassland community, although there are no known records of their presence in the HEDI KITE project area.



HEDI KITE Debris Impact Area

Figure 2-12

The higher elevations of the San Andres Mountains constitute the remainder of the outer debris impact area (Figure 2-12). This region consists of bare rock outcrops, with intervening benches and slopes containing the pinyon juniper plant community. Pinyon pine (Pinus edulis), alligator juniper (Juniperus deppeana), and one variety of seed juniper (Juniperus monosperma) are the visually dominant tree species in this community. However, a large number of shrubs, forbs, and grasses are also present (257). The amount of vegetative cover varies widely, depending on the local extent of rock outcrops, but is generally less than 30 percent. A small possibility exists that the Nooding cliff daisy (Perityle cernua) may be present.

The mountainous area is habitat for the desert bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis) (Figure 2-13), which is designated as an endangered species by the State of New Mexico. The number of bighorn in the San Andres Mountains at WSMR has varied from a high of about 300 animals in 1970 to a low of about 34 animals today (260). The San Andres Mountains herd is the indigenous population of desert bighorn in New Mexico and represents a unique genetic stock. Intensive efforts have been made in the past to protect the sheep from disease and predation, and the bighorn are intensively managed today. The daily and seasonal movements and activity patterns of many sheep are monitored with radio collars. Current information (278) indicates a population of 34 sheep in two or three herds, consisting of 11 ewes, 10 rams, 8 yearlings, and 5 lambs. Lamb production was 100 percent in 1988, a very positive sign of recovery, considering the loss of productivity noted in the last decade.

The desert bighorn sheep occupy all of the San Andres Mountains, utilizing different areas during different seasons. Areas of consistently high use include the Sputh Brushy Mountain and San Andres Peak in the San Andres NWR. The population is considered to be under stress from scabies, noise disturbances, and predation. The sheep habitat within the HEDI KITE debris impact area is of importance to the species, especially during the early part of the year when it is used for browsing, resting, and lambing. During the lambing season, disturbance to the sheep potentially jeopardizes lamb survival, and thus the overall stability of the herd. The peak of the lambing season generally occurs between February and May, but may extend as long as December to June.

The mountains also provide high-quality habitat for other wildlife. High-interest species known to be present include the prairie falcon, golden eagle, mountain lion (Felis concolor), and mule deer (Odocoileus hemionus). Protected species that may be present at higher elevations include the occult bat (Myotis lucifugus occultus), the spotted bat (Euderma maculata), and the Organ Mountains chipmunk (Eutamias quadrivittatus australis). Significant biological features include the natural seeps and springs and the developed water sources for wildlife (guzzlers, catchment basins, and tanks). The mountainous regions, along with the adjacent foothill communities, appear to provide suitable habitat for the Federally listed endangered northern Aplomado falcon (Falco femoralis septentrionalis). The southwest portion of the San Andres Mountains could be a potential reintroduction site for this predatory bird, which is presumed to be extirpated from the United States.

In compliance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the Endangered Species Act, the HEDI KITE project followed the procedures established at WSMR for



Known Habitats for Some Endangered and Threatened Species on WSMR

Figure 2-13

coordination with state and Federal agencies. The biological survey was submitted to the base biologist, who transmitted it to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, and the New Mexico Department of Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources. This correspondence is included in Appendix C.

2.9.2 Cultural Resources

Much of the information pertaining to cultural resources at WSMR has been compiled in the cultural resource overview prepared by Soil Systems, Inc. (241). Prior to this report, 331 recorded prehistoric sites had been described in 61 cultural resource investigations undertaken on or adjacent to WSMR. Early studies concentrated on larger or unique archaeological sites, primarily for descriptive and chronological purposes. However, 51 of the 61 projects have been performed as a result of recent cultural management laws and procedures; 296 of the 331 sites have been recorded since 1970 during such survey programs. The locations of these studies are depicted in Figure 2-14.

Locations of known sites are closely correlated with the study areas, because cultural resources have been inventoried in only a small part of the range. All of the range areas studied, except the playa lake beds, contain prehistoric properties. Large sites (greater than 10,000 square meters [107,643 square feet]) of the El Paso phase are known to exist in the bajada areas adjacent to the San Andres Mountains. Lower bajada areas contain chipped stone scatters, bedrock mortar sites associated with Archaic through Formative settlements, and Formative villages; prehistoric agriculture field and ditch systems may also be present. Upper bajada areas are expected to contain mostly low-density lithic scatters resulting from plant-gathering activities spanning the full chronological range of prehistoric occupations. Smaller sites are common in the mountains and in the basin. In the mountains, the probability of isolated finds and sites from all prehistoric periods is high. Site types would include small scatters representing hunting camps and kill sites; lithic quarries; planting, gathering, and processing sites; and seasonally occupied rock shelters and caves. Small villages and trails could also be recorded. Breternitz and Doyel (241) provide more detail about the purposes of these studies and the structure and composition of the recorded archaeological sites.

More recently, sample archaeological surveys have been performed at three locations proposed for the Ground-Based Free Electron Laser Technology Integration Experiment (249). The site most pertinent to the current EA is the area north of the NASA site. Within the 14-percent sample area, 66 archaeological sites were recorded. These surveys are indicative of the large numbers of unrecorded archaeological sites that may be present in areas of the WSMR that have not been intensively surveyed.

Breternitz and Doyel (241, Table 4-2) tabulate known standing historic structures, citing a recent historic properties survey by Building Technology, Inc. (1983), which inventories historic military sites and premilitary ranches and their associated corrals, wells, and tanks. Seventy-nine historic ranch sites are located in WSMR, several of which are depicted on Figure 2-15. Other known historic site types, which have not been thoroughly recorded, include other ranch complexes and mines and



Archaeological Projects Conducted on WSMR, 1934-1983 (South Half)

Figure 2-14



Known Pre-Military Historic Sites on WSMR (South Half)

Figure 2-15

mining camps dating from 1880 to 1942. Breternitz and Doyel (241, Table 4-3) also list 127 potential locations of prehistoric or historic sites associated with known historic water sources within WSMR.

In addition to prehistoric and historic archaeological sites and historic structures, sites utilized by Mescalero Apache could be identified during intensive field surveys. These could include sacred sites such as graves and shrines, as well as hunting sites, mescal pits, gathering sites, campsites, and sites of military encounters. Salinas Peak and Hembrillo Canyon are two known Mescalero Apache sacred sites (241) outside the current project area.

Two cultural resources within WSMR are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Trinity Site, the location of the detonation of the world's first atomic explosion, consists of the blast area (ground zero); the McDonald Ranch House, where the device was assembled; Trinity Camp, where troops were housed; and several concrete bunkers. The Site, which is in the northern section of the range, has been completely bulldozed and fenced. The other site is Launch Complex 33, on Nike Road within WSMR, just east of the Post area. In addition, two sites are listed on the State of New Mexico Cultural Property Register: Army Blockhouse/V-2 Gantry Crane and the 500K Static Test Stand, both of which are part of Launch Complex 33.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This section assesses the significance of potential environmental consequences of the proposed HEDI technology test program. It is based on a comparison of the test requirements described in Section 1.0 with the facilities to be utilized at proposed test locations and their affected environments, as described in Section 2.0. Any environmental documentation that addresses the types of activities proposed for the installations is incorporated by reference.

To assess the potential for and significance of the impacts from HEDI technology testing at each installation, a two-step methodology was utilized (Figure 3-1). The first step was the application of assessment criteria developed by the EA team to identify activities deemed to present no potential for significant environmental consequences. Activities were deemed to present no potential for significant environmental consequences provided they met all of the following criteria:

- The installation and its associated infrastructure are deemed adequate for the proposed activity (i.e., the tests can be conducted without new construction, excluding minor modifications).
- The current installation staffing is adequate to conduct the test(s), excluding minor staff-level adjustments.
- The resources of the surrounding community are deemed adequate to accommodate the proposed testing.
- The activities do not threaten a violation of Federal, state, or local laws or regulations imposed for the protection of the environment (see Appendix A).
- The activities do not adversely affect public health or safety.
- The activities do not adversely affect or result in the loss of unique environmental, scientific, cultural, or historical resources.
- The activities are not highly uncertain and do not involve unknown risk.
- The activities do not result in irreversible and irretrievable commitments of unique or important environmental resources.

HEDI activities proposed for each installation were also reviewed against existing environmental documentation on current and planned actions, anticipated future projects, and existing conditions at each installation to determine potential for cumulative impacts.

If a proposed technology testing activity was determined to present a potential for impact, i.e., if one or more of the above criteria are not met, the second step in the methodology was implemented. In this step, the potential that the proposed activities would cause significant impacts was evaluated for one or more of the following broad environmental attributes: air quality, biological resources, cultural resources,



Method for Assessing Potential Environmental Consequences

Figure 3-1

hazardous waste, infrastructure, land use, noise, public health and safety, socioeconomics, and water quality. As a result of that evaluation, consequences were assigned to one of three categories: insignificant, mitigable and nonsignificant, and potentially significant.

Environmental consequences were determined to be insignificant if, in the judgment of the preparers of this document or as concluded in existing environmental documentation of similar actions, no potential for significant environmental impacts exists. Consequences were deemed mitigable and nonsignificant if concerns exist but it was determined that all potential consequences could be readily mitigated through standard procedures, or by measures recommended in existing environmental documentation. In this EA mitigation includes: (1) avoiding the impact altogether by not taking action or parts of an action, (2) minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, (3) rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment, (4) reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action, or (5) compensating for the impact by replacing or providing suitable resources or environments. If consequences exist that could not be readily mitigated, the activity was determined to present potentially significant environmental impacts.

Subsection 3.1 provides a discussion of the potential environmental consequences for each location proposed for the HEDI technology test program. The amount of detail presented in the following environmental consequences subsections is proportional to the potential for impacts. Subsections 3.2 through 3.8 provide discussions of the following: environmental consequences of the no-action alternative; any conflicts with Federal, regional, state, local, or Indian tribe land-use plans, policies, and procedures; energy requirements and conservation potential; natural or depletable resource requirements; adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided; the relationship between short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources that would accompany HEDI technology testing activities.

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

3.1.1 McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company

The HEDI KITE tests to be conducted at MDSSC's Huntington Beach, California, installation will use several existing facilities to conduct the launch control equipment simulations, fabricate and assemble the KV, and assemble the launch control equipment. Similar HEDI XTV tests are expected to be conducted at MDSSC. These activities are routine at this installation, with no new personnel required; thus, no infrastructure or socioeconomic impacts will occur. The installation is in compliance with environmental standards (24) and no significant biological or cultural resources exist at the installation (27).

Based on meeting all of the assessment criteria, the environmental consequences of testing for HEDI are considered to be insignificant. HEDI activities were reviewed

against existing environmental documentation on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects and no cumulative impacts were identified as a result of the HEDI testing.

3.1.2 Arnold Engineering Development Center

The HEDI KITE tests to be conducted at AEDC will use several existing wind tunnels to test flight components and obtain jet interaction validation data. HEDI XTV wind tunnel tests of the new booster and/or of the improved KV may also be conducted at AEDC. The wind tunnels are used regularly and this type of testing is considered routine. At present, most of the 3,800 employees are dedicated to wind tunnel testing or maintenance of the tunnels (39). An additional 20 to 30 contractor personnel will be required temporarily to conduct both the HEDI KITE and the HEDI XTV tests, but this 0.5 to 0.8 percent increase in staff will not tax the installation's infrastructure, nor the ability of the surrounding communities (with a population of 97,000) to accommodate these additional temporary personnel. Thus, no socioeconomic impacts are expected. Although three Federally listed endangered species (the gray bat, the Indiana bat, and the red-cockaded woodpecker) and two designated wetland areas exist on the base, the proposed HEDI activities would be similar to the routine missions of AEDC, and will not pose any new or additional threat to the endangered species, nor encroach on the wetlands areas. The installation is in compliance with environmental standards.

Based on the presence of adequate facilities and staff, adequate resources in the surrounding community, and compliance with environmental standards, the environmental consequences of testing for HEDI are anticipated to be insignificant. HEDI activities were reviewed against existing environmental documentation on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects, and no cumulative impacts were identified as a result of the HEDI testing.

3.1.3 Hill Air Force Base

The HEDI KITE tests at Hill AFB will involve the refurbishment of the target rocket motor systems (ARIES boosters) (53). HEDI XTV tests may involve the refurbishment of MINUTEMAN I rocket motors or tests of the first- and second-stage rocket motors of the STARS launch vehicle. This activity is routine at Hill AFB, well within the capability of existing facilities, with no new personnel required (53); thus, no infrastructure or socioeconomic impacts will occur. The installation is in compliance with Federal standards for water quality and air quality, although Hill AFB is located within a nonattainment area for ozone and carbon monoxide (61, 71). Because the HEDI test activities at Hill AFB will not emit pollutants to the atmosphere and no additional personnel will be involved, HEDI activities will not contribute to or exacerbate the current ozone and carbon monoxide problem.

Solvents will be used in the refurbishment of the target rocket motor systems, but the quantities are small (less than 30 milliliters [1 ounce]). Current waste-handling activities are in compliance with the RCRA and past contamination conditions are being addressed under the U.S. Air Force IRP remedial actions (64, 65). Although one endangered species, the bald eagle, has been sighted at the base (55, 70), HEDI

activities will be part of the routine mission of Hill AFB and will not pose any new or additional threat to the bald eagle.

Based on the above analysis, the environmental consequences of testing for HEDI will be insignificant. HEDI activities were reviewed against existing environmental documentation (54, 55) on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects, and no cumulative impacts were identified as a result of the HEDI testing.

3.1.4 National Test Facility, Falcon Air Force Base

The NTF will be used for the storage, analysis, and application of data from flight tests of the HEDI in simulation exercises. The functions of the NTF in storing and utilizing data obtained from the HEDI KITE and XTV tests are consistent with its overall mission. Environmental effects of construction and operation of the NTF are presented in the National Test Facility Environmental Assessment (78), which resulted in a FNSI.

Until the NTF is completed, the staff is operating in an existing interim facility, the Consolidated Space Operations Center at Falcon AFB. The environmental consequences of the proposed use of these existing facilities were addressed in a Request for Environmental Impact Analysis (77), which concluded that the action qualified for a categorical exclusion (CATEX) and that no significant impact on the environment would result.

Because the HEDI testing will be part of the NTF's other SDI activities, which have already been assessed and found to have insignificant impacts, impacts from the HEDI technology testing activities are considered insignificant. HEDI activities were reviewed against existing environmental documentation (76, 78) on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects, and no cumulative impacts were identified as a result of the HEDI testing.

3.1.5 Naval Surface Warfare Center

The HEDI KITE tests to be conducted at NSWC involve simulations in Wind Tunnel No. 9 to evaluate HEDI's window/forebody cooling system. HEDI XTV wind tunnel tests of the new booster and/or of the improved KV may also be conducted at NSWC. The base's four wind tunnels are used regularly, and this type of activity is considered routine (102). At present, 5,200 employees are dedicated to this, the Navy's principal research, development, test, and evaluation installation (88). No additional staff will be required, although three or four additional personnel are expected as observers during the tests. Consequently, no socioeconomic or infrastructure impacts are expected. The installation complies with environmental standards, and no significant biological or cultural resources exist at the center.

Because the center meets all of the assessment criteria, the environmental consequences of testing for HEDI are considered to be insignificant. HEDI activities were reviewed against existing environmental documentation on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects, and no cumulative impacts were identified as a result of the HEDI testing.

3.1.6 Sandia National Laboratories

The HEDI KITE activities to be conducted at Sandia National Laboratories will involve component/assembly testing of the target vehicle and refurbishment of the SPRINT booster rocket. HEDI XTV tests may involve tests of the third-stage rocket motor of the STARS launch vehicle. The five existing technical testing areas are routinely used for this type of activity; no additional staff will be required, although an additional two or three contractor personnel will be temporarily assigned to Sandia for the duration of the tests. Thus, no socioeconomic or infrastructure impacts are expected.

The installation complies with Federal standards for water quality, hazardous waste, and air quality, although Sandia National Laboratories is located within a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide. However, because HEDI test activities will not emit pollutants to the atmosphere, and only two or three additional temporary contractor personnel will be involved, HEDI activities that contribute to or exacerbate the current carbon monoxide problem (from automobile pollution, etc.) are insignificant. Similarly, HEDI test activities will not contribute to or exacerbate the potential public health and safety problems that have been identified.

Applying the assessment criteria against the test activities, all of the criteria for the no significant impact determination are met. As a result, the environmental consequences of testing for HEDI at Sandia National Laboratories are considered to be insignificant for all environmental attributes. HEDI activities were reviewed against existing environmental documentation on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects, and no cumulative impacts were identified as a result of the HEDI testing.

3.1.7 U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll

Activities for the HEDI KITE and XTV programs are proposed for USAKA. The HEDI KITE activities at Kwajalein Island, USAKA, will involve collecting IR signature data for use in developing the HEDI seeker. Data will be collected with the IRIS on board a modified Learjet six to ten times a year. This use of USAKA facilities is consistent with the current missions and operations of those facilities. Use of existing facilities is planned to support this data collection and no new permanent personnel requirements have been identified, although 11 transient personnel associated with IRIS will be stationed at USAKA for approximately 4 months per year. These 11 transient personnel will represent a 0.9 percent temporary increase in staff and will not tax the installation's infrastructure nor induce any socioeconomic impacts. Storage of liquid nitrogen, which will be used to cool the aircraft window, is an ongoing activity and will not cause a problem.

HEDI XTV activities on Kwajalein Island involve the construction of a new 557-square-meter (6,000-square-foot) warehouse, to be shared with ERIS; an associated driveway just north of Lagoon Road adjacent to Building 1010; and the connection/hook-up of new power lines. The site of the warehouse has been previously disturbed and is in an area of other warehouses and supply activities.

Although the Federally endangered hawksbill turtle, the threatened green sea turtle, and the rare giant clam have been observed off Kwajalein Island, and the original island is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, HEDI activities will be similar to the routine mission of USAKA and will not pose any new or additional threat to the threatened and endangered species, nor any new or additional disturbance to the island's cultural resources.

In addition, other HEDI XTV activities are proposed for Meck Island, USAKA. These activities will involve launch support equipment simulation tests; component/ assembly tests of the ground support and launch equipment, KV assembly and readiness evaluations, and validating prelaunch intercept data reception; and flight tests, including a ballistic test of the new booster and an intercept test using a target vehicle.

HEDI XTV facilities at Meck Island will be used on an alternate basis with the SBI program, and include construction of a new MAB; modification of an existing launch station (a 1-meter [3-foot]-thick concrete slab in an area now covered by asphalt), launch equipment room, and payload assembly building; and renovation of the Meck Island Control Building. These construction, modification, and renovation activities are covered in a Record of Environmental Consideration (136), which concluded that the actions qualified for a categorical exclusion.

The new facilities being constructed on Meck Island (Section 1.0, Figure 1-9) for joint use by the HEDI/SBI and ERIS programs include: a new 0.95-million-liter (250,000-gallon) water storage tank; a new breakwater, an enlarged pier, and waiting shelter; a camera transformer vault; a guardhouse; a freshwater pumphouse; two camera towers; and a new MMH fuel storage building and associated 23-meter (75-foot) asphalt pavement. Support facilities undergoing rehabilitation and renovation include: the dining hall, guardhouse, freshwater filtration/treatment plant, septic tank/leach field systems, a camera tower; and the power plant, respectively. This joint-use construction, rehabilitation, and renovation is covered in a Record of Environmental Consideration (135), which concluded that the actions qualified for a categorical exclusion.

The only new construction activities on Meck Island not covered by the two Records of Environmental Consideration are: the approximately 76-meter (250-foot) long, 3-5-meter (10-15-foot)-high seawall to protect the HEDI/SBI MAB; the power, telephone, sewer, and water lines and road that will connect the MAB to existing power and utility lines and to an existing roadway; and the KV fueling area (Section 1.0, Figure 1-8).

The type of booster to be used for the HEDI XTV effort is expected to use a 1.3 explosive class solid propellant rather than the 1.1 explosive class solid propellant used in earlier SPRINT boosters previously launched from Meck Island. The 1.3 explosive class will be less hazardous than the SPRINT 1.1 explosive class. The propellant and ordnance storage areas utilized will comply with quantity-distance building separation standards. Transportation, storage, assembly, and launch activities will be carried out according to DOD 6055.9-STD, Ammunition and Explosives Safety Standards, and USAKA Regulation 385-75, Explosives Safety.

Sites for flight test activities have been reviewed and approved by the DOD Explosives Safety Board (129) based on the 1.1 explosive class propellant. The ESQDs and launch safety procedures will be adequate for storage, handling, and normal launch operations, and in the unlikely occurrence of a booster conflagration.

Missile assembly, and other prelaunch and launch activities for HEDI XTV flight tests will be typical of the activities routinely conducted for previous USAKA test programs. Missile assembly operations will include lifting missile components onto assembly stands, surface preparation and cleaning using solvents, mechanical assembly of components, and testing. The contractor will be responsible for handling, treatment, storage, and disposal of any materials including any hazardous or toxic materials (e.g., explosives, liquid propellants, battery packs, cleaning fluids) utilized at the launch complex. Minimal amounts of hazardous or toxic waste are expected to be generated for HEDI XTV activities; handling and disposal will be in accordance with USAKA safety standards and existing Federal standards, and these minimal amounts will not contribute to or exacerbate USAKA's existing waste management situation. Positioning of the assembled missile on the launch pad will be scheduled to minimize exposure to the harsh USAKA environment.

Launch activities will be conducted with strict control of both the immediate area of the launch, the much larger area of Kwajalein Atoll, the BOA northeast of the atoll, and the airspace affected by the launch activities. Figure 1-7 (Section 1.0) shows the launch azimuth for both HEDI XTV test flights, expected to be nominally 18 degrees. This launch azimuth avoids overflight of any populated areas. Personnel on Meck Island will either be moved off the island or required to be in designated shelters for protection against the effects of propellant combustion, in accordance with USAKA Regulation 385-4. Commercial aircraft and ocean vessels will be notified in advance of launch activities through the use of NOTAM and NOTMAR, respectively, so that alternate routes can be used during the flight tests. This notification affects primarily the BOA where the flight will occur and where spent booster cases and debris are calculated to fall.

A large variety of sensing, tracking, and safety instrumentation is available at USAKA to support the HEDI XTV flight tests. Some instrumentation that would potentially be used is the GBR to be located at Building 1500 on Kwajalein Island, the USAKA link to the Global Positioning System, cameras located on Meck in support of ERIS, meteorological rocket launches from Kwajalein or Omelek islands, and the Kwajalein Range Safety System. All instrumentation utilized that emits electromagnetic energy would be operated within existing USAKA safety standards. With the exception of the GBR, all instrumentation is already in routine use to support ongoing USAKA activities.

The potential use of the GBR to augment USAKA tracking and range safety instrumentation during HEDI XTV launches would require GBR operation below its normal minimum elevation of 2 degrees above the horizontal. This minimum beam elevation was established to ensure safety of personnel from adverse effects of electromagnetic radiation. The operation of GBR with its main beam below the normal minimum elevation does not adversely affect its range safety operation and it has been previously analyzed. The following operational constraints have been imposed for such operation: only the Full-Field-of-View antenna will be used and the radar will operate

at a low duty cycle of no greater than 0.2 percent so that resulting power densities will not exceed permissible exposure limits. Initial indications show that these operating procedures for controlling possible human exposure will reduce any impact of the GBR electromagnetic fields on possible fuel hazards or inadvertent detonation of electroexplosive devices or ordnance.

A full discussion of the potential effects of electromagnetic radiation, safety standards, and an analysis of GBR operations on USAKA is presented in the Ground-Based Radar Environmental Assessment (9), which is incorporated by reference. This EA specifically addressed the potential use of GBR at elevations of less than 2 degrees and concluded with a FNSI. Consequently, HEDI XTV tests will not contribute to or exacerbate the potential public health and safety issues previously identified.

The type of booster to be used for the HEDI XTV is expected to be solid propellent. The primary emission products are expected to be aluminum oxide, hydrogen chloride, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, water, hydrogen, and nitrogen. Ground-level concentrations would not affect the ambient air quality, except during the few seconds at liftoff. Air quality is not normally monitored during launches at USAKA, and launches do not pose an air quality problem. Late-stage emissions will quickly dissipate high in the atmosphere and not cause an impact at sea level. Emission levels are judged to be insignificant. HEDI flight tests on Meck Island will not contribute to or exacerbate any possible localized air quality problems on Kwajalein Island.

Noise associated with the HEDI XTV launches on Meck Island will be of high intensity but only a few seconds duration. Essential mission personnel left on Meck Island during a launch will be inside the Meck Island Control Building, will be adequately protected from any noise impacts in accordance with AR 200-1. No significant impacts from launch noise are expected on Meck Island or any of the populated islands.

The primary debris would be expected to consist of steel, titanium, and aluminum fragments, plus spent booster casings. Debris will be handled in accordance with USAKA's prescribed policies, responsibilities, and procedures for the security, recovery, and disposition of classified, unclassified, and hazardous test material impacting on and off the range (161). Because the debris footprint will be in the unpopulated BOA northeast of the atoll, no significant impacts will result.

The total construction program on Meck Island will require an estimated 105 workers (70-75 construction workers will be housed in contractor-supplied trailers on Meck Island and 30 will commute daily from Kwajalein Island). There will be an estimated operational support staff of 56 accompanied personnel and 8 unaccompanied personnel. An additional 25 transient engineers and technicians will be required to support test flights. All of the operational support personnel will be housed on Kwajalein Island in existing housing. This represents less than a 3 percent increase in personnel over Kwajalein Island's currently projected population of approximately 3,000 in the first quarter of 1993. This 3 percent increase could have an impact on socioeconomics (housing) and infrastructure. Marshallese employment increases on USAKA are not anticipated and further Marshallese inmigration is regulated by the Kwajalein Missile Range Employment Ordinance of 1986. However, no HEDI-induced changes to the local Marshallese conditions are anticipated.

Applying the assessment criteria against the HEDI-related test activities, all of the criteria for the no significant impact determination are met, except in the areas of biological resources (marine), cultural resources, infrastructure, and socioeconomics (housing). Consequently, these areas are discussed in more detail below.

3.1.7.1 Biological Resources (Marine)

Potential impacts from the HEDI XTV test activities could arise from construction activities associated with the approximately 76-meter (250-foot)-long, 3-5-meter (10-15-foot)-high seawall built on the edge of the high intertidal zone of the seaward reef flat platform (Section 1.0, Figure 1-8) and the possible need for a protective off-shore seawall located between the existing seawall and the reef platform quarry to prevent undermining the existing seawall and HEDI/SBI MAB during storm-wave events.

Analysis of adjacent areas suggests that the site was a previously disturbed, intertidal, rubble beach and back beach area. As noted in Section 2.7.1, the site is characterized by very low biological diversity and density because the reef platform is exposed during low tide periods. Moreover, the biota of the small pools and depressions in the high intertidal zone of the reef platform is limited because of the exceptionally high temperatures (33.4 degrees C [92.1 degrees F]) that prevail during low tide periods. Consequently, potential impacts on marine biology are believed to be insignificant. No cumulative impacts that would further jeopardize any marine biological resources have been identified.

3.1.7.2 Cultural Resources

Potential impacts from the HEDI XTV test activities could occur from construction activities and sewer and utility line connections/hookups.

Kwajalein Island - Direct impacts on cultural resources could result from the construction of the joint HEDI/ERIS warehouse and associated driveway. However, the warehouse site has been disturbed previously and is not located on or near the known archaeological and historic sites (Figure 3-2).

Meck Island - Direct impacts on cultural resources could occur from: the connection/hookup of the power, telephone, sewer, and water lines, and the new road that will connect the HEDI/SBI MAB to existing power and utility lines and to the existing roadway; and the construction of the KV fueling area. However, the new road and the power and utility lines will be constructed and laid in a previously disturbed (bulldozed) area with no known archaeological or historic sites. Similarly, the KV fueling area will be built on a site with an existing concrete slab that will be removed, and the new water and utility lines will be placed along existing asphalt pavement that will be removed and replaced in an area previously bulldozed and disturbed and with no known archaeological or historic sites.





EXPLANATION

- ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDY SITES
- HISTORIC SITES
- NEW LAND CREATED BY DREDGING AND FILLING





References: Modified from US Army Kwajalein Atoll (Draft) Master Plan 1988
National Register of Historic Places Inventory Nomination Form/ Kwajalein Island Battlefield, 1984

Cultural Resource Sites and New HEDI/ERIS Warehouse, Kwajalein Island, USAKA

Figure 3-2

Consequently, potential impacts on cultural resources from HEDI XTV test activities are believed to be insignificant. No cumulative impacts that would further jeopardize any cultural resources have been identified.

3.1.7.3 Infrastructure

Potential impacts on water supply and wastewater treatment on Kwajalein Island could arise from the less than 3 percent increase in personnel in the first quarter of 1993 attributable to the HEDI XTV test activities.

Water Supply - Demands on the Kwajalein Island groundwater lens would increase during the dry season and particularly during drought periods. The potential to overpump the groundwater lens would increase, resulting in an increased potential for groundwater quality degradation as a result of saltwater infiltration. However, water conservation techniques are a necessary and routine part of life at USAKA during such times. Furthermore, any water shortfall would be mitigated by the installation of the proposed 568,000-liter-per-day (150,000-gallon-per-day) desalination plant planned for completion prior to the start of HEDI XTV activities at USAKA.

Consequently, potential direct impacts on water supply and potential indirect impacts on groundwater quality are considered to be mitigable and nonsignificant.

Wastewater Treatment - The Kwajalein Island wastewater treatment plant is currently reaching its hydraulic capacity, but the organic loading is only 70 percent of the design organic capacity. Increased demand on the wastewater treatment system could result in periodic discharges of excessive suspended solids and primary treatment criteria might not be met. However, these potential impacts would be readily mitigated by water conservation, continued wastewater monitoring, and by participation in a wastewater treatment effectiveness study to ensure that wastewater effluent standards are met.

Consequently, potential impacts on the wastewater treatment system are considered to be mitigable and nonsignificant.

HEDI activities were reviewed against existing environmental documentation on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects, and the potential for cumulative impacts on water supply and wastewater treatment infrastructure exists. However, the potential cumulative impacts can be mitigated effectively by the mitigation measures cited above, which have also been made a part of the proposed action and described in Section 1.0.

3.1.7.4 Socioeconomics (Housing)

Potential impacts on housing could arise from the estimated additional operational support staff of 56 accompanied personnel, 8 unaccompanied personnel, and 25 transient engineers and technicians required to support the HEDI XTV test flights. These additional personnel will contribute to a predicted housing shortage in the fiscal year 1992-1993 time frame even after construction of the proposed 130 new family housing units and 400 UPH units.

However, because USAKA is dedicated to military missions and populated by U.S. residents, the military and contractor personnel and their dependents are not allowed to reside on Kwajalein Island unless approved housing is available. In addition, the anticipated housing shortage is predicated on the planned phase-out of the 254 trailers after fiscal year 1992. The predicted shortage would be mitigated by the construction of the proposed 130 new housing units, 400 UPH units, and by retaining as many of the current 254 trailers, substandard by current Army standards, as will be required to house personnel supporting HEDI and other programs at USAKA.

Consequently, potential impacts on housing are considered to be mitigable and nonsignificant.

HEDI activities were reviewed against existing environmental documentation on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects, and the potential for cumulative impacts on housing exists. However, the potential cumulative impacts can be effectively mitigated by the mitigation measures cited previously, which have also been made part of the proposed action and described in Section 1.0.

As a result of the Summary EA prepared in August 1987 for technologies in the SDI Demonstration/Validation program, the SDIO and the USASDC determined that the Demonstration/Validation activities proposed for these technologies and the associated facilities needed to support them at USAKA could have significant and cumulative effects on the environment of Kwajalein Atoll (17). An EIS is being prepared for USASDC by the Pacific Ocean Division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. Meanwhile, routine range operations continue.

3.1.8 Vandenberg Air Force Base/Western Test Range

The HEDI test program will collect IR signature data (utilizing the IRIS target tracking system) from launches of MINUTEMAN missiles out of Vandenberg AFB into USAKA to aid in development of the HEDI seeker. HEDI XTV may require a dedicated launch of a MINUTEMAN missile. Regularly scheduled launches are a continuation of activities that are within the existing operational limits of Vandenberg AFB. No new construction or additions to staff will be required (195, 224); thus, no infrastructure or socio-economic impacts will occur. HEDI technology testing activities will not create additional launches. Environmental effects of MINUTEMAN and Thor missile launches at Vandenberg AFB have been addressed in an EA (216), which concluded that there would be no adverse environmental impacts.

There are five Federally listed endangered species (the California brown pelican, California least tern, least Bell's vireo, American peregrine falcon, and unarmored three-spine stickleback), two threatened species (the southern sea otter and the Guadalupe fur seal), and over 600 known cultural resources (one site is on the National Register of Historic Places for Vandenberg AFB). However, HEDI activities are similar to the routine mission activities of Vandenberg AFB and will not pose any new

or additional threat to the threatened and endangered species nor disturb the archaeological sites. Because no additional permanent personnel will be required, HEDI activities will not contribute to or exacerbate the aquifer overdraft problem or the nonattainment status of northern Santa Barbara County for ozone and particulate matter.

All of the criteria for the no significant impact determination are met when the assessment criteria are applied against the test activities at Vandenberg AFB. The Western Test Range also meets all the assessment criteria. HEDI activities were reviewed against existing environmental documentation on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects, and no cumulative impacts were identified as a result of the HEDI testing.

3.1.9 White Sands Missile Range

The HEDI KITE tests to be conducted at WSMR are: analyses and component/assembly tests to evaluate nontactical launch equipment, analyses and component/assembly tests to evaluate the reception of prelaunch intercept data, component/assembly tests of the KV, analysis and component/assembly tests to evaluate the window cooling system, and actual flight testing of KITE 1 through KITE 3. Existing facilities will be utilized, the most recent construction and refurbishment of which is covered in the Record of Environmental Consideration (251).

The only new construction at WSMR in support of HEDI tests will be the siting and construction of new fixed recording camera stands along the missiles' trajectory and the possible burying of the connecting fiber-optic cables in shallow trenches, as detailed in Section 1.0. Additional HEDI KITE-related personnel requirements have been estimated at 1 full-time individual and 35 to 40 additional contractor personnel on temporary duty from approximately 6 months before until 1 month after each of the three HEDI KITE test flights. This represents an approximate 0.4-percent increase in staff and will not tax the installation's infrastructure nor the ability of the surrounding communities (which have a combined population of 750,000) to accommodate WSMR personnel. Additional water consumption by these individuals will be minor and temporary, and, therefore, will not contribute significantly to the current groundwater overdraft situation. Flight operations will involve the use of small amounts of hazardous and toxic materials (see Appendix F). Any hazardous or toxic waste will be collected and disposed of by an approved and licensed contractor(s) in accordance with State of New Mexico and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations. Debris will be handled in accordance with WSMR's existing prescribed policies, responsibilities, and procedures for the security, recovery, and disposition of classified, unclassified, and hazardous test material impacting on and off the range (WSMR Regulation 70-8). HEDI KITE tests will not contribute to or exacerbate the potential public health and safety issues previously identified (see Table B-8, Appendix B).

Both stages of the SPRINT system and the ARIES booster use solid propellant. The primary emission products will be aluminum oxide, hydrogen chloride, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, water, hydrogen, and nitrogen. Ground-level

concentrations would not affect vegetation, wildlife, or the ambient air quality, except during the few seconds at liftoff. Air quality monitoring during launches is not normally done at WSMR, and launches do not pose an air quality problem. The second-stage emissions will quickly dissipate high in the atmosphere and not cause an impact at the ground level. With KITEs 1 and 2 representing just one launch each and KITE 3 two launches (SPRINT and ARIES), compared to a baseline average of 852 test flights per year since 1945, these emission levels are considered minor.

Applying the assessment criteria against the test activities, all of the criteria for the no significant impact determination are met, except in the areas of biological resources, cultural resources, infrastructure (transportation), and land use. Consequently, these areas are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

3.1.9.1 Biological Resources

Potential impacts from the HEDI KITE test activities could arise from construction activities associated with establishment of the trajectory monitoring stations (camera stations), from falling debris, or from noise. Similarly, there exists a small chance that fires started by falling debris could affect several plant and animal species, but this is considered nonsignificant because WSMR has a fire response unit that normally contains the small fires caused occasionally by falling debris. The most recent fire occurred in 1987 and biological damage was minimal. Protected species within the project area that are subject to these direct and indirect impacts are listed in Table 3-1.

Construction Impacts - Few direct impacts are anticipated from the HEDI testing program because no major construction is anticipated. The camera stations near Launch Complex 37 are in a previously disturbed area, and no significant biological impacts are expected from construction. However, if new camera sites, connecting cables, and access roads must be placed in natural (undisturbed) terrain, there is a small possibility for losses of individual plants of two protected plant species: the dune unicorn plant and sand prickly pear. Relatively undisturbed creosote bush scrub vegetation will be affected by construction of the northernmost camera site (Site 9). Protected species that may be present in this community include the black-tailed prairie dog and trans-Pecos rat snake.

The mitigation measures proposed for locating the camera monitoring sites will ensure that a minimum of native ground is disturbed by construction and that impacts on sensitive plants will be avoided (see Section 4.0). A key aspect of this mitigation is a walkover survey to be performed, prior to any construction, by the WSMR wildlife biologist or other WSMR-designated biologist. If protected plant or animal species are located, the alignment of the facilities will be moved to avoid the protected species.

Table 3-1. PROTECTED SPECIES KNOWN OR POSSIBLY OCCURRING WITHIN THE HEDI KITE CAMERA SITE AND DEBRIS IMPACT AREAS AT WSMR

FEDERAL DESIGNATIONS

Category 2 (possibly endangered or threatened; more data required)

BIRDS:
Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni)
Southern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis lucida)
Mountain plover (Charadrius montanus)

MAMMALS:
Spotted bat (Euderma maculatum)
Occult bat (Myotis lucifugus occultus)
Arizona prairie dog (Cynomys ludovicianus arizonensis)

PLANTS:
Dune unicorn plant (Proboscidea sabulosa)
Grama grass cactus (Pediocactus papyracanthus)
Nooding cliff daisy (Perityle cernua)
Alamo beard tongue (Penstemon alamosensis)
Gray sibara (Sibara grisea)
Organ Mountains evening primrose (Oenothera organensis)
Sand prickly pear (Opuntia arenaria)
Curl-leaf needle grass (Stipa curvifolia)

NEW MEXICO LISTED SPECIES

BIRDS:
Gray vireo (Vireo vicinior) Endangered, Group 2.

MAMMALS:
Desert bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis) Endangered, Group 1.

REPTILES:
Trans-Pecos rat snake (Elaphe subocularis) Endangered, Group 2.

Impacts from Falling Debris - The HEDI KITE debris impact trajectory contains two areas (Figure 3-3). The Sigma 1 area is that area in which 68 percent of the debris is expected to fall (see Appendix G). The Sigma 3 area is that area in which 95 percent of the debris is expected to fall. The Sigma 3 area that is outside the Sigma 1 area is, thus, that area in which 27 percent of the debris is expected to fall. The lethality of the debris is a function of the kinetic energy of the pieces of debris as they would hit the ground. A number of models have been developed to estimate the characteristics of debris fragments. These models were used to estimate the number, size, weight, density, and construction of lethal fragments resulting from the destruction of the HEDI KV. These results were used, along with the size of the debris areas, to determine probabilities of lethal debris falling in a given area. (Additional discussion is presented in Appendix G.)

Many protected species are found within the debris impact areas. The plants, if present, will not suffer adverse effects from the minor amounts of debris. There is a remote chance that animals will be disturbed or harmed by falling debris, and this impact is judged to be insignificant.

The desert bighorn sheep in the San Andres NWR will be exposed to an extremely remote chance of impacts from falling debris. It is predicted that 190 pieces of debris will fall with a lethal force within the debris impact area of 48,255 hectares (119,236 acres). The probability of a piece of lethal debris falling in any 0.4 hectare (1 acre) in the Sigma 1 area is 0.0023296 (1 in 450), and 0.0008043 (1 in 1,250) that lethal debris will fall in the Sigma 3 area outside the Sigma 1 area (see Appendix G). Assuming that a sheep covers an area of 0.46 square meters (5 square feet), the probability that a sheep in the Sigma 1 area will be hit by a piece of lethal debris is 0.000000267 (1 in 4 million), and 0.000000093 (1 in 11 million) that a sheep in the Sigma 3 area outside the Sigma 1 area will be hit (see Appendix G). Moreover, the possibility that a sheep will be in the debris impact area is small. (Although the projected flight and fallout path will cover approximately one-third of the eastern and northern portions of the refuge, it will cover less than 10 percent of the total range of the sheep, as shown in Section 2.0, Figure 2-13). The HEDI KITE flights 2 and 3, along a similar trajectory and producing similar amounts of debris, will have essentially the same debris impact areas as HEDI KITE 1. Therefore, it is concluded that the falling debris will not have a significant impact on the desert bighorn sheep population.

Noise Impacts - Existing information on responses of bighorn sheep to noise is equivocal, consisting of anecdotal observations. For example, Monson and Sumner (244) report that "sonic booms sometimes startle bighorn, but on other occasions the bighorn pay no attention to them." They also cite Geralo I. Day of the Arizona Fish and Game Department: "Jets, sonic booms, and artillery fire practically overhead did not seem to disturb bighorn." Another observer stated, "I can relate experiences of having seen bighorn become startled with sonic booms. Again there are those that pay little or no attention to the boom. I did observe several bighorn go into headlong flight when the scream of rockets was heard nearby." An observation from California stated "Sonic booms have startled bighorn, causing them to leap into the air and lose their footing while they were being observed in the Santa Rosa Mountains." Information is not available on noise levels within the San Andres NWR caused by



HEDI KITE Debris Impact Lethality

Figure 3-3

WSMR activities. The local desert bighorn sheep are expected to be most sensitive to noise disturbance during the lambing season (February to May).

Impacts on the bighorn from noise caused by sonic booms emanating from the HEDI KITE tests were also judged to be insignificant. This is because the HEDI KITE test site will be very far away (15 kilometers [9 miles]) from the sheep, and because only three tests, about one per year, are planned. The disturbance from these tests will be far less than that now experienced by the local desert bighorn from aircraft overflights, which occur frequently. Tests will occur annually, beginning in 1989, and will be scheduled to minimize potential impact on the San Andres NWR, in coordination with the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish.

Other types of noises definitely are known to cause panic in desert bighorn. Low-altitude helicopter flights can cause the bighorn to "dart in all directions, bowling over their lambs, and in general showing great fear" (244). In the remote event of a failure during the HEDI KITE tests, recovery of debris in the mountainous areas using helicopters may be necessary. This worst-case scenario, which has a very low probability, could cause adverse impacts on the local desert bighorn sheep population if recovery efforts were conducted in proximity to the sheep. In the event such recovery is necessary, mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize potential impacts on the bighorn sheep. The biologist at the San Andres NWR will be contacted before any recovery effort will be made to determine whether any bighorn sheep are in the recovery area. If there are sheep in the area, recovery will be delayed until they have moved. During the recovery operation, the biologist will accompany the recovery team to ensure that recovery efforts are not conducted in areas then inhabited by bighorn sheep.

Overall, however, potential impacts on biological resources are considered to be mitigable and nonsignificant. No cumulative impacts on biological resources have been identified.

3.1.9.2 Cultural Resources

Potential impacts from the HEDI KITE test activities could occur from construction activities associated with establishing the fixed camera stands and from falling debris.

Construction Impacts - Direct impacts on cultural resources could occur from the construction of camera stands and the placement of communications cables. However, an archaeological survey will be performed prior to any construction, and, if any sites are located, they will either be avoided or significant data will first be recovered, after consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The results of such archaeological surveys at WSMR are routinely coordinated via written reports to the SHPO and any necessary actions handled in accordance with the Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (PMOA) among the DOD, the New Mexico SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (261). Similarly, any Mescalero Apache sacred sites located would be avoided and reported to tribal authorities.

Impacts from Falling Debris - Figures 3-4 and 3-5 show the anticipated flight trajectory superimposed on a map showing the locations of known prehistoric and



Potential Impact of Falling Debris on Archaeological Projects Conducted on WSMR, 1934-1983 (South Half)

Figure 3-4



Potential Impact of Falling Debris on Known Pre-Military Historic Sites on WSMR (South Half)

Figure 3-5

historic sites. Only five known archaeological sites are in the Sigma 3 area, one of which is just on the border of the debris impact area (Figure 3-4). Only three known premilitary historic sites are located within the Sigma 3 debris impact area (Figure 3-5). Prehistoric sites are expected in all major landforms within WSMR, except alkali flats; site type distributions and frequencies are expected to vary concomitantly (241). Given the low probability of large debris pieces falling in any 1 acre, the probability of impacts on any one prehistoric or historic archaeological site is very low; therefore, debris impact damage is highly unlikely and considered insignificant. The two National Register of Historic Places sites (Trinity Site and Launch Complex 33) are not in the debris impact area and will not be affected by HEDI KITE activities, nor will the two New Mexico Cultural Property Register sites.

Overall, potential impacts on cultural resources are believed to be insignificant. No cumulative impacts that would further jeopardize any cultural resources have been identified.

3.1.9.3 Infrastructure (Transportation)

Infrastructure impacts of HEDI tests at WSMR involve closing U.S. Highway 70, which crosses the lower portion of the range north of the launch complexes, between Las Cruces and Alamogordo. For safety reasons, this portion of the highway is routinely closed before all test flights and remains closed until after the test, for a total of no more than 80 minutes. This practice is routine and normal for the range and local population. The impact of HEDI's one test flight per year, compared to the average of 850 test flights per year, is considered insignificant.

3.1.9.4 Land Use

Potential land-use impacts of HEDI tests include the evacuation of ranchers in the co-use area adjacent to the western boundary of the range. When firings are scheduled, residents (approximately 21 in the affected area) leave their homes for a specified time, generally a maximum of 12 hours. Upon completion of the firings, all-clear notices are broadcast from area radio stations as public service announcements. In addition to being paid for the use of their land, these ranch families, adults and children, are paid for the hours they spend away from home each time they are evacuated. This evacuation occurs periodically for particular launch trajectories.

Evacuations are limited to a maximum of four per month by terms of the agreement between WSMR and the ranchers (289). Because there would be only one scheduled HEDI launch each year and routine procedures and agreements exist for such evacuations, impacts from these evacuations are considered insignificant.

A potential indirect impact of the HEDI KITE test activities is the increased likelihood that use of this part of the range (debris impact area) will be increased to take advantage of the new instrumentation. This possibility, however, is considered small, because the trajectory requirements of HEDI KITE (high altitude, short range) are unusual and not typically required of other test programs, and the new

instrumentation is confined to the southernmost part of the range south of U.S. Highway 70 and not located along the length of HEDI KITE's trajectory. In addition, any future program that might desire use of similar trajectories or debris impact areas would require separate environmental analysis and documentation. This EA does not address the use of this part of the range for anything other than the specific HEDI KITE flight tests described.

HEDI activities were reviewed against existing environmental documentation on current and planned actions and anticipated future projects, and no cumulative impacts were identified as a result of the HEDI testing.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF NO ACTION

If the no-action alternative is selected, no additional environmental consequences are anticipated. Present activities would continue at current installations with no change in operations; however, the no-action alternative would preclude the timely evaluation of the HEDI technology.

3.3 CONFLICTS WITH FEDERAL, REGIONAL, STATE, LOCAL, OR INDIAN TRIBE LAND-USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS

All of the technology test activities at all locations, except WSMR and USAKA, will take place in existing or modified/refurbished facilities. The HEDI KITE flight test activities at WSMR will also utilize existing, modified, or refurbished facilities, with the one exception of requiring the construction of new fixed recording camera stands. Because WSMR has been dedicated to supporting missile development and test programs since 1945, HEDI KITE activities will pose no conflicts with land-use plans, policies, and controls. The low probability of debris impacting on the westernmost edges of the White Sands National Monument is recognized by the Master Special Use Agreement (260) (and its renewal through December 31, 1996) between the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army. This agreement permits concurrent use of specified areas within the boundaries of the White Sands National Monument when necessary for technical testing of space and missile materials.

HEDI XTV test activities at USAKA will also utilize existing, modified, or refurbished facilities, with the exception of the new joint HEDI/ERIS warehouse on Kwajalein Island and the new HEDI/SBI MAB seawall; power, telephone, sewer, and water lines and road; and KV fueling area on Meck Island. Because USAKA has been dedicated to supporting ICBM programs, various orbital programs, and other research programs since the 1950s, HEDI activities will pose no conflicts with land-use plans, policies, and controls.

3.4 ENERGY REQUIREMENTS AND CONSERVATION POTENTIAL

Anticipated energy requirements of each technology test activity at each location are well within the energy supply capacity of each installation (see the Electricity section

of Tables B-1 through B-8, Appendix B), as validated by site visits. Energy requirements will be subject to the routine energy conservation practices at each installation. No new power generation capacity will be required for any of the HEDI technology test activities at any of the locations identified, because the activiiies will be compatible with the installations' ongoing missions.

3.5 NATURAL OR DEPLETABLE RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

Other than the various metallic and nonmetallic structural materials and fuel resources used in the technology test activities, there are no significant natural or depletable resource requirements associated with the program. Only existing or modified facilities will be used to conduct the various analyses, simulations, and component/assembly activities for HEDI KITE and even the flight tests will use refurbished SPRINT boosters for KITEs 1, 2, and 3 and an ARIES booster for the KITE 3 target vehicle. For HEDI XTV, the same types of tests will be required, although a new booster will be fabricated and new facilities will be constructed at USAKA.

3.6 ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED

There are no known adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided for any of the technology test activities at any of the locations identified.

3.7 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Technology test activities at all locations involved in the proposed action, with the exception of WSMR and USAKA, will take advantage of existing facilities and infrastructure using modified or refurbished facilities. Activities at WSMR will necessitate the construction of new fixed recording camera stands and associated cable trenches on part of the range that has been dedicated to supporting missile development and test programs since 1945. Similarly, activities at USAKA will necessitate the construction of a new warehouse and associated roadway on Kwajalein Island and the connection/hookup of power and other utility lines and a new road on Meck Island on part of the range that has been dedicated to supporting ICBM orbital and other research programs since the 1950s. Therefore, the proposed action does not eliminate any options for future use of the environment for any of the locations under consideration.

3.8 IRREVERSIBLE OR IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

The proposed action will result in no loss of habitat for plants or animals, no loss or impact on threatened and endangered species that cannot be mitigated, and no loss of cultural resources, such as archaeological or historical sites, that cannot be mitigated by avoidance or data recovery. Moreover, there will be no changes in land use nor

preclusion of development of underground mineral resources that were not already precluded.

The amount of materials required for any technology test-related construction and energy use during project utilization will be small. However, development of the HEDI through the technology test phase would result in irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources, such as electronic components, various metallic and nonmetallic structural materials, fuel, and labor. This commitment of resources is not different from that necessary for many other aerospace research and development programs; it is similar to the activities that have been carried out in previous aerospace programs over the past several years.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental consequences of HEDI technology test activities are deemed to be insignificant for all locations except USAKA and WSMR. The detailed mitigation actions described here are an integral part of the proposed action, as discussed in Subsection 1.3.

4.1 U.S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL, REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

Potential HEDI XTV infrastructure and socioeconomic (housing) impacts at USAKA will be mitigated by the installation of the proposed desalination plant in the case of water supply; water conservation, wastewater monitoring, and participation in a wastewater treatment effectiveness study in the case of wastewater treatment; and construction of new housing and retention of as many of the trailers due to be phased out as necessary to house personnel supporting HEDI in the case of housing, resulting in nonsignificant impacts.

4.1.1 Infrastructure

Water Supply - Demands on the Kwajalein Island freshwater supply would increase with HEDI XTV test activities and the potential to overpump the groundwater lens would also increase. This will be mitigated by:

- Constructing the proposed 568,000-liter-per-day (150,000-gallon-per-day) desalination plant to increase the capacity of the freshwater supply provided by the water catchment and lens well system.

Wastewater Treatment - Demands on the Kwajalein Island wastewater treatment system could result in periodic discharge of excessive suspended solids and primary treatment criteria might not be met. This will be mitigated by:

- Participation in water conservation procedures
- Continued wastewater monitoring
- Participation in a wastewater treatment effectiveness study to ensure that the wastewater treatment plant continues to meet effluent standards.

4.1.2 Socioeconomics (Housing)

Demands on Kwajalein Island housing could result in a potential housing shortage. This will be mitigated by:

- Retention of as many of the 254 trailers due to be phased out after fiscal year 1992 as necessary to house personnel supporting HEDI
- Construction of 130 housing units and 400 UPH units.

4.2 WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

Potential HEDI KITE biological and cultural resource impacts at WSMR will be mitigated by avoidance, resulting in nonsignificant impacts.

4.2.1 Biological Resources

Installation of Fixed Camera Sites - Although biological impacts on native vegetation and habitat at the camera sites were judged to be nonsignificant, the HEDI KITE testing program is committed to reducing the amount of new construction in undisturbed natural communities. Therefore, the installation of the camera sites will proceed under the following guidelines:

- Existing camera sites and access roads will be utilized to the greatest extent possible.

- Connecting cables between fixed-camera stands will be laid on the ground surface at several sites, avoiding trenching through undisturbed terrain, unless the location is determined to require protection for the cable to ensure operational capability. Cable laid on the surface will be removed after each mission.

- For the northernmost camera site (Site 9), the trench right-of-way will be combined with the road access. The shortest distance from existing access roads and electrical cables will be used for new construction.

- Prior to construction through undisturbed terrain, the wildlife biologist for WSMR or other designated biologist will perform a walkover survey of the right-of-way. If protected plant or animal species are located, the alignment of the facilities will be moved to avoid the protected species.

Debris Impact Area - The impact of falling debris on biological resources was judged to be insignificant. However, in the remote possibility of a flight failure for any of the three HEDI KITE tests, recovery of the fragments may be necessary. Because of the sensitivity of the desert bighorn sheep population in the San Andres Mountains, the following guidelines will be followed for debris recovery in the mountainous areas:

- Prior to the recovery effort, WSMR safety and recovery personnel will contact Ms. Patricia Hoban, the wildlife biologist at the San Andres NWR, for clearance to proceed.

- No helicopter flights will take place within the debris impact area inside the San Andres NWR without contacting the San Andres NWR.

- The wildlife biologist at the San Andres NWR will be invited to accompany recovery personnel during the helicopter flights to ensure that recovery flights are not conducted in areas then inhabited by the bighorn sheep.

4.2.2 Cultural Resources

Installation of Fixed Camera Sites - Although impacts on cultural resources at the camera sites were judged to be nonsignificant, the HEDI KITE testing program is committed to minimizing the amount of construction in undisturbed areas. Therefore, the installation of the fixed camera sites will proceed under the same guidelines previously outlined for biological resources, with the one difference that, prior to construction, the WSMR archaeologist will perform a walkover survey of the right-of-way. If cultural resources are located, the alignment of the facilities will be moved to avoid the cultural resource sites.

In addition, compliance procedures pertaining to potential impacts on cultural resources will be implemented in a manner consistent with the WSMR Historic Preservation Plan (250) and the PMOA among the Department of the Army, the New Mexico SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (261).

Cultural resource surveys will be undertaken along the access routes connecting recording camera sites commensurate with planned construction activities and other impacts that could occur as a result of project implementation. Such surveys will identify and evaluate potentially affected historic and prehistoric archaeological sites and historic buildings. Appropriate consideration will be given to potential impacts on Native American sacred sites. Resources identified will be evaluated with regard to criteria of eligibility for National Register listing and for criteria of effect. If necessary, mitigation measures will be developed in consultation with the SHPO and implemented in a manner that will allow for appropriate data recovery, analysis, archival curation, and dissemination of results. Cultural resources located during construction procedures will be handled in a manner prescribed by the PMOA.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

5.0 GLOSSARY

ABM:	Antiballistic Missile
AEDC:	Arnold Engineering Development Center
Ambient Air Quality Standards:	Standards established on a state or Federal level that define the limits for airborne concentrations of designated "criteria" pollutants to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety (primary standards) and to protect public welfare, including plant and animal life, visibility, and materials (secondary standards).
Alluvial Fan:	A cone-shaped area that is generally formed by mountain stream deposits as they run out onto a lowland plain.
Aquifer:	The water-bearing portion of subsurface earth material that yields or is capable of yielding useful quantities of water to wells.
Archaeology:	A scientific approach to the study of human ecology, cultural history, and cultural process, emphasizing systematic interpretation of material remains.
Attainment Area:	An air quality control region that has been designated by the EPA and the appropriate state air quality agency as having ambient air quality levels better than the standards set by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).
Azimuth:	A distance in angular degrees in a clockwise direction from the north point.
Bajada (bahada):	In arid or semiarid areas, the nearly flat surface created where two or more alluvial fans join at the foot of a mountain range.
Biological Diversity:	Refers to the number of species and their relative abundance in an area or habitat.
Biota:	The animal and plant life of a particular region.
BOA:	Broad Ocean Area
Boost Phase:	The first phase of a ballistic missile trajectory during which it is powered by its engines. During this phase, which usually lasts 3 to 5 minutes for an ICBM, the missile reaches an altitude of about 200 kilometers (124 miles).

Candidate Species:	Species for which listing as Threatened or Endangered is possible, but for which more biological and threat data are needed before a final determination is made.
CERCLA:	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
Concept Exploration:	Provides the research to determine whether a technology can meet a mission need. After reviewing the status of concept exploration, a decision will be made regarding advancement of the technology to demonstration/ validation.
CONUS:	Continental United States
Cultural Resources:	Prehistoric and/or historic districts, sites, structures or other physical evidence of human use considered of some importance to a culture, subculture, or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons.
Demonstration/Validation Program:	A program designed to determine the ability of the technology to perform its intended function and to provide the information necessary to make an informed decision whether to proceed with full-scale development.
DOD:	Department of Defense
DOPAA:	Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives
DPDO:	Defense Property Disposal Office
Endangered Species:	A species that is threatened with extinction throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range.
Endoatmosphere:	Within the earth's atmosphere, generally altitudes below 33,500 meters (110,000 feet).
Environmental Assessment (EA):	A concise public document in which a Federal agency provides sufficient analysis and evidence for determining the need for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI). EAs provide agencies with useful data regarding compliance with the NEPA and are an aid in the preparation of an EIS.
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS):	A detailed analysis of environmental aspects of a proposed project that is anticipated to have a significant effect on the human environment.

EPA:	Environmental Protection Agency
ESQD:	Explosive Safety Quantity Distance
Fauna:	Animals: organisms of the animal kingdom of a given area taken collectively.
Flora:	Plants: organisms of the plant kingdom taken collectively.
FNSI:	Finding of No Significant Impacts
FY:	Fiscal Year
GBR:	Ground-Based Radar
Groundwater:	All the water derived from percolation of rainwater, from water trapped in a sediment at its time of deposition, and from magmatic sources lying under the surface of the ground above an impermeable layer, but excluding underground streams.
Hazardous Waste:	The RCRA defines hazardous waste as any discarded material that may pose a substantial threat or potential danger to human health or the environment when improperly handled. Some of the characteristics of these wastes are toxicity, ignitability, corrosivity, and reactivity.
HEDI:	High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor
ICBM:	Intercontinental Ballistic Missile
Impact:	An assessment of the meaning of changes in all attributes being studied for a given resource; an aggregation of all the adverse effects, usually measured by a qualitative and nominally subjective technique.
IR:	Infrared
IRIS:	Infrared Instrumentation System
IRP:	Installation Restoration Program
Kinetic Energy	The energy created by the motion of an object.

Kinetic Kill Vehicles:	Weapons that would attack the warhead-carrier buses in the post-boost phase as they deploy their warheads and decoys.
KITE:	Kinetic Kill Vehicle Integrated Technology Experiment. This relates to a conventional kill of an RV.
KV:	Kill Vehicle
kWh:	Kilowatt-hour
Landfill:	Land waste disposal site that is located to minimize water pollution from runoff and leaching; waste is spread in thin layers, compacted, and covered with a fresh layer of soil each day to minimize pest, aesthetic, disease, air pollution, and water pollution problems.
Ldn:	The 24-hour average-energy sound level expressed in decibels, with a 10-decibel penalty added to sound levels between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.
Lithic Scatter:	The debris left from the construction of stone tools.
MAB:	Missile Assembly Building
MDSSC:	McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company
Milliwatt:	One one-thousandth of a watt
Mitigation:	A method or action to reduce or eliminate program impacts.
MMH	Monomethylhydrazine Fuel - a colorless, odorless, corrosive rocket fuel.
NAAQS:	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NCO Housing:	Housing for non-commissioned officers
NEPA:	National Environmental Policy Act
NOI:	Notice of Intent
Nonattainment Area:	An air quality control region that has been designated by the EPA and the appropriate state air quality agency as having ambient air quality levels below the primary standards set by NAAQS.

NOTAM:	Notice to All Airmen
NOTMAR:	Notice to Mariners
NPDES:	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. Regulates discharges into the nation's waters with a Federal permit program designed to reduce the amount of pollutants in each discharge.
NTF:	National Test Facility
OR Report:	Operation Requirement Report
Outcrop:	That part of a geologic formation or structure that appears at the surface of the Earth.
PACA:	Propulsion and Control Assembly
PCBs:	Polychlorinated Biphenyls
PMOA:	Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement
PSD:	Prevention of Significant Deterioration regulations. Prevents degradation of air that is already cleaner than that required by NAAQS.
RCRA:	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Established in 1976 to protect human health and the environment from improper waste management practices.
Reentry Vehicle (RV):	The part of a ballistic missile that carries the nuclear warhead to its target. The reentry vehicle is designed to reenter the Earth's atmosphere in the terminal portion of its trajectory and proceed to its target.
Revegetation:	Regrowth or replacement of a plant community on a disturbed site. Revegetation may be assisted by site preparation, planting, and treatment, or it may occur naturally.
RMI:	Republic of the Marshall Islands
SBI:	Space-Based Interceptor
SDI:	Strategic Defense Initiative
SDIO:	Strategic Defense Initiative Organization

Seeker:	Infrared sensor in the KV that is used to acquire, angle track, and provide closure information on a targeted RV.
Sensitive Species:	Species for which more scientific information is needed to determine its current biological status.
SHPO:	State Historic Preservation Officer
SLBM:	Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missile
Sludge:	The accumulated semi-liquid suspension of settled solids deposited from wastewaters or other fluids in tanks or basins.
STARS:	Strategic Target System
Tactical:	(As in tactical missiles). Of or pertaining to the technique of securing the objectives designated by strategy.
Target of Opportunity:	A target launched as part of one program that can be used by another program as well, e.g., for tracking tests.
Taxa:	A taxonomic entity (species, subspecies, or variety) or a group of such entities.
Terminal Phase:	The final phase of a ballistic missile trajectory during which warheads and penetration aids reenter the atmosphere. This phase follows the end of the midcourse phase and continues until impact or arrival of the missile in the vicinity of the target.
Threatened Species:	Taxa likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future.
Trajectory:	The curved path of an object hurtling through space, especially that of a projectile from the time it is fired.
UPH:	Unaccompanied Personnel Housing
USAKA:	U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll - USAKA includes 11 leased islands (Kwajalein, Roi-Namur, Ennylabegan, Meck, Gagan, Gellinam, Omelek, Eniwetak, Legan, Ennugarret, and Illeginni) in the Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands.
USASDC:	U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command

Wetlands:	Areas that are inundated or saturated with surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil, including swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar places.
Wind Tunnel Test:	Test environment that simulates high-speed flight; used to evaluate the guidance and control system in various flowfields.
Window Cooling System:	The equipment that passes liquid nitrogen over the sapphire window of the KV to cool it and prevent distortion.
WSMR:	White Sands Missile Range
WTR:	Western Test Range
XTV:	Experimental Test Vehicle

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

6.0 AGENCIES CONTACTED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll
APO San Francisco, California
96555-2526

U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command
Crystal Mall #4, Suite 900
1641 Jefferson Davis Highway
Crystal City, Virginia 22215

U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command
P.O. Box 1500
Huntsville, Alabama 35807-3801

U.S. Army White Sands Missile Range
STEWS-EL-N
White Sands, New Mexico 88002-5076

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Arnold Engineering and Development Center, AEDC/DE
Arnold AFB, Tennessee 37389-5000

Hill AFB
Environmental Office
2849 ABG/DEV
Hill Air Force Base, Utah 84056

National Test Facility
Consolidated Space Operations Center
Falcon AFB
1003 SSG/DEEV
Peterson AFB, Colorado 80914

Vandenberg AFB
1 STRAD/ET
Vandenberg AFB, California
92437-5000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Naval Surface Warfare Center
10901 New Hampshire Avenue
Silver Springs, Maryland 20903

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Department of Energy
Albuquerque Operations Office
P.O. Box 5400
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87115

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Endangered Species
P.O. Box 1306
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2800 Cottage Way, Room #1803E
Sacramento, California 95825

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
San Andres National Wildlife Refuge
P.O. Box 756
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88004

White Sands National Monument
P.O. Box 458
Alamogordo, New Mexico 88310

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pacific Islands Office
P.O. Box 50167
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Environmental Protection Agency
401 "M" Street, SW
Washington, DC 20460

Environmental Protection Agency
215 Fremont Street
San Francisco, California 94105

Environmental Protection Agency
Hazardous Waste Division
Superfund Office - Remedial Branch
999 18th Street, Suite #200
Denver, Colorado 80202

CONTRACTORS

McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company
5301 Bolsa Avenue
Huntington Beach, California 92647

Teledyne Brown Engineering
Cummings Research Park
300 Sparkman Drive
Huntsville, Alabama 35807-7007

STATE AGENCIES

Utah Department of Health
Bureau of Air Quality
288 North, 1460 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

Maryland Department of Environment
Division of Air Monitoring/Engineering
Air Management Administration
201 W. Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

State Agencies Cont.

New Mexico State Historic
Preservation Officer
Office of Cultural Affairs
Historic Preservation Division
228 East Palace Avenue
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

New Mexico Department of Game
and Fish
Biological Services Division
State Capitol Complex,
Villagra Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

7.0 REFERENCES

GENERAL REFERENCES

1. Air Force Association, 1987. Guide to U.S. Air Force Bases at Home and Abroad, Air Force Magazine, 70(5): 188-202, May.

2. Air Force Association, 1988. Air Force Magazine, 71(5), May.

3. Army Times Publishing Company, 1986. Guide to Military Installations in the U.S.

4. Cubbison, D.R., Teledyne Brown Engineering, 1988. Memorandum to Frank Chapuran of Teledyne Brown Engineering regarding HEDI Demonstration/Validation, Baseline Technology Interceptor (BTI) Booster Activities, July 29.

5. Keglovits, LTC, 1988. Environmental Assessment (EA) Familiarization Briefing, (U), U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, Huntsville, Alabama.

6. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983. County and City Data Book 1983, U.S. Government Printing Office.

7. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988. 1986 Population and 1985 Per Capita Income Estimates for Counties and Incorporated Places: West-Series P-26, No. 86-W-SC, U.S. Government Printing Office.

8. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1988. 1986 Population and 1985 Per Capita Income Estimates for Counties and Incorporated Places: South-Series P-26, No. 86-S-SC, U.S. Government Printing Office.

9. U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, 1989. Ground-Based Radar (GBR) Environmental Assessment, March.

10. U.S. Department of Defense, 1987. Battle Management Command, Control, and Communications (BM/C3) Demonstration/Validation Program Environmental Assessment, Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, August.

11. U.S. Department of Defense, 1987. Boost Surveillance and Tracking System (BSTS) Demonstration/Validation Program Environmental Assessment, Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, August.

12. U.S. Department of Defense, 1987. Exoatmospheric Reentry Vehicle Interception System (ERIS): Demonstration/Validation Program Environmental Assessment, August.

13. U.S. Department of Defense, 1987. Ground-Based Surveillance and Tracking System (GSTS) Demonstration/Validation Program Environmental Assessment, Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, August.

14. U.S. Department of Defense, 1987. Report to the Congress on the Strategic Defense Initiative, Strategic Defense Initiative Organization.

15. U.S. Department of Defense, 1987. Space-Based Interceptor (SBI) Demonstration/Validation Program Environmental Assessment, Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, August.

16. U.S. Department of Defense, 1987. Space-Based Surveillance and Tracking System (SSTS) Demonstration/Validation Program Environmental Assessment, Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, August.

17. U.S. Department of Defense, 1987. Strategic Defense Initiative Demonstration/Validation Program Environmental Assessments Summary, Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, August.

18. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1978. Final Environmental Impact Statement, MX: Milestone II, Volume I - VI.

19. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1984. Endangered and Threatened Species on U.S. Air Force Installations, Engineering and Services Center, U.S. Air Force, August.

20. Cubbison, D., 1988. Memorandum from D. Cubbison to Frank Chapuran, Teledyne Brown Engineering, regarding McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company staffing requirements at White Sands Missile Range, October 10.

DATA CONTACTS

21. HEDI Project Office, 1988. Strategic Defense Command, Huntsville, Alabama.

22. Taylor, M., 1988. Telephone conversation between M. Taylor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Section 7 requirements, October 6.

McDONNELL DOUGLAS SPACE SYSTEMS COMPANY

REFERENCES

23. McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Company, 1988. High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor Kinetic Kill Vehicle Integrated Technology Experiment.

DATA CONTACTS

24. Jordan, D., 1988. Conversation between Jordan, McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., about NEPA regulations at McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, September 9.

25. Mitchell, K., 1988. Telephone conversation between Mitchell, EPA Superfund Hotline, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding the National Priorities List, McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, October 26.

26. Ugoretz, K., 1988. Telephone conversation between Ugoretz, McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., regarding staffing at McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, October 5.

27. Valinsky, J., 1988. Telephone conversation between Valinsky, McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding facility data and environmental conditions at the McDonnell Douglas Huntington Beach, California facility, October 26.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

REFERENCES

28. Arnold Engineering Development Center, 1986. Economic Resource Impact Statement, Air Force Systems Command, Arnold Air Force Station, Tennessee.

29. Gresham, Smith and Partners, 1985. Environmental Assessment for the Elk Regional Resource Recovery Facility, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Station, Tennessee.

30. Nelson, D., 1988. Memorandum from D. Nelson, Earth Technology Corp., to Q. Gillard, Earth Technology Corp., regarding September 16 meeting and tour at Arnold Engineering Development Center, September 17.

31. Tennessee Department of Health and Environment, 1988. Tennessee Hazardous Waste Management Alt. EPA I.D. #TN8 57 02 4044.

32. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1986. Testing Today to Fly Tomorrow, Information Package, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Station, Tennessee.

33. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1984. 1984 Environmental Quality Program, Arnold Air Force Station, Tennessee.

34. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Air Force Systems Command, 1973. Environmental Impact of Noise from the Proposed High Reynolds Number Tunnel, prepared by K. J. Plotkin, J. E. Robertson, and J. A. Cockburn, Wyle Laboratories, Eastern Operations, Huntsville, Alabama.

DATA CONTACTS

35. Bone, J., 1988. Telephone conversation between Bone, Arnold Engineering Development Center Sewage Treatment Plant, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., regarding sewage treatment issues, August 17.

36. Bone, J., and B. Hazens, 1987. Telephone conversation between Bone and Hazens, Arnold Engineering Development Center, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., regarding infrastructure, May 13.

37. Bunn, R., Capt., and W. Dunne, 1987. Telephone conversation among Bunn and Dunne, Arnold Engineering Development Center, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., regarding noise and air quality, May 11.

38. Dunne, W., 1987. Telephone conversation between Dunne, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Director of Environmental Planning, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., regarding noise, May 26.

39. Dunne, W., 1987. Telephone conversation between Dunne, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Director of Environmental Planning, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., regarding wind tunnel data, June 3.

40. Dunne, W., 1988. Telephone conversation between Dunne, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Department of Environmental Planning, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about environmental conditions and public health and safety, August 15.

41. Edwards, R., 1988. Telephone conversation between Edwards, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Department of Environmental Planning, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about visual, natural, and cultural resources, August 16.

42. Edwards, R., 1988. Telephone conversation between Edwards, Arnold Engineering Development Center, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding need for Section 7 of the Rare and Endangered Species Act for HEDI Testing, October 7.

43. Hazens, B., 1988. Telephone conversation between Hazens, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Department of Programs, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about the demands and capacities of the infrastructure, August 16.

44. Jones, B., 1988. Telephone conversation between Jones, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Public Affairs Office, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about socioeconomic issues, August 15.

45. Jones, B., 1988. Telephone conversation between Jones, Arnold Engineering Development Center, Public Affairs Office, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about base size and the availability of facilities, August 16.

46. Kravitz, R., 1988. Telephone conversation between Kravitz, Earth Technology Corp. (Alexandria, Virginia), and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp. (San Bernardino, California), about the permit status of Arnold Engineering Development Center, August 15.

47. Lominac, K., 1988. Telephone conversation between Lominac, Arnold Engineering Development Center, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about transportation conditions and historic and archaeological sites, August 17.

48. Majors, A., 1988. Telephone conversation between Majors, Tennessee Department of Health and Environment, Department of Solid Waste Management, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about hazardous waste management at the Arnold Engineering Development Center, August 16.

49. Mever, Capt., G., 1988. Telephone conversation between Mever, Arnold Engineering Development Center, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., regarding HEDI staffing, October 12.

HILL AIR FORCE BASE

REFERENCES

50. Hill Air Force Range, Utah, 1984. Real Property Study KSCZ.

51. Mormedia Sales Inc., 1985. Welcome to Hill Air Force Base, Hill Air Force Base, Utah.

52. Ogden ALC, 1984. Road Map to the Future, Long Range Master Plan.

53. Peyton, P., Earth Technology Corp., 1988. Memorandum to S. Scott, Earth Technology Corp., regarding September 13 meetings with Hill Air Force Base personnel, September 20.

54. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1978, coordinated by the Wasatch Front Regional Council, 1978. Environmental Narrative, Hill Air Force Base, Utah.

55. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1982. Environmental Impact Statement Establishment of the Gandy Range Extension and Adjacent Restricted Airspace as an Area for Supersonic Flight Training, Hill Air Force Base, Utah, October.

56. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1985. Hill Air Force Base Economic Resource Impact Statement, Ogden Air Logistics Center.

57. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1985. Utah Test and Training Range.

DATA CONTACTS

58. Cooper, E., 1988. Telephone conversation between Cooper, Hill Air Force Base, and D. James, Earth Technology Corp., about the location of the HEDI project, August 23.

59. Cooper, E., 1988. Telephone conversation between Cooper, Hill Air Force Base, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding refurbishment of MINUTEMAN I, MINUTEMAN III, and ARIES motors, October 7.

60. Currier, N., 1987. Telephone conversation between Currier, Hill Air Force Base, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., about missile facilities at Hill Air Force Base, May 12.

61. Dalley, B., 1988. Telephone conversation between Dalley, Bureau of Air Quality, Department of Health, Salt Lake City, Utah, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., about air quality at Hill Air Force Base, October 4.

62. Hedrick, Sgt., 1988. Telephone conversation between Hedrick, Hill Air Force Base, and D. James, Earth Technology Corp., about the location of the HEDI project in relation to Hill Air Force Base and Utah Test and Training Range, August 19.

63. Huber, L., 1988. Telephone conversation between Huber, EPA National Superfund Hotline, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Hill Air Force Base listing on the National Priorities List, September 23.

64. James, B., 1988. Telephone conversation between James, Hill Air Force Base, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., about hazardous waste, October 4.

65. Littlejohn, J., 1988. Telephone conversation between Littlejohn, Superfund Office, Remedial Branch, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding details of Hill Air Force Base listing on National Priorities List, September 23.

66. McKenzie, B., 1987. Telephone conversation between McKenzie, Hill Air Force Base, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., about utilities information, May 21.

67. Pannebaker, R., 1988. Telephone conversation between Pannebaker, EPA National Superfund Hotline, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Hill Air Force Base listing on the National Priorities List, September 22.

68. Pierson, F., 1987. Telephone conversation between Pierson, Hill Air Force Base, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., about noise problems at Hill Air Force Base, May 21.

69. Sant, M., 1988. Telphone conversation between Sant, Hill Air Force Base, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Section 7, Rare and Endangered Species Act, October 7.

70. Taylor, B., 1987. Telephone conversation between Taylor, Hill Air Force Base, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., about threatened and endangered species, permitting of natural resources, and infrastructure, May 21.

71. Taylor, B., 1988. Telephone conversation between Taylor, Hill Air Force Base, and D. James, Earth Technology Corp., about environmental issues, infrastructure, permits, cultural resources, and natural resources, August 19.

72. Wagstaff, G., 1987. Telephone conversation between Wagstaff, Hill Air Force Base, and K. Bitner, Earth Technology Corp., about the frequency of testing of MINUTEMAN missiles, May 12.

73. Williams, M., 1988. Telephone conversation between Williams, Hill Air Force Base, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Section 7, Rare and Endangered Species Act, October 7.

NATIONAL TEST FACILITY
REFERENCES

74. Environmental Contracts and Planning Office for Peterson and Falcon Air Force Bases, 1988. Falcon Air Force Base Projected Water Consumption, September 15.

75. Peyton, P., Earth Technology Corp., 1988. Memorandum to S. Scott, Earth Technology Corp., regarding content of September 15, 1988 meetings held with National Test Facility and Falcon Air Force Base personnel, September 20.

76. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1981. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Consolidated Space Operations Center. Environmental Impact Analysis Process.

77. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1987. Memo from HQ Space Command, Peterson Air Force Base, to A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Request for Environmental Impact Analysis, CATEX information, May 22.

78. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Electronic Systems Division, 1987. National Test Facility Environmental Assessment, Strategic Defense Initiative National Test Bed Program.

DATA CONTACTS

79. deNaray, A., 1987. Telephone conversation between deNaray, Peterson Air Force Base, and E. Morelan, Earth Technology Corp., regarding air quality, water quality, hazardous waste, noise, sewage, and solid waste, May 11.

80. deNaray, A., 1987. Telephone conversation between deNaray, Peterson Air Force Base, and D. Navecky, Earth Techology Corp., regarding natural and cultural resources, threatened and endangered species, land use, and current environmental assessments, May 21.

81. deNaray, A., 1987. Telephone conversation between deNaray, Peterson Air Force Base, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., regarding hazardous waste, June 23.

82. deNaray, A., 1988. Telephone conversation between deNaray, Falcon Air Force Base, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding environmental issues at the National Test Facility, Falcon Air Force Base (air quality and permits, wastewater, natural and cultural resources), August 12.

83. Dietrich, Maj., 1988. Telephone conversation between Dietrich, Falcon Air Force Base, and E. Joy, Earth Technology Corp., regarding the proposed action at Falcon Air Force Base, September 16.

84. Scharing, W., Sgt., 1988. Telephone conversation between Scharing, Peterson Air Force Base, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., regarding payroll and personnel data at Falcon Air Force Base, August 31.

85. Sojouner, N., 1988. Telephone conversation between Sojouner, Falcon Air Force Base, and E. Joy, Earth Technology Corp., regarding the proposed action and environmental impacts at National Test Facility and Falcon Air Force Base, September 16.

86. Wuest, W., 1987. Telephone conversation between Wuest, URS Corporation/Electronic System Division, Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., regarding documents, May 26.

NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER

REFERENCES

87. Olenginski, E., 1988. Comments to HEDI Draft EA, October 7.

88. U.S. Navy, 1987. Naval Surface Warfare Center Brief.

DATA CONTACTS

89. Collier, A., 1988. Telephone conversation between Collier, Naval Surface Warfare Center, and Q. Gillard, Earth Technology Corp., regarding test facilities, September 14.

90. Coney, W., 1988. Telephone conversation between Coney, Division of Air Monitoring, Air Management Administration, Department of the Environment, Baltimore, Maryland, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., about air quality at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, White Oak, October 5.

91. Etheridge, M., 1988. Telephone conversation between Etheridge, Naval Surface Warfare Center, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., regarding public health and safety, September 16.

92. Johnson, B., 1987. Telephone conversation between Johnson, Naval Surface Warfare Center, and B. Chapline, Earth Technology Corp., about solid waste disposal, May 27.

93. Kendricks, G., 1988. Telephone conversation between Kendricks, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Public Works Department, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., regarding the base master plan, August 25.

94. Olengenski, E., 1988. Telephone conversation between Olengenski, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Engineering/Environmental Office, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about environmental issues and infrastructure, August 17.

95. Olenginski, E., 1988. Telephone conversation between Olenginski, Naval Surface Warfare Center, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding the need for Section 7 of the Rare and Endangered Species Act for HEDI testing, October 7.

96. Ruehl, J., 1987. Telephone conversation between Ruehl, Naval Surface Warfare Center, and B. Chapline, Earth Technology Corp., about infrastructure, May 27.

97. Schon, L., 1988. Telephone conversation between Schon, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Public Works Department, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about transportation, August 17.

98. Staten, J., 1988. Telephone conversation between Staten, Naval Surface Warfare Center, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., regarding testing areas and staffing, August 18.

99. Swope, A., 1987. Telephone conversation between Swope, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Engineering/Environmental Office, and B. Chapline, Earth Technology Corp., about permit status, May 27.

100. Swope, A., 1988. Telephone conversation between Swope, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Public Works Department, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about hazardous waste management, August 16.

101. Swope, A., 1988. Telephone conversation between Swope, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Public Works Department, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about documents pertaining to the Naval Surface Warfare Center, August 25.

102. Tidwell, G., 1988. Telephone conversation between Tidwell, HEDI Project Office, Teledyne Brown Engineering, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about facility requirements for HEDI testing, August 22.

103. Tidwell, G., 1988. Telephone conversation between Tidwell, SDC, Huntsville, Alabama, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding HEDI staffing requirements at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, October 11.

104. Wray, T., 1988. Telephone conversation between Wray, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Public Works Department, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about noise, natural resources, and cultural resources, August 16.

105. Zook, D., 1987. Telephone conversation between Zook, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Public Affairs Office, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., about socioeconomic issues, May 13.

106. Zook, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Zook, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Public Affairs Office, and J. DeGange, Earth Technology Corp., about socioeconomic and political issues, August 16.

SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES

REFERENCES

107. Advance Sciences, Inc. 1987. Environmental Assessment, Strategic Defense Facility, Sandia National Laboratories.

108. Energy Research and Development Administration, 1977. Environmental Impact Assessment, Sandia Laboratories.

109. Kirtland Air Force Base, 1981. Tab A-1 Environmental Narrative, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

110. Millard, Pei, Felicetti, Gray, Thompson, and Phelan. 1986. Environmental Monitoring Report 1987, Sandia National Laboratories.

111. Peyton, P., Earth Technology Corp., 1988. Memorandum to S. Scott, Earth Technology Corp., regarding September 14, 1988 meetings at Sandia National Laboratories, New Mexico, September 20.

DATA CONTACTS

112. Adams, M., 1988. Telephone conversation between Adams, Sandia National Laboratories, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., about staffing, housing, and payroll, August 22.

113. Adams, M., 1988. Telephone conversation between Adams, Sandia National Laboratories, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., about endangered species, August 25.

114. Bickle, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Bickle, Sandia National Laboratories, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding SPRINT Booster refurbishment at Sandia National Laboratories, October 11.

115. Burnett, W., 1987. Telephone conversation between Burnett, Sandia National Laboratories, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., about noise and wastewater, May 11.

116. Burnett, W., 1988. Telephone conversation between Burnett, Sandia National Laboratories, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., about hazardous waste and solid waste, August 23.

117. Burton, W., 1988. Telephone conversation between Burton, Sandia National Laboratories, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., about cultural resources, August 23.

118. Easely, V., 1987. Telephone conversation between Easley, Sandia National Laboratories, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., about infrastructure, May 11.

119. Farner, R., 1988. Telephone conversation between Farner, McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Company, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding SPRINT booster refurbishment and staffing requirements at Sandia National Laboratories, October 11.

120. Reddick, R., 1988. Telephone conversation between Reddick, Department of Energy, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., about most recent environmental assessment of Sandia National Laboratories, August 16.

121. Reddick, R., 1988. Telephone conversation between Reddick, Department of Energy, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., about air quality at Sandia National Laboratories, August 23.

122. Reddick, R., 1988. Telephone conversation between Reddick, Sandia National Laboratories, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Section 7, Rare and Endangered Species Act, October 7.

123. Schaeffer, E., 1987. Telephone conversation between Schaeffer, Sandia National Laboratories, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., about infrastructure, May 12.

REFERENCES

124. Allred, J., Col., 1988. Record of Environmental Consideration, Radar Complex (GBR-X), Kwajalein Island, May 16.

125. Athens, J.S., and K. Shun, 1987. Archaeological Investigations on Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, October.

126. Athens, J.S., 1987. Archaeological Monitoring and Sampling, Airport Taxiway and Special Purpose Aircraft Parking Apron, Kwajalein Airfield, USAKA Republic of the Marshall Islands, August.

127. Bell Laboratories, 1975. Kwajalein Field Station, Whippany, New Jersey, October.

128. Girlando, J., Lt. Col., 1988. Memorandum from Girlando Range Command USAKA, to F.W. Wanner, LCS Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, regarding request for information about USAKA programs and projects, July 5.

129. Hall, T., 1988. Final Safety Submission, HEDI, ERIS, and SABIR Facilities, Meck Island, U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll (USAKA), January 15.

130. Joy, E., Earth Technology Corp., 1988. Memorandum to Steve Scott, Earth Technology Corp., regarding August 20-21, 1988 U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll meetings, August 24.

131. Joy, E., Earth Technology Corp., 1989. Memorandum to Larry Milliken, Earth Technology Corp., regarding April 12-14, 1989 HEDI EA Revision Meetings, Huntsville, Alabama, May 2.

132. Joy, E., Earth Technology Corp., 1989. Memorandum to Larry Milliken, Earth Technology Corp., regarding April 17-20, 1989 U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll trip and meetings, May 10.

133. Martin, W., 1987. Estimate of Facility Requirements for HEDI at Meck Island, Kwajalein Missile Range, U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, Huntsville, Alabama.

134. McClellan, M., 1985. Memorandum for Record, Environmental Assessment for Airborne Optical Adjunct (AOA), Program, April 5.

135. Moncrief, R., 1986. Record of Environmental Consideration, FY88, MCA Construction of Missile Launch Facilities, Meck Island, Kwajalein Missile Range, Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands (ERIS), November 28.

136. Moncrief, R., 1986. Record of Environmental Consideration, FY89, MCA Construction of Missile Launch Facilities, Meck Island, Kwajalein Missile Range, Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands (HEDI), November 28.

137. Morrow, J.W., 1986. Air Quality Impact Analysis, Kwajalein Island Power Plant No. 1, May 28.

138. Office of Micronesian Status Negotiations, 1984. Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Compact of Free Association.

139. Pan Am World Services, Inc., 1988. Analysis of Existing Facilities, U.S. Army Strategic Command, U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands, June.

140. Republic of the Marshall Islands, 1984. First Five Year Development Plan, 1985-1989, the Initial Phase of a Fifteen Year Development Plan, Office of Planning and Statistics, Majuro Marshall Islands.

141. Ryba, T., 1988. Comments to GBR/HEDI Draft, September 21.

142. Ryba, T., 1989. Memorandum for Record Regarding Comments to HEDI Draft EA of May 1989, May 18.

143. Schilz, A.J., 1989. Archaeology Reconnaissance Survey and Sampling, U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, February 6.

144. Sox, D., 1988. Engineering Review Comments Ground-Based Radar and High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor Environmental Assessment (Working Draft), U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, September 19.

145. Streck, C. F., 1987. Memorandum for Record Regarding Historic Preservation Recommendations for USAKA, Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands, June 9.

146. Streck, C. F., 1987. Memorandum for Record Regarding Site Visit for Archaeological Contract Management on Kwajalein Island, and Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey on Legan and Roi Namur performed on July 20-28, 1987, August 13.

147. Thompson, E. N., 1984. National Register of Historic Places Inventory - Nomination Form, Kwajalein Island Battlefield, May 2.

148. United States Government and the Government of the Marshall Islands, 1982. Agreement Regarding the Military Use and Operating Rights of the Government of the United States in the Marshall Islands Concluded Pursuant to Sections 321 and 323 of the Compact of Full Association, May 24.

149. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Division, 1987. HEDI and SABIR Launch Complex, Meck Island, U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll.

150. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, 1975. Solid Waste Disposal Study, Kwajalein Island, Marshall Islands District, Trust Territory of the Pacific.

151. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, 1985. FY87 MCA PN 244-Harbor/Channel Dredging, Various Locations, Kwajalein Missile Range, Environmental Assessment, August 21.

152. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, 1986. Environmental Assessment for Upgrade of Power Plant No.1, Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands, May.

153. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, 1987. Hazardous Waste Management Plan for U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands, May.

154. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, 1988. Facilities Requirement Evaluation, U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll: Existing Conditions, Shortfalls, and Future Requirements, May, prepared by CH2M Hill and Belt Collins and Associates.

155. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, 1988. Master Plan Report: Concept Plans, Future Development Plans, and Utilities Analyses, U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll (Draft), May, prepared by CH2M Hill and Belt Collins and Associates.

156. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, 1988. Draft Marine Environmental Assessment Report on United States Army Leased Lands at Kwajalein Atoll, August 11, prepared by Sea Grant Extension Service, University of Hawaii.

157. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, undated. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Waste Management Study, Present Practices and Corrective Actions Report, prepared by GMP Associates, Inc.

158. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Kwajalein Missile Range, 1986. KMR Regulation Number 385-4, Change No. 1, Protection of Personnel During Missile Operations, November 13.

159. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, 1988. Republic of the Marshall Islands, 1988 Census of Population and Housing, Preliminary Results, (Map; scale 1 inch = 130 miles).

160. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, 1988. Telephone Directory Supplement, April.

161. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, 1989. Range Users Manual (Draft), April 17.

162. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, 1989. Comments to GBR Draft, from U.S. Kwajalein Atoll to Maj. L. Cox, GBR Project Office, Huntsville, Alabama, January 27.

163. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, undated. Memorandum of Understanding Concerning Disposal of Certain Wastes in the Pacific Ocean in the Vicinity of Kwajalein Atoll, (Draft).

164. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, 1989. Housing Files.

165. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, undated. USAKA Range Safety Program.

166. U.S. Congress, 1986. Public Law 99-239: Compact of Free Association Act of 1985, January 14.

167. U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Economic Adjustment, 1984. Economic Development in the Marshall Islands.

168. U.S. Department of State, 1986. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

169. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1986. Small ICBM Area Narrowing Report, Volume III: Hard Silo in Patterned Array Basing Mode, February.

170. U.S. Department of the Army, 1977. Environmental Assessment, Missile Impacts, Illegini Island at the Kwajalein Missile Range, Kwajalein Atoll, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, prepared by Environmental Consultants, Inc., Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii, under contract No. DACW84-77C-0034, modification No. P00004, for Engineer Division, Pacific Ocean Corps of Engineers for the Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command, Huntsville, Alabama.

171. U.S. Department of the Army, Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command, Huntsville, Alabama, 1979. Environmental Assessment Homing Overlay Experiment Program, Kwajalein Missile Range, Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Island, March.

172. U.S. Department of the Army, 1980. Environmental Impact Assessment of Kwajalein Missile Range Operations, Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands, August.

173. U.S. Department of the Army, 1980. Environmental Impact Assessment of Kwajalein Missile Range Operations, Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands, Revision No. 1, Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command and Engineering Division, Pacific Ocean.

174. U.S. Department of the Army, U.S. Strategic Defense Command, 1986. Environmental Assessment for Family Housing Dwellings, FY 1987-1989 Phases, Kwajalein Island, Kwajalein Missile Range, Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands.

175. U.S. Department of the Army, U.S. Strategic Defense Command, 1988. USAKA Range Instrumentation and Support Facilities Manual, October 1.

176. U.S. Department of the Army, U.S. Strategic Defense Command, undated. HEDI Facilities, USAKA.

177. Volpe, M., Col. 1987. Memorandum for Secretary of the Army Regarding SDI Program Environmental Assessment for Demonstration/Validation Testing, U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, July 6.

178. Wall, J. F., Lt. Gen., 1987. Memorandum for: Director, Strategic Defense Initiative Regarding Environmental Impact Statement at U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, July 27.

179. Watanabe, F.K., 1986. Archaeological Reconnaissance for Family Housing Dwellings, FY 1987-1989 Increments, Kwajalein Island, Kwajalein Missile Range, Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands, March 10.

DATA CONTACTS

180. Allendorf, J., 1987. Telephone conversation between Allendorf, Western Test Range Operations, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding reentry debris from Western Test Range, May 22.

181. Donneley, S., 1988. Telephone conversation between Donneley, U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, Huntsville, Alabama, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., to request Kwajalein-related documents, August 22.

182. Elmore, W., 1988. Telephone conversation between Elmore, U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, Huntsville, Alabama, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Kwajalein-related documents, August 17.

183. Flythe, R., Lt. Col., 1987. Telephone conversation between Flythe, U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, Huntsville, Alabama, and W. Hemming, Earth Technology Corp., regarding upgrade of Power Plant No. 1, Kwajalein Island, July 7.

184. Maragos, J., and H. Takemoto, 1987. Telephone conversation among Maragos and Takemoto, Chief Environmental Officer, Environmental Resource Section, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., regarding environmental monitoring, May 26.

185. Maragos, J., C. Streck, and H. Takemoto, 1987. Telephone conversation among Maragos, Streck, and Takemoto, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, Hawaii, and A. Jennings, Earth Technology Corp., regarding air quality, solid waste, hazardous waste, cultural resources, and socioeconomics, June 22.

186. McGoldrick, T., 1988. Telephone conversation between McGoldrick, U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., regarding payroll statistics, September 1.

187. Phillips, J., 1988. Telephone conversation between Phillips, U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, Huntsville, Alabama, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding electricity, solid waste, and sewage on Kwajalein Island, August 16.

188. Sox, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Sox, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and air quality at U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, August 15.

189. Sox, D., 1988. Telephone conversation among Sox, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, and P. Peyton and E. Joy, Earth Technology Corp., regarding comments to HEDI/GBR draft, October 7.

190. Takemoto, H., 1988. Telephone conversation between Takemoto, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding hazardous waste, biological resources, and the draft marine survey, August 15.

191. Wall, B. D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Wall, U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, Huntsville, Alabama, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding infrastructure and noise on Kwajalein Island, August 16.

VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE

REFERENCES

192. Air Force Office of Scientific Research, 1975. Ecological Assessment of Vandenberg Air Force Base.

193. Air Force Systems Command, 1987. Welcome to the 6595th TEG Launch Facility 03. Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

194. ICF Technology, URS Corporation, 1987. Space Launch Support Feasibility Study, Status Briefing, Space Division, Los Angeles Air Force Station, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, April 28.

195. Izzo, V., Earth Technology Corp., 1988. Memorandum to S. Scott, Earth Technology Corp., regarding October 4, 1988 Vandenberg Air Force Base meeting.

196. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1973. Final Environmental Statement for the Office of Space Science Launch Vehicle and Propulsion Programs.

197. TRW, 1983. Reentry Systems Launch Program (RSLP) Booster and Missile Guidance Set (MGS) Refurbishment and Baseline Configuration Requirements, Document No. 3650.20.80-121, May 2, prepared for Ballistic Missile Office, Air Force Systems Command.

198. TRW, 1985. Reentry Systems Launch Program (RSLP) Booster and Missile Guidance Set (MGS) Refurbishment and Baseline Configuration Requirements, MINUTEMAN III Booster, PSRE, and MGS, Document No. F810-JTA 85-053, prepared for Ballistic Missile Office, Air Force Systems Command.

199. U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command, 1987. Scope of Work SW-X-[illegible]-68-Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of the Army, USASDC, and BMO for USASDC Test and Validation Programs, January 2, 1987.

200. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1973. Final Environmental Statement, Advanced Ballistic Reentry Systems (ABRES) Radioactive Sensors.

201. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1976. Ecological Assessment of Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

202. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1978. Final Environmental Impact Statement, MX Milestone II, Volumes I-VI.

203. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1978. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Space Shuttle Program, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, Environmental Impact Analysis Process.

204. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1983. Supplement to Final Environmental Impact Statement, Space Shuttle Program, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, Environmental Impact Analysis Program.

205. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1986. Mission Evaluation of Oil and Gas Development and Production, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

206. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1987. Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Mineral Resources Management Plan, Potential Exploration, Development, and Production of Oil and Gas Resources, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

207. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1987. Environmental Assessment, Peacekeeper in Rail Garrison and Small ICBM Flight Test Program, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, November.

208. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1987. Environmental Assessment, Repair and Restoration of Space Launch Complex 4, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, June.

209. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1987. Space Launch Support Feasibility Study, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, April 28 (Status Briefing).

210. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1988. Biological Assessment for the Titan II and Titan IV Space Launch Vehicle Modification and Launch Operation, 1988, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

211. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1988. Environmental Assessment, Titan IV Space Launch Vehicle Modification and Operation, 1988, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

212. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1988. Programmatic Environmental Assessment, Commercial Expendable Launch Vehicle Programs 1988, Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

213. U.S. Department of the Air Force, HQ 1st Strategic Aerospace Division, 1983. Base Development Pattern, Environmental Planning Branch, Vandenberg Air Force Base.

214. U.S. Department of the Air Force, HQ 1st Strategic Aerospace Division, 1986. 1STRAD/Planning Guidance Document, Vandenberg Air Force Base.

215. U.S. Geological Survey, 1985. Development and Calibration of a Two-Dimensional Digital Model for the Analysis of the Ground Water Flow System in San Antonio Creek Valley, Santa Barbara County, California.

216. Vandenberg Air Force Base, 1976. Environmental Assessment for Minuteman and Thor Missile Launches at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

217. Vandenberg Air Force Base, 1986. Vandenberg Air Force Base Emissions Inventory.

218. Vandenberg Air Force Base, 1987. Western Test Range Users Handbook.

DATA CONTACTS

219. Allendorf, J., 1987. Telephone conversation between Allendorf, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. Bruckner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding MINUTEMAN launches in the Western Test Range, May 21.

220. Allendorf, J., 1987. Telephone conversation between Allendorf, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. Bruckner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding the Western Test Range, May 22.

221. Anderson, J., 1988. Telephone conversation between Anderson, Regional Superfund Hotline (EPA Federal Facilities Division), and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Vandenberg Air Force Base's listing on the National Priorities List, September 23.

222. Antoigue, J., 1989. Telephone conversation between Antoigue, Western Test Range Scheduling Office, and V. Izzo, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Local Notice to Mariners (LoNote), May 11.

223. Berry, S., 1988. Telephone conversation between Berry, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding archaeological and historic sites, August 31.

224. Chansler, P., Maj., 1987. Telephone conversation between Chansler, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding staffing and facility construction, June 18.

225. Chansler, P., Maj., 1987. Telephone conversation between Chansler, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding facility construction, June 18.

226. Chansler, P., Maj., 1987. Telephone conversation between Chansler, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Titan IV facilities, June 18.

227. Fitzgerald, V., 1987. Telephone conversation between Fitzgerald, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and E. Morelan, Earth Technology Corp., regarding sewage treatment and solid waste, May 12.

228. Fitzgerald, V., 1987. Telephone conversation between Fitzgerald, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and E. Morelan, Earth Technology Corp., regarding electricity and solid waste, May 12.

229. Huber, L., 1988. Telephone conversation between Huber, EPA National Superfund Hotline, and R. Boon, Earth Technology Corp., regarding Vandenberg Air Force Base's listing on the National Priorities List, September 23.

230. McElligott, M., 1988. Telephone conversation between McElligott, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and A. Downing, Earth Technology Corp., regarding transportation, September 14.

231. Morris, Lt. Col., 1987. Telephone conversation between Morris, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and E. Morelan, Earth Technology Corp., regarding hazardous waste, air quality, and sewage treatment, May 11.

232. Morris, Lt. Col., 1988. Telephone conversation between Morris, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. James, Earth Technology Corp., regarding air quality, water quality, and hazardous waste, August 16.

233. Poll, Lt., 1988. Telephone conversation between Poll, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and P. Peyton, Earth Technology Corp., regarding the recent change in the status of air quality at Vandenberg Air Force Base, November 23.

234. Sanchez, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Sanchez, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. James, Earth Technology Corp., regarding utility information, August 22.

235. Staba, G., 1987. Telephone conversation between Staba, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and E. Morelan, Earth Technology Corp., regarding wastewater, May 12.

236. Staba, G., 1987. Telephone conversation between Staba, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding air quality, water quality, threatened and endangered species, infrastructure, hazardous waste, noise, cultural resources, socioeconomics, and land use, June 23.

237. Staba, G., 1987. Telephone conversation between Staba, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding environmental impact statements for the Space Shuttle and Titan IV programs, June 23.

238. Toomey, R., 1987. Telephone conversation between Toomey, Strategic Defense Initiative, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding environmental assessments for the Western Test Range and its operations, May 29.

239. Turley, R., 1987. Telephone conversation between Turley, Environmental Task Force, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. Brukner, Earth Technology Corp., regarding air quality, May 22.

240. Van, Sgt. 1988. Telephone conversation between Van, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and D. James, Earth Technology Corp., regarding base and test facilities, August 22.

WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

REFERENCES

241. Breternitz, C. D., and D. E. Doyel, 1985. A Cultural Resources Overview and Management Plan for the White Sands Missile Range, Soil Systems, Inc., Phoenix, Arizona.

242. Martin, W. C., and C. R., Hutchins, 1980. A Flora of New Mexico, Vols. I, II. , J. Cramer in der A. R. Gantner Verlag Kommanditgesellschaft.

243. McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Company, 1988. High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) Kinetic Kill Vehicle Integrated Technology Experiment KITE): WSMR Activation, Integration, and Readiness Plan, Huntington Beach, California, April.

244. Monson, G., and L. Sumner (Eds.), 1980. The Desert Bighorn, University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

245. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1971. Environmental Impact Statement for Manned Spacecraft Center and White Sands Test Facility (Institutional Statement), Houston, Texas.

246. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, 1985. Handbook of Species Endangered in New Mexico, Santa Fe.

247. New Mexico Native Plants Protection Advisory Committee, 1984. A Handbook of Rare and Endemic Plants of New Mexico, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

248. The Earth Technology Corporation, 1988. Draft Assessment of Water Supply Alternatives for the Ground-Based Free Electron Laser-Technology Integration Experiment Facility, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, April.

249. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1987. Final Environmental Impact Statement of the Proposed Ground-Based Free Electron Laser Technology Integration Experiment, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, Huntsville Division, Huntsville, Alabama and Fort Worth District, Fort Worth, Texas.

250. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1988. Historic Preservation Plan, White Sands Missile Range.

251. U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, White Sands Missile Range, 1986. Record of Environmental Consideration, Control No. RCSDD-M (AR) 1327 010-86, March 21.

252. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1986. Environmental Planning Technical Report, Biological Resources and Threatened and Endangered Species, Small ICBM program, November.

253. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1986. Environmental Planning Technical Report, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Small ICBM program, November.

254. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1986. Environmental Planning Technical Report, Land Use, Small ICBM program, November.

255. U.S. Department of the Air Force, 1986. Legislative Environmental Impact Statement, Small ICBM program, November.

256. U.S. Department of the Army, 1985. Final Environmental Assessment for Border Star 1985, Joint Readiness Exercise, Ft. Bliss, Texas and New Mexico, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico and Specified Adjoining Lands, prepared for U.S. Readiness Command, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida by Gulf South Research Institute, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

257. U.S. Department of the Army, 1985. Installation Environmental Assessment and appendix, U.S. Army White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico.

258. U.S. Department of the Army, Strategic Defense Command, 1986. Draft Environmental Impact Statement of the Proposed Ground-Based Free Electron Laser Technology Integration Experiment, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Division, Alabama, and Fort Worth District, Texas.

259. U.S. Department of the Army, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 1980. Capability Analytical/Environmental Assessment Report, Step 5, Higginbotham and Associates, P.C., Colorado Springs, Colorado.

260. U.S. Department of the Army, White Sands Missile Range, 1983. Natural Resources Management Plan, with appendices that include several White Sands Missile Range co-use agreements, December.

261. U.S. Department of the Army, White Sands Missile Range, the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1985. Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement.

262. U.S. Department of the Interior, 1972. Draft Environmental Statement, Proposed Master Plan, White Sands National Monument, New Mexico, National Park Service, Southwest Region.

263. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1979. "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants, Determination that Coryphantha sneedii var. sneedii is an Endangered Species," Federal Register 44 (217): 64741-64743.

264. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1981. "Endangered and Threatened Plants, Determination of Two New Mexico Plants To Be Endangered Species and Threatened Species, With Critical Habitat," Federal Register 46 (12): 5730-5733.

265. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1985. "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants, Review of Plant Taxa for Listing as Endangered or Threatened Species," Federal Register 50 (188): 39526-39584.

266. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1985. Todsen's Pennyroyal (Hedeoma todsenii) Recovery Plan, prepared by R.S. Irving and Associates, Inc.

267. White Sands Missile Range, Public Affairs Office, 1983. WSMR Fact Sheet, April.

DATA CONTACTS

268. Bingham, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Bingham, White Sands Missile Range Public Affairs Office, and A. Downing, Earth Technology Corp., regarding range size, staff, and payroll, August 16.

269. Burton, R., 1988. Telephone conversation between Burton, White Sands Missile Range, Staff Archaeologist, and E. Weil, Earth Technology Corp., regarding cultural resource policies and known sites on the range, August 22.

270. Carmichael, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Carmichael, Tetra Tech, and A. Downing, Earth Technology Corp., regarding environmental conditions and the 1986 EIS for Small ICBM at White Sands Missile Range, September 6.

271. Concannon, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Concannon, Tetra Tech, and A. Downing, Earth Technology Corp., regarding threatened and endangered species within White Sands Missile Range, September 8.

272. Cubbison, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Cubbison, Teledyne Brown Engineering, and Q. Gillard, Earth Technology Corp., about impacts from debris, August 24.

273. Cubbison, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Cubbison, Teledyne Brown Engineering, and Q. Gillard, Earth Technology Corp., concerning first and second stage of MINUTEMAN and noise information, August 25.

274. Donahoo, M., 1988. Telephone conversation between Donahoo, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and J. Easton, Tierra Madre Consultants, requesting Hedeoma todsenii status report and recovery plan; and discussion concerning the pupfish, August 23.

275. Gamboa, E., 1988. Telephone conversation between Gamboa, White Sands Missile Range, and Q. Gillard, Earth Technology Corp., regarding information on launches, air quality, population, permits, payroll, refuse amounts, sewage treatment, transportation, and water supply, August 19.

276. Gamboa, E., 1988. Telephone conversation between Gamboa, HEDI Project Office, White Sands Missile Range, and Q. Gillard, Earth Technology Corp., regarding the difference between launch control equipment and ground support equipment, October 12.

277. Gonzales, T., 1988. Telephone conversation between Gonzales, White Sands Missile Range, and Q. Gillard, Earth Technology Corp., concerning the completion and refurbishing of fuel rooms and sink holding basins, August 10.

278. Hoban, P., 1988. Telephone conversation between Hoban, San Andres National Wildlife Refuge, and L. La Pre, Tierra Madre Consultants, about stress on the bighorn sheep population from sonic boons and rocket debris, September 12.

279. Jornada Experimental Range, 1988. Telephone conversation between range personnel and L. La Pre, Tierra Made Consultants, regarding Jornada Experimental Range, White Sands Missile Range New Mexico boundary, October 3.

280. La Pre, L., 1988. Conference between La Pre, Tierra Madre Consultants, and A. Downing, Earth Technology Corp., about additional threatened and endangered species at White Sands Missile Range, September 12.

281. La Pre, L., 1988. Telephone conversation between La Pre, Tierra Madre Consultants, and A. Downing, Earth Technology Corp., about endangered species at White Sands Missile Range; La Pre provided a new list of endangered species, September 15.

282. Merlan, T., 1988. Telephone contact between Merlan, Office of Cultural Affairs, New Mexico, and E. Weil, Consultant, regarding cultural resources, September 21.

283. Roberts, J., 1988. Telephone conversation between Roberts, Teledyne Brown Engineering, and Q. Gillard, Earth Technology Corp., about requirements for recording camera sites, August 22.

284. Sandoval, A., 1988. Telephone conversation between Sandoval, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, and A. Downing, Earth Technology Corp., concerning the state and Federal status of the golden eagle and the bald eagle, September 15.

285. Sandoval, A., 1988. Telephone conversation between Sandoval, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, and L. LaPre, Tierra Madre Consultants, regarding endangered species in New Mexico, October 3.

286. Stoleson, Capt., 1988. Telephone conversation between Stoleon, White Sands Missile Range, and Q. Gillard, Earth Technology Corp., regarding launch trajectory and sonic boons, September 9.

287. Taylor, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Taylor, White Sands Missile Range, Wildlife Biologist, and A. Downing, Earth Technology Corp., about threatened and endangered and candidate species listed as occurring or possibly occurring on White Sands Missile Range, August 16.

288. Taylor, D., 1988. Telephone conversation between Taylor, White Sands Missile Range, Wildlife Biologist, and L. La Pre, Tierra Madre Consultants, about potential biological problems from fire, toxic materials, and noise, August 23.

289. Reynolds, V., 1988. Telephone conversation between Reynolds, White Sands Missile Range, Flight Safety Office, and F. Chapuran, Teledyne Brown Engineering, about procedures and agreements for evacuation of co-use areas, December 7.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

Name	Highest Degree	Technical Expertise	Area of Responsibility
Bateman, Richard	PhD	Hydrology	Water resources
Boon, Richard	BSc	Geography	Water quality
Brewer, William	MS	Marine Biology	Marine biological resources, water quality
DeGange, John	MS	Economic and Urban Geography	Infrastructure, socioeconomics
Downing, Ann	BA	Geography, Ecosystems	Biological resources, water quality, land use
Gillard, Quentin	PhD	Geography	Technical Director
Higman, Sally	MPI/MA	Land Use, Socioeconomics	Socioeconomics
Izzo, Vincent	BA	Geography	Hazardous waste
James, David	MS	Geography, Climatology	Air quality, noise
Joy, Edd	BA	Geography	Program Manager
Kensok, Orville	MS	Materials Engineering	Reviewer
La Pre, Lawrence	PhD	Biology	Biological resources
Miller, James	MS	Geological Engineering	Reviewer
Milliken, Larry	BS	Geology	Reviewer
Nelson, Dean	MS	Environmental Engineering	DOPAA, microwave radiation
Peyton, Paige	BA	Anthropology	Cultural resources, visual resources
Porter, Stephen	BA	Geography	Air quality, noise
Scott, Steven	BS	Geology	Reviewer
Tell, Richard	MS	Radiation Sciences	Microwave radiation
Weil, Ed	PhD	Anthropology	Cultural resources

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A

ENVIRONMENTAL ATTRIBUTES, APPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS, AND COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ENVIRONMENTAL ATTRIBUTES, APPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS, AND COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

AIR

AIR QUALITY ACT (1967) 42 USC 7401 et seq., Pub. L. 90-148 81 Stat. 485

Protects and enhances the quality of the nation's air.

PREVENTION OF SIGNIFICANT DETERIORATION (PSD) REGULATIONS 39 Fed Reg 42510 (1974) Amended by 44 Fed Reg 51924 (1979)

Prevents degradation of air that is already cleaner than that required by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

CLEAN AIR ACT (1963) 42 USC 7401 et seq., Pub. L. 95-95 91 Stat. 685-796

Regulates air pollution by means of (1) air quality control, which sets a maximum allowable level of air pollution for the surrounding air and determines the emission levels for conformity to a maximum allowable ambient level, and (2) emission control of certain pollutants by national standards.

Clean Air Act (amendments) 1977, Section 111. Pub. L. 91-604, 84 Stat. 1676-1713, Title 42. New Source Performance Standards.

NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS (NAAQS) Section 109 Clean Air Act

Public health and the public welfare are protected by national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards for "criteria" pollutants (ozone, carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, and hydrocarbons).

BIOLOGY

FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT (1965) 16 USC 662 Pub. L. 89-72 79 Stat. 216

This law requires that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service be consulted when water bodies, including wetlands, greater than 10 acres in area are to be modified, controlled, or impounded. It further requires action to be taken to prevent loss and damage to these resources and provision for their development and improvement.

THE BALD AND GOLDEN EAGLE ACT (1940) 16 USC 668-668(d), Chapter 278 54 Stat. 250

Under this Act, activities that have the potential to disturb these birds and/or their nests require prior consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding mitigation measures.

THE MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT (1918) 16 USC 703-712, Chapter 128 40 Stat. 755

This Act prohibits the pursuit, hunting, taking, capture, possession, or killing of such species or their nests and eggs. Also potential impacts of a proposed action on migrating birds have to be discussed with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT (1973) 16 USC 1531-1543, Pub. L. 93-205, 87 Stat. 884 (1973)

Section 7 requires every Federal agency to inquire of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service whether any threatened or endangered species may be present in the area of a proposed agency activity before that activity can be taken.

Amended by Pub. L. 95-632, 92 Stat. 3571 (1978) Amended by Pub. L. 97-304, 96 Stat. 1411 (1982)

Protects species of fish and wildlife that are either in danger of extinction or are likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant part of their range.

All Federal agencies are directed to carry out programs for the conservation of endangered and threatened species, and to take such actions as necessary to ensure that their actions will not jeopardize the continued existence of such species (16 USC 1532(2)).

Federal agencies must also see to it that their actions do not result in destruction or modification of the habitats of such species determined to be "critical."

CULTURAL RESOURCES

ANTIQUITY ACT (1906) Pub. L. 59-209, 34 Stat. 225, 16 USC 431-433

Provides for the protection of all historic and prehistoric ruins or monuments on Federal lands.

HISTORIC SITES ACT (1935) Pub. L. 74-292, 49 Stat. 666, 16 USC 461-467

Declares as national policy the preservation for public use of historic sites, buildings, and objects. Established the National Historic Landmarks program (the beginning of the National Register program).

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (1966) 16 USC 470, Pub. L. 89-665, 80 Stat. 915-919 as amended.

Provides for an expanded National Register of Historic Places to register districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant to American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture. Section 106 requires that the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation be afforded an opportunity to comment on any undertaking that adversely affects properties listed on the National Register.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11593: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT (1971) 16 USC 470

Requires that Federal plans and programs contribute to the preservation and enhancement of sites of historic, architectural, and archaeological significance.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (1974) 16 USC 469, Pub. L. 93-291 88 Stat.

Directs the preservation of historic and archaeological data that would otherwise be lost as a result of Federal construction or other Federally licensed or aided activities.

HAZARDOUS WASTES

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT (1976) 42 USC 6901-6987, Pub. L. 94-580, 90 Stat. 2795

Regulates the disposal of discarded materials and hazardous wastes. RCRA mandated the EPA to promulgate criteria for identifying hazardous waste (42 USC 6921), and establish standards to apply to waste generators (42 USC 6922) and transporters (42 USC 6923), as well as owners or operators of treatment, storage, or disposal facilities for hazardous wastes (42 USC 6924).

Regulates disposal with a Federal and state permit program.

COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE COMPENSATION AND LIABILITY ACT (CERCLA), OR "SUPERFUND ACT" (1980) 42 USC 9601-9615, 9631-9633, 9641, 9651-9657; 26 USC 4611-4612, 4661-4662, and 4681-4682; 33 USC 1364. Pub. L. 96-510 94 Stat. 2767.

Amended by Pub. L. 99-499, Title I, Para. 101, 114 (B), 127 (A).

Requires notification of any release into the environment of substances that may present substantial danger to public health or welfare or the environment (42 USC 96002 [a]). It is the primary mechanism for governmental response actions to spills, discharges, or release of any substance designated toxic or hazardous by other environmental statutes.

NOISE

NOISE CONTROL ACT (1972) 42 USC 4901-4918, Pub. L. 92-574, 86 Stat. 1234

Establishes noise emission performance standards for certain noise source products and subjects Federal facilities to state and local noise emission standards that apply to stationary sources.

WATER

CLEAN WATER ACT (1977) 33 USC 1251 et seq., 1311 et seq., Pub. L. 95-217, 91 Stat. 1566.

Restores and maintains the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters.

NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)

Regulates discharges into the nation's waters with a Federal permit program designed to reduce the amount of pollutants in each discharge via control point discharge. The primary requirement is compliance with effluent limitations for each point discharge source. The Act contains provisions that (1) require that the best available technology (BAT) be utilized by discharge applicants to prevent water pollution, (2) encourage conservation of nutrients and other natural resources, and (3) establish maximum levels for pollutants.

MARINE PROTECTION, RESEARCH, AND SANCTUARIES ACT (1972) 33 USC Section 1401 et seq. Pub. L. 93-254, 86 Stat. 1052 Amended 1974

More commonly referred to as the "Ocean Dumping Act," this law regulates the dumping of dredging wastes, industrial chemicals, and sewage sludge into the ocean environment.

ENVIRONMENT (GENERAL)

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (1969) 42 USC 4321, 4331-4335, 4341-4347, Pub. L. 91-190, 83 Stat. 852

Amended by Pub. L. 94-475, 90 Stat. 2071 (1976)

Requires Federal agencies to consider environmental issues under NEPA just as they consider other matters within their mandate. Environmental issues must be considered in the decision-making process.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REGULATIONS ON IMPLEMENTING NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT PROCEDURES (1978) 40 CFR 1500-1508; 43 FR 55990

Corrected by 44 FR 873 (1979) Amended by 51 FR 15625 (1986)

Regulations are binding on all Federal agencies, replacing earlier sets of agency regulations, and provide uniform standards applicable throughout the Federal Government for conducting environmental reviews. Regulations are designed to ensure that the action-forcing procedures of Section 102(2) of NEPA are used by agencies to fulfill the requirements of the policy set forth in Section 101 of the Act.

Section 101 states that "it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with state and local governments, and other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans."

Section 102(2)(C) states that all agencies of the Federal Government shall include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on:

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,
(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,
(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,
(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and
(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented

APPENDIX B

SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS AT PROPOSED HEDI TEST INSTALLATIONS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE B-1 page 1 of 2	SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER			REFERENCES
PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS	FACILITIES	BASE SIZE	15,816 hectares (39,081 acres), main laboratory is a 1,214-hectare (3,000-acre) fenced compound	29, 33, 45
		BASE FACILITIES	1,214-hectare (3,000-acre) fenced main laboratory area, 1,829-meter (6,000-foot) airstrip, test and administration buildings, recreation areas, 1,619-hectare (4,000-acre) Wood's Reservoir	33, 45
		TEST FACILITIES	40 aerodynamic and propulsion wind tunnels, 11 rocket and turbine engine test cells, 4 ballistic and impact ranges, 2 arc heaters, and 4 space environment chambers	33, 45
	ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS	NATURAL RESOURCES	Wood cutting permits are sold to the general public for cutting firewood in designated areas. The Wildlife Management Program restocks fish in Wood's Reservoir. Recreational facilities for base personnel and the general public are available at the Reservoir. 567 hectares (1,400 acres) are under sharecropper permits with local farmers.	29, 33, 41
		PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	No public health and safety issues have been identified.	40
		SPECIAL STATUS	Federally listed endangered species are the gray bat, Indiana bat, and the red-cockaded woodpecker. There are two designated wetlands, but no designated historic or archaeological sites.	19, 29, 33, 40, 41, 47
		NOISE	Work at Arnold Engineering Development Center creates noise in excess of safety levels within the test areas. The noise problems are minimized by a 2,428-hectare (6,000-acre) dense pine plantation, the distance of the site from the nearest town, selective scheduling of operations, and mufflers for facility exhausts. Tests are of short duration and are conducted after duty hours.	29, 33, 34, 37, 40
OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (BASE)	STAFFING	Civilian = 210, Military = 148, Contractor = 3,450 (June 1988)	44
		PAYROLL	Military = $6,856,660; Civil Service = $6,835,603; 3 operating contractors = $106,664,210 (Sept 30, 1987)	44
		HOUSING	Officer = 24, NCO = 16, Transient = 47 (1986)	28, 44
	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (REGIONAL)	POPULATION/ EMPLOYMENT	Coffee County has an estimated 1986 population of 41,300 persons, which is almost an 8% increase over 1980 population totals of 38,311 persons. Coffee County had a 1984 total civilian labor force of 21,163 persons and an 8.7% unemployment rate. Franklin County has an estimated 1986 population of 33,700 persons, which is almost a 5.5% increase over 1980 population totals of 31,983. Franklin County had a 1984 total civilian labor force of 12,965 persons and a 10.9% unemployment rate.	8
		INCOME	Coffee County has a per capita income of $9,171 (1985), which is a 49% increase over the 1981 figure of $6,153, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $16,516. Franklin County has a per capita income of $8,113 (1985), which is a 46% increase over the 1981 figure of $5,544, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $15,576.	8
		HOUSING	Coffee County has a total of 14,967 year-round housing units. Franklin County has a total of 11,570 year-round housing units.	6

TABLE B-1 page 2 of 2		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER		REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS (Cont.)	INFRASTRUCTURE	ELECTRICITY	Demand: 463,806,720 kWh/year at a cost of $21,238,000. Supplied by Tennessee Valley Authority; capacity is undetermined.	43
		SOLID WASTE	Construction debris is disposed of in an on-base landfill; other waste has been removed by a contractor to an off-base landfill in the City of Tullahoma. This landfill is now closed; a landfill site in the City of Winchester will be used in the future.	43
		SEWAGE TREATMENT	Design capacity for main plant = 232,000 gallons/day Current use averages 200,000 gallons/day Pumping capacity is 1 million gallons/day	35, 36
		TRANS-PORTATION	Interstate 24 and other Federal and state highways provide a good network of roads and access points for the base. There is, however, the potential for traffic congestion during rush hour periods.	29, 47
		WATER SUPPLY	Demand = 1.07 million gallons/day Capacity = 2.50 million gallons/day	36
PERMIT STATUS		AIR	There are currently 27 PSD permits; the base is in compliance with all air quality permits.	29, 37, 40, 46
		WASTE WATER	There are NPDES permits for cooling water, the sewage treatment plant, housing, the airfield, and the rocket preparation areas. Wastewater permits are in compliance.	40, 46
		HAZARDOUS WASTE	There is a temporary storage facility for hazardous waste. The base submitted an RCRA Part B in August 1985 and is awaiting public notification. It was recently inspected by the state Department of Health and Environment, July 19, 1988; they found no violations. Materials are stored on base, then transported and disposed of by the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office.	46, 48
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION		Environmental Compliance Plan still under development; Base Master Plan currently under revision; Existing EA; formal EA for AEDC Operations, revision of February 1977, currently undergoing another revision; EA for Elk Resource Recovery Facility, AEDC; 1984 Environmental Quality Program, Arnold AFB; Environmental Statement, National Guard Use of AEDC, April 1972; Environmental Impact of Noise from the Proposed AEDC High Reynolds Number Tunnel, March 1973.		29, 33, 34, 37, 40
COMMENTS		The Earth Technology Corporation recently conducted an audit of environmental compliance. All permits are in compliance.		46

TABLE B-2 page 1 of 2		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		REFERENCES
PHYSICAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	FACILITIES	BASE SIZE	2.692 hectares (6,654 acres)	53
		BASE FACILITIES	Storage and maintenance facilities, work facilities to open and rework missiles. There is a single 4,115-meter (13,500 foot) class B runway. There are 1,284 buildings, including maintenance shops and hangars, administration, operations, warehouses, training, community, recreation, housing, testing and fuel storage, a 35-bed hospital, exchanges and shops. 70% of Hill AFB is reserved for munitions storage and flightline/airfield-related activities.	2, 3, 52, 60
		TEST FACILITIES	Test firing range is approximately 161 kilometers (100 miles) from the base. Ogden Air Logistics Center, 2701st Explosive Ord. Disposal, 6514th test squadron	3, 60
	ENVIRON-MENTAL CONDITIONS	NATURAL RESOURCES	No known minerals, oil or gas reserves, or forest land. Land use: grazing, agriculture, recreation.	55, 70, 71
		PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	No significant public health and safety issues have been identified.	52
		SPECIAL STATUS	No known cultural resources. There are four threatened or endangered species within a 20-kilometer (12-mile) radius of Hill AFB. Endangered: *the peregrine falcon and the bald eagle. Threatened: the spotted bat and the steptoe dace.*	55, 70, 71
		NOISE	There are no noise problems.	52, 55, 68
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (BASE)	STAFFING	Military: 5,100 Civilian: 15,300 (as of 1988)	2, 3
		PAYROLL	Total payroll: $586 million (1988)	2
		HOUSING	Housing on base is available for military personnel: 263 officer, 882 NCO, 45 transient. Additional housing is also available in the Ogden area.	2, 3
	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (REGIONAL)	POPULA-TION/EM-PLOYMENT	Davis County has an estimated 1986 population of 180,100 persons, which is an almost 23% increase over 1980 population totals of 146,450 persons. Davis County had a 1982 total civilian labor force of 66,793 persons and a 5.9% unemployment rate. Weber County has an estimated 1986 population of 158,800 persons, which is almost a 10% increase over 1980 population totals of 144,616 persons. Weber County had a 1982 total civilian labor force of 67,860 persons and an 8.6% unemployment rate.	7
		INCOME	Davis County has a per capita income of $8,761 (1985), which is almost a 40% increase over the 1981 figure of $6,275, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $21,948. Weber County has a per capita income of $9,250 (1985), which is almost a 41% increase over the 1981 figure of $6,585, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $19,748.	7
		HOUSING	*Davis County has a total of 41,549 year-round housing units. Weber County* has a total of 50,294 year-round housing units.	6

TABLE B-2 page 2 of 2		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS HILL AIR FORCE BASE		REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS (Cont.)	INFRASTRUCTURE	ELECTRICITY	Capacity: 192,928,000 kWh/month	66
		SOLID WASTE	On the average 11,100 tons/year is removed to the North Davis County landfill off base.	54, 66
		SEWAGE TREATMENT	The North Davis County Sewage District treats the 832,286,000 gallons/year of sewage generated by Hill AFB. Industrial waste is pretreated in an Industrial Waste Pretreatment Plant so that it is brought up to standards prior to being released into the municipal system.	52, 54, 66, 71
		TRANSPORTATION	There are five gates; three are open 24 hours and two are open during shift hours. The main gate is accessed from Interstate 15. Most people travel by car, although the Utah Transit Authority does provide public transportation between the base and the Ogden/Salt Lake City area; car and van pools are popular.	66
		WATER SUPPLY	Most water is pumped from wells on base. Some water is purchased.	54, 56, 66, 71
PERMIT STATUS		AIR	Hill AFB is in a nonattainment area for ozone and carbon monoxide. There are no PSD permits. The state has a monitoring system off base.	52, 61, 70, 71
		WASTE WATER	Base has NPDES permits. Water released into local sewage systems must meet water quality standards.	52, 71
		HAZARDOUS WASTE	Hill AFB was placed on the National Priorities List on October 1984. The listing currently cites ten areas of hazardous waste disposal which cover a total area of 22 hectares (54 acres). The base is participating in the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) which identifies, evaluates, and controls the migration of hazardous contaminants from hazardous waste sites.	63, 64, 65, 67, 70, 71
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION		No environmental compliance plan available. Base Master Plan (under contract for revision), Bed Down EIS- for F16 at Hill AFB-'78, EIS to establish Gandy supersonic air space at UTTR- Oct. '84		55
COMMENTS				

TABLE B-3 page 1 of 2		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS NATIONAL TEST FACILITY, FALCON AIR FORCE BASE		REFERENCES
PHYSICAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	FACILITIES	BASE SIZE	259 hectares (640 acres)	2
		BASE FACILITIES	Administrative offices, communications network, medical aid station	2, 3, 78
		TEST FACILITIES	Advanced communications network capabilities	78
	ENVIRON-MENTAL CONDITIONS	NATURAL RESOURCES	There are no known minerals, ores, forests, or other natural resources on the National Test Facility. The facility does overlie the Laramie-Fox Hills aquifer.	78, 80
		PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	No significant public health and safety issues have been identified.	75
		SPECIAL STATUS	No threatened or endangered species have been reported at the National Test Facility. Although three pre-historic isolated finds were made at the National Test Facility, none were considered significant by the Colorado State Office of Historic Preservation. No other cultural resources have been identified.	78, 80, 82
		NOISE	The current ambient noise level is within acceptable limits.	78, 79
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (BASE)	STAFFING	Military = 1,200 (active duty); Civilian = 2,088 (1988, at Falcon Air Force Base) Upon completion, the new National Test Facility will employ approximately 2,700 people.	1, 84
		PAYROLL	Available payroll figures are for the Peterson AFB complex as a whole (Peterson AFB, Falcon AFB, Cheyenne Mountain, and the Federal Building in downtown Colorado Springs). Payroll data for individual units are not kept.	84
		HOUSING	There is no housing at Falcon Air Force Base. Nearby Peterson AFB has available on-base housing. Housing is also provided off base in the Colorado Springs area.	3, 78
	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (REGIONAL)	POPULA-TION/EM-PLOYMENT	El Paso County has an estimated 1986 population of 380,400 persons, which is almost a 23% increase over 1980 population totals of 309,424 persons. El Paso County had a 1984 total civilian labor force of 163,883 persons and an unemployment rate of 5.4%.	7
		INCOME	El Paso County has a per capita income of $10,855 (1985), which is a 54% increase over the 1981 figure of $7,027, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $18,729.	7
		HOUSING	El Paso County has a total of 116,770 year-round housing units.	6

TABLE B-3 page 2 of 2		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS NATIONAL TEST FACILITY, FALCON AIR FORCE BASE		REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS (Cont.)	INFRASTRUCTURE	ELECTRICITY	The peak daily demand of the Consolidated Space Operations Center and the National Test Facility is 13,110 kWh/day. The existing substation on Falcon AFB is capable of providing 15,000 kWh/day, with the capacity to expand to 25,000 kWh/day. The Colorado Springs area is more than capable of supplying additional demands expected by facility expansion.	75, 78
		SOLID WASTE	Solid waste is disposed off site at a licensed landfill by a private contractor. Additional solid waste generation is expected to be minor.	78, 79, 82
		SEWAGE TREATMENT	Design capacity = 0.069 million gallons/day; designed to support 2,300 base personnel. Modification of the sewage facility will be necessary for the increased staff. Current waste-water facilities need to be expanded by 0.124 million gallons/day to accommodate the additional waste generated by the new facility. Sewage treatment plant expansion will begin in the spring of 1989.	75, 78, 79, 82
		TRANS-PORTATION	Access to Falcon AFB provided by State Highway 94 and Enoch Road. Current traffic at SH94 = 3,500 vehicles/day, capacity = 16,000 vehicles/day (as of 1987). Current traffic at Enoch Road = 1,550 vehicles/day, capacity = 11,300 vehicles/day.	78, 82
		WATER SUPPLY	The Cherokee Water District 's contract with Falcon AFB limits the delivery of water to 0.479 million gallons per day. Existing peak water demands at the installation are estimated at 0.409 million gallons per day. Presently supporting approximately 2,500, the existing water supply could support 6,000.	74, 75, 78
PERMIT STATUS		AIR	This area is in attainment by Colorado standards (Falcon AFB is outside the Colorado Springs nonattainment areas for carbon monoxide and total suspended particulates).	78, 79, 82
		WASTE WATER	NPDES permit under revision; the present wastewater treatment plant is being modified.	75, 78, 82
		HAZARDOUS WASTE	Potential hazardous wastes: electrolytes, sodium hydroxide, sodium sulphide, dichlorodifluoromethane, sulfur dioxide, SSP-55, all in very small amounts; offsite disposal by the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office.	79, 81
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION		Environmental Compliance Assessments and Management Program, 1988. The Base Comprehensive Plan is being developed and is expected to be completed in 1989. Current EA: National Test Bed Program, 1987; Final Environmental Impact Statement, Consolidated Space Operations Center, January 1981.		75, 76, 78, 80
COMMENTS		National Test Facility has a categorical exclusion for the interim National Test Facility as stated in document 813 (control #AFSPC 86-1) dated 8-12-86. Data are for Falcon Air Force Base, unless otherwise noted.		77, 86

TABLE B-4 page 1 of 2		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER		REFERENCES
PHYSICAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	FACILITIES	BASE SIZE	NSWC=2,057 hectares (5,083 acres) (White Oak = 295 hectares [729 acres])	88
		BASE FACILITIES	149,040 square meters (1,604,302 square feet) of research, development, training, and education facilities; 28,125 square meters (302,745 square feet) of administrative buildings; and 108,343 square meters (1,166,234 square feet) of various other buildings.	88
		TEST FACILITIES	Four wind tunnels, explosive test facilities, a robotics research and development laboratory, various weapons evaluation facilities, biological and chemical laboratory facilities, explosive test facilites, acoustic and hydro-acoustic facilities. Tunnel 9 will be used for HEDI testing.	88
	ENVIRON-MENTAL CONDITIONS	NATURAL RESOURCES	There are no natural resources.	104
		PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	No public health and safety issues have been identified.	91
		SPECIAL STATUS	There are no known Federally listed endangered species. There are no recorded historical or archaeological sites.	104
		NOISE	Noise is not of concern because testing areas are scattered and sufficiently buffered by thick hardwood forest. There have been no recent public complaints.	104
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (BASE)	STAFFING	Total employees = 5,196 Military = 107; Civilian = 5,089 (Figures include White Oak and Dahlgren). White Oak alone employs approximately 1,900 staff.	98, 103
		PAYROLL	Payroll not available, but estimated total budget = FY 1988 - $639.6 million FY 1989 - $684.4 million	88
		HOUSING	There are only four on-base housing units for military personnel. No other on-base housing is available. Adequate housing provided for in the Silver Springs area within the greater Washington D.C. metropolitan area.	105
	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (REGIONAL)	POPULA-TION/EM-PLOYMENT	Montgomery County has an estimated 1986 population of 665,200 persons, which is almost a 15% increase over 1980 population totals of 579,053 persons. Montgomery County had a 1982 total civilian labor force of 335,308 persons and a 3.9% unemployment rate. Prince Georges County has an estimated 1986 population of 681,400 persons, which is almost a 2.4% increase over 1980 population totals of 665,071 persons. Prince Georges County had a 1982 total civilian labor force of 392,677 persons and a 5.8% unemployment rate.	8
		INCOME	Montgomery County has a per capita income of $19,589 (1985), which is almost a 59% increase over the 1981 figure of $12,335, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $33,702. Prince Georges County has a per capita income of $13,067 (1985), which is almost a 52% increase over the 1981 figure of $8,616, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $25,525.	8
		HOUSING	Montgomery County has a total of 216,052 year-round housing units. Prince Georges County has a total of 236,339 year-round housing units.	6

TABLE B-4 page 2 of 2		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER		REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS (Cont.)	INFRASTRUCTURE	ELECTRICITY	Electricity is supplied by Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO). Demand is well within the capacity established by PEPCO.	94, 96
		SOLID WASTE	Solid waste is removed and disposed off base by Superior Services. In the past, on-base landfills were used but these are now closed and are being monitored for leakage.	92, 94
		SEWAGE TREATMENT	The base at one time had its own sewage treatment plant, which has been closed within the last 10 years. Sewage is now treated off base by the Washington D.C. Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC). The WSSC will accept up to 150,000 gallons per day from NSWC, White Oak.	87, 94, 96
		TRANS-PORTATION	There are a limited number of access points to the base. Traffic congestion is a problem, characteristic of the greater Washington D.C. metropolitan area.	94, 97
		WATER SUPPLY	The base is connected to the municipal system (WSSC), with no measurable limit on demand or capacity.	94, 96
PERMIT STATUS		AIR	There are no PSD permits. The state presently monitors emissions; there have been no violations. Emissions by NSWC are varied but in small quantities.	94, 99
		WASTE WATER	NPDES permits are in place for industrial discharges.	87, 94
		HAZARDOUS WASTE	The Center operates with an interim permit from EPA from the State of Maryland. Almost every type of hazardous waste is generated. A private contractor transports waste off base to sites in Emelle, Alabama or to the Chicago area for disposal, storage, or incineration.	87, 100
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION	No EAs or EISs have been performed. There is a Hazardous Waste Management Plan, which was updated in 1986. The base master plan is currently being updated; the last update was in 1970.			93, 100, 101
COMMENTS				

TABLE B-5 page 1 of 2	SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES			REFERENCES
PHYSICAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	FACILITIES	BASE SIZE	Within the Kirtland AFB boundaries, 20,168 hectares (49,835 acres) have been set aside for the five areas of Sandia National Laboratories.	3, 108
		BASE FACILITIES	Sandia consists of 5 technical areas and some remote environmental test areas. There are laboratories, administrative offices, libraries, shops, housing, plants and testing facilities, medical facilities, parks, museums, and recreational facilities.	107, 108, 110
		TEST FACILITIES	There are five technical testing areas and several remote environmental labs with distinctive operations, including: I. Research and Development of weapons systems II. Explosive Testing III. Environmental Testing (Sled Tracks, Centrifuges, Radiant Heat Facility) IV. Inertial Confinement Fusion Research: Pulsed Power Research V. Electron Beam Accelerators, Hot Cell Facilities A Strategic Defense Facility under construction will provide laboratory space that will enable Sandia to conduct experimental research leading toward future U.S. Strategic Defense Systems.	107, 110
	ENVIRON-MENTAL CONDITIONS	NATURAL RESOURCES	Sandia, through the Department of Energy, has use permits for areas of the Cibola National Forest controlled by the U.S. Forest Service and the Air Force.	111
		PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	Safety risks include: fire, explosion, release of toxic and radiological materials, aircraft crashes, electrical failures, and high-power microwave emissions.	107
		SPECIAL STATUS	Although a number of threatened or endangered species are known to occur in Bernalillo County, habitat requirements make it unlikely that they exist within the area of the Sandia Labs. Species known to inhabit the area include: grama grass cactus, the bald eagle, the peregrine falcon, whooping crane, and meadow jumping mouse. Ground surveys have not encountered these species, but the birds may pass over the area while migrating. No cultural resources have been identified at Sandia Labs.	107, 108, 117
		NOISE	There are no reported noise problems.	107, 115
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (BASE)	STAFFING	Civilian = 7,268 employees (Oct. 1987)	112
		PAYROLL	Total payroll = $296 million (Sept. 1987)	112
		HOUSING	Housing is provided off base within the City of Albuquerque.	112
	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (REGIONAL)	POPULATION/ EMPLOYMENT	Bernalillo County has an estimated 1986 population of 474,400 persons, which is almost a 13% increase over 1980 population totals of 420,262 persons. Bernalillo County had a 1982 total civilian labor force of 202,085 persons and an 8.3% unemployment rate.	7
		INCOME	Bernalillo County has a per capita income of $10,637 (1985), which is almost a 49% increase over the 1981 figure of $7,137, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $19,294.	7
		HOUSING	Bernalillo County has a total of 161,787 year-round housing units.	6

TABLE B-5 page 2 of 2		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES		REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS (Cont.)	INFRASTRUCTURE	ELECTRICITY	Electrical power is supplied by the Public Service Company of New Mexico through the 115 kV Eubank Switching Station and several substations. Peak daily capacity = 107 kW	108, 123
		SOLID WASTE	Solid waste is disposed of at the Kirtland AFB sanitary landfill.	116
		SEWAGE TREATMENT	Portions of the sewage treatment demand are handled by the Kirtland AFB and City of Albuquerque systems. The remaining sewage is treated by an on-base septic tank system.	108, 118
		TRANS-PORTATION	Access to the base is provided by Interstates 40 and 25 and a network of smaller roads. The road network is part of the greater Albuquerque metropolitan system and is capable of handling large volumes of traffic.	107
		WATER SUPPLY	Sandia's principle source of water is the Santa Fe group aquifers. Daily demand = 1 million gallons Daily delivery dapacity = 3 million gallons Several large storage tanks exist. Groundwater monitoring gives no indication of groundwater pollution.	107, 110, 123
PERMIT STATUS		AIR	Sandia Laboratories is located within a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide because of vehicle emissions.	121
		WASTE WATER	There are no NPDES permits. Sandia is covered by the State of New Mexico. Liquid sanitary waste from Area I is discharged into the Kirtland AFB sewage system.	108, 110, 115
		HAZARDOUS WASTE	Sandia has an RCRA Part A permit to operate a temporary storage facility. They have applied to the State of New Mexico for an RCRA Part B permit.	110, 116
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION		EIA - Sandia Labs, Albuquerque (1977) Environmental Monitoring Report 1988 EA Strategic Defense Facilitiy 1987		107, 108, 110
COMMENTS		Sandia submitted a wastewater discharge permit application to the City of Albuquerque liquid waste division in August 1986.		107

TABLE B-6 page 1 of 4			SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS U.S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL - KWAJALEIN ISLAND*	REFERENCES
PHYSICAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	FACILITIES	BASE SIZE	Approximately 100 component islands in Kwajalein Atoll, total land area = 1,560 hectares (3,854 acres); USAKA (11 islands) = 529 hectares (1,306 acres); Kwajalein Island = 303 hectares (749 acres)	139
		BASE FACILITIES	Operational facilities (Communication/Navigation/Liquid Fueling/Helicopter Pad) airfield with 2,057x 60 meter (6,750 x 200 foot) runway; maintenance facilities; utilities and grounds improvements; supply facilities; medical facilities; housing - accompanied and unaccompanied; administrative facilities; marine terminal facilities; schools.	139, 144
		TEST FACILITIES	Research and Development and Test Facilities that include: tracking radar, optical instrumentation, telemetry facilities, multiple launch facilities, satellite communications.	139, 167
	ENVIRON-MENTAL CONDITIONS	NATURAL RESOURCES	Coconut harvesting and operation of fisheries. Mineral deposits of limited quantity exist on the Marshall Islands, but not on Kwajalein Island.	140
		PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	Radar and microwave installations are governed by Technical Bulletin: Medical 523 (July 1980), as amended by Technical Guide No. 153, U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (April 1987) and by USAKA Regulation 385-3. Aircraft landing sites have a clear zone that extends 152 meters (500 feet) from the runway centerline.	155
		SPECIAL STATUS	One endangered species, the hawksbill turtle, one threatened species, the green sea turtle, and one rare species, the giant clam. Turtles have been observed at the southwestern end of Kwajalein Island but they have not been seen nesting on Kwajalein Island. Existing parks and sanctuaries are either privately owned or operated by the local authorities. A marine survey now in draft form addresses the marine habitat. The original Island of Kwajalein is on the National Register of Historic Places. Prehistoric sites on the island are up to 2,000 years old. Separate USAKA EIS studies will address the marine habitat and cultural resources in detail.	144, 155, 172, 174
		NOISE	The primary noise sources on USAKA are aircraft, power plants, and heavy equipment. The locations of facilities (i.e., the power plant) and their distance from possibly affected areas precludes most noise problems. Workers in noise-risk facilities are required to wear hearing protection.	155, 191
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (BASE)	STAFFING	Employees: 1,892 Total USAKA population: 2,972 (as of December 1988) Dependents: 1,080	164
		PAYROLL	Total USAKA military and civilian payroll: $4,501,000 annually. At a minimum, $60 million were earned by USAKA contract employees in 1988 (based on RMI 5% income tax receipts of $3.3 million from residents of USAKA recorded in 1988).	142, 144, 186
		HOUSING	There are 425 existing family housing units. There are 1,240 barracks/dormitory spaces, 150 transient units on base, and 254 trailers.	139, 191
	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (REGIONAL)	POPULATION/ EMPLOYMENT	In 1985 Ebeye had a population of 7,875 persons and in 1982 had a full-time employment level of 996 persons.	7
		INCOME	Not available.	
		HOUSING	Ebeye has a total of 602 housing units. 1988 Ebeye housing data are presently being analyzed.	6, 144

*Data presented are for Kwajalein Island only, unless otherwise noted.

TABLE B-6 page 2 of 4		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS U.S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL - KWAJALEIN ISLAND		REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS (Cont.)	INFRASTRUCTURE	ELECTRICITY	Electricity is supplied by diesel generators; Power plant #1 capacity = 13,500 kW, Power plant #2 capacity = 4,800 kW, peak demand on Kwajalein Island = 11,600 kW. A new power plant is being built (Power Plant 1-A) that will increase capacity by 10 megawatts by 1991.	130, 139, 187
		SOLID WASTE	Metal wastes were previously transported by barge to an authorized deep water dumping site 2.1 miles off shore. Wastes were dumped into 1,000 fathoms of water. The last deep water dump was in 1984. Other solid waste is incinerated and placed in sanitary landfills. Wet waste is taken to a landfill where it is carried out to sea at high tide. A Waste Disposal Plan is now being developed as a part of the forthcoming 1989 EIS.	130, 155, 187
		SEWAGE TREATMENT	The design capacity of the sewage treatment plant on Kwalajein Island is 450,000 gallons/day.	139, 155
		TRANSPORTATION	The sea transportation network provides inter-island movement of cargo and passengers, and logistical support. On Kwajalein Island, there are 21 kilometers (13 miles) of paved road and 300 vehicles with no vehicular congestion. Workers from Ebeye are brought over by ferry. Air transportation is available on Kwajalein Island. Bicycles are the principal mode of personal transportation.	139, 144, 191
		WATER SUPPLY	Potable water systems on Kwajalein Island include two primary water sources, a rainwater catchment system, and a groundwater lens well system. Reverse osmosis units have been used in the past and a freshwater production facility is scheduled for completion in 1990. The average supply of catchment water is 8.8 million gallons per month (assuming 100% capture in the catchment areas) and the estimated monthly sustainable yield from the groundwater lens well system is 4.2 million gallons per month (when average rainfall [105 inches] occurs). Because the amount of rainfall can vary, droughts can occur; during these droughts, stringent water conservation measures are employed. Total water supply is approximately 433,000 gallons per day; average water consumption per day is 250,000 gallons. Most of the outer islands are too small to provide additional water, but Meck, Roi Namur, and Ennylabegan have small catchment systems that can provide water, if needed.	130, 139, 144, 155
PERMIT STATUS		AIR	Air pollution is currently not a problem because of the constant tradewinds, the island's low profile, and lack of constraining factors. Air pollutants are generated from transportation, range operations, power plant generators, dust, and waste incineration. Power plant generators are the major source for particulates, sulfur oxides, and nitrogen oxides. Estimates of power plant emissions have shown emissions approaching the limits of EPA standards for nitrogen oxides. Six of the nine diesel engines of Power Plant 1 have been rebuilt to help decrease these levels.	130, 152, 155, 172, 185
		WASTE WATER	The wastewater treatment plant is currently operating near design capacity.	142
		HAZARDOUS WASTE	Known hazardous wastes on Kwajalein: PCB's, solvents, asbestos, hydrazine fuel. The base hazardous waste plan is in the draft stage. No storage facilities are currently available.	130, 184, 185
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION	EIA, Kwajalein Missile Range Operations, 1980; EA, Family Housing Dwellings, 1986; Facility Requirements for HEDI, Meck Island, 1987; Record of Environmental Consideration, Airborne Optical Adjunct, 1985; EA Power Plant Upgrade, Kwajalein Island, 1987. Draft Master Plan Report: Concept Plans, Future Development Plans and Utilities Analyses (Draft), May 1988. Analysis of Existing Facilities, 1988; Facilities Requirement Evaluation, May 1988.			133, 134, 139, 152, 154, 155, 172, 174
COMMENTS	U.S. operations on the Kwajalein Atoll must comply with all NEPA standards. It is the responsibility of the user agency to make sure standards are met. It is a local USAKA policy to recover all reentry vehicle debris that lands in the Kwajalein Lagoon.			166, 180, 184

TABLE B-6 Page 3 of 4		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS U. S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL - MECK ISLAND*		REFERENCES
PHYSICAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	FACILITIES	BASE SIZE	22.3 hectares (55 acres)	155
		BASE FACILITIES	Helipad; missile launch facilities; production and construction shops; mess hall; miscellaneous buildings that house fire protection equipment, power production, and water storage; a boat ramp and dock facilities.	155, 171
		TEST FACILITIES	Systems Technology Test Facility Missile Site Radar (MSR) Test Tower	139, 171
	ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS	NATURAL RESOURCES	None	155
		PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	Live-explosive storage facilities and fuels associated with launch facilities.	155
		SPECIAL STATUS	Cultural Resources: No evidence for any surface or subsurface cultural remains was found during archaeological survey and testing of the entire island in 1989. Threatened and Endangered Species: None	143, 155
		NOISE	Noise sources on Meck Island are associated with aircraft, power generation, and launch facility activities.	155
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	SOCIOECONOMICS	STAFFING	Staffing is dependent on current operations.	155
		PAYROLL	Total USAKA military and civilian payroll: $4,501,000 annually. At a minimum, $60 million were earned by USAKA contract employees in 1988 (based on RMI 5% income tax receipts of $3.3 million from residents of USAKA recorded in 1988).	142, 144, 186
		HOUSING	Contractor provided trailers for construction only.	132

*Data presented are for Meck Island only, unless otherwise noted.

TABLE B-6 page 4 of 4		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS U.S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL - MECK ISLAND		REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS (Cont.)	INFRASTRUCTURE	ELECTRICITY	Five 565-kW diesel engines.	142
		SOLID WASTE	Construction debris, landscape waste, and miscellaneous trash is concentrated into piles in various locations around the island for future burning and/or in situ burial.	157
		SEWAGE TREATMENT	Meck Island has one septic tank/leach field; current practice is to bury the tank pumpings on the island.	157
		TRANS-PORTATION	Access to Meck Island is by boat or helicopter only. Ground transportation is predominantly by bicycle.	155
		WATER SUPPLY	Meck Island has a potable water system and an abandoned nonpotable salt water system. Potable water is provided by a 50,990-square-foot rainwater catchment located adjacent to the runway. Water from the catchment is stored in two tanks (a third is being added) (251,000 gallons and 502,000 gallons) prior to treatment (filtration and chlorination) and distribution. During the dry season, fresh water consumption exceeds the amount of rainwater obtainable from catchments. In order not to deplete the stored supply, fresh water is drawn from the lens wells on Kwajalein Island.	155, 171
PERMIT STATUS		AIR	Air pollution is not currently a problem because of the prevailing northeasterly winds, the island's low profile, and a lack of constraining factors.	171
		WASTE WATER	Wastewater is handled through the septic tank/leach field system.	157
		HAZARDOUS WASTE	Hazardous wastes on Meck Island associated with launch facilities include hypergolic fuels and various solvents (trichloroethane, etc.). No storage facilities are currently available.	157
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION	Analysis of existing facilities U.S. Army Strategic Command, U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Marshall Islands, 1988; Master Plan Report: Concept Plans, Future Development Plans And Utilities Analyses. U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, May 1988; Economic Development in the Marshall Islands, 1984; Environmental Assessment, Homing Overlay Experiment Program, 1979.			139, 155, 167, 171
COMMENTS	Meck Island is a significant site with respect to the SDI missile defense program. On June 10, 1984, an interceptor missile was launched from Meck and successfully accomplished the first direct interception and nonnuclear destruction of an incoming warhead launched from Vandenberg AFB, thus initiating USAKA's role as the test site for the SDI missile defense program.			155

TABLE B-7 page 1 of 2		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE		REFERENCES
PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS	FACILITIES	BASE SIZE	39,822 hectares (98,400 acres)	2
		BASE FACILITIES	45-bed hospital, 6 on base electrical power plants, 2,428-hectare (6,000-acre) cantonment area, 35 missile launch sites, 4,572-meter (15,000-foot) runway	2, 206, 240
		TEST FACILITIES	Missile assembly buildings, missile launch pads, missile control building, tracking stations	240
	ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS	NATURAL RESOURCES	Proven on-base oil and gas reserves	206
		PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	Potential safety risks have been significantly reduced by setting up safety clear zones around storage and operations areas.	206
		SPECIAL STATUS	There are over 600 known cultural resources, mostly archaeological sites. One site is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and others may qualify. Federally listed endangered species include: the California brown pelican, California least tern, least Bell's vireo, American peregrine falcon, and the unarmored three-spine stickleback. The southern sea otter and the guadalupe fur seal are threatened species. There are no known threatened or endangered plant species on base. There are approximately 2,070 hectares (5,100 acres) of wetlands. The base also contains 56 kilometers (35 miles) of coastline, 267 kilometers (166 miles) of streams, 3,642 hectares (9,000 acres) of dune habitat, and 1,670 hectares (4,126 acres) of woodland.	206, 223, 236
		NOISE	The north part of the base is affected by missile launches, maintenance activities, and traffic. Noise levels in the cantonment area are typical of a residential area. The south part of the base is affected by launch facilities, traffic, and the Southern Pacific Railroad. There is a noise monitoring network on base. Noise reduction measures include rerouting project-related traffic and avoiding conducting flight tests during sleep hours.	202, 206
OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (BASE)	STAFFING	Military = 3,824 Civilian = 1,479 Contractor = 4,992 (1988)	2
		PAYROLL	Military and civilian $121.1 million; contractors $181.3 million (1988)	2
		HOUSING	On-base housing is provided for military personnel: Officer = 511 NCO = 1,567 Transient = 400 Mobile housing = 172 Off- base housing is available in the nearby communities of Lompoc and Santa Maria, and within surrounding Santa Barbara County.	2, 206
	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (REGIONAL)	POPULATION/EMPLOYMENT	Santa Barbara County has an estimated 1986 population of 339,400 persons, which is almost a 14% increase over 1980 population totals of 298,694 persons. Santa Barbara County had a 1984 total civilian labor force of 167,921 persons and a 5.9% unemployment rate.	7
		INCOME	Santa Barbara County had a per capita income of $12,611 (1985), which is an increase over the 1981 figure of $8,400, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $21,630.	7
		HOUSING	Santa Barbara County has a total of 123,476 year-round housing units.	6

TABLE B-7
page 2 of 2

SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS
VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE

				REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS (Cont.)	INFRASTRUCTURE	ELECTRICITY	Electricity is supplied by the PG&E Power Co. Peak demand is 550,000 kWh/day. Capacity is 580,000 kWh/day.	228, 236
		SOLID WASTE	Volume = 25,000 tons/year, capacity = 95,000 tons/year; disposed of at a class III landfill on base.	195, 227, 228
		SEWAGE TREATMENT	The design capacity of the off-site facility (serving the City of Lompoc, unincorporated areas surrounding Lompoc, and Vandenberg AFB) is 5 million gallons/day. An on-site system with a capacity of 3 million gallons/day treats waste from the cantonment area. In 1986 approximately 1 million gallons of sewage/day was produced on base.	202, 206
		TRANS-PORTATION	The road network on base has considerable excess capacity. The road network leading to the base is near or at capacity during peak traffic periods. Access to launch sites is restricted for several hours prior to launches.	206, 230
		WATER SUPPLY	Ten on-base wells supply all of Vandenberg's water needs. Demand = 6 million gallons per day The highest quality potable water is drawn from San Antonio Creek, which is currently being overdrawn by 11,000 acre-feet/year. The base is currently pulling out 3,400 acre-feet/year of the overdraw. Current water usage rate will deplete this local source in 50 years.	195, 206
PERMIT STATUS		AIR	Permits in place from the Air Pollution Control District authorize on-base construction and operations. The north portion of Santa Barbara County, which contains Vandenberg, is currently in nonattainment of air quality standards for ozone and particulates. There are two PSD monitoring stations on base.	195, 231, 233, 239
		WASTE WATER	NPDES permits are in place for 15 on-base sewage discharge locations.	235
		HAZARDOUS WASTE	Approximately 700 tons of hazardous waste are generated per year; all is disposed at an off-site facility by private contractor. Vandenberg has a short-term hazardous waste storage RCRA Part B permit issued by the California Department of Health Services.	195, 231, 232
ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION	There is a recent (1987) Draft EIS on oil and gas exploration at Vandenberg and existing EIS documents (1983, 1978) for MX missile and space shuttle launches from Vandenberg. Various quantity-distance requirement zones are part of safety regulations that restrict land use development on base.			202, 203, 204, 206, 208
COMMENTS	Missile launches have relatively little impact on air quality. Further drawdown of the aquifer could have an impact on aquatic and biologically dependent species of Barka Slough and San Antonio Creek.			206, 239

TABLE B-8 page 1 of 3			SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	REFERENCES
PHYSICAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	FACILITIES	BASE SIZE	The main range area is 161 kilometers (100 miles) long and 64 kilometers (40 miles) wide. The main range and the leased co-use areas comprise over 1.69 million hectares (4.2 million acres).	257
		BASE FACILITIES	Headquarters area, barracks, administrative office space, post offices, schools, medical clinic, recreational facilities, library, nursery, chapels, shops, maintenance shop, storage areas, laboratories, sewage treatment plant. Five airstrips, NASA site, Rhodes Canyon Range Center, Oscura Range Center, Stallion airfield, Oscura airfield with a 1,219 x 30 meter (4000 x 100 foot) airstrip, solid waste management area, hazardous waste storage, repair shops, technical buildings, and housing. There are thousands of structures on the range.	257
		TEST FACILITIES	Static test facilities, nuclear effects laboratory, south range launch facilities, small missile range, Air Force impact areas, artillery range, high energy laser facilities, up-range launch site, hazardous test area, test cell area, NASA test facility, RF radiation facility, vibration and temperature facilities, areas for testing Army missile systems, air defense fire distribution systems, and other material. Capable of testing tactical weapons systems, air defense systems, nonnuclear hazardous material. Test support includes launch support, telemetry, real-time and deferred time trajectory data, photo-optical coverage, and simplified recovery of test items. Also rain, humidity, and salt/fog test facilities.	257
	ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS	NATURAL RESOURCES	Most land is underdeveloped open range areas for grazing. There is an abundance of gypsum and dolomite. Numerous metal deposits and parts of two coal fields are within the installation boundaries. The resources are not economical to mine and market. The San Andres National Wildlife Refuge and a portion of the Jornada Experimental Range are within the installation boundaries.	257
		PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY	Potential safety risks include: fires, biologically harmful noise levels, potential ionizing radiation, RF radiation, and exposure to radioactive materials from missile fragmentation. Missile impact sites are monitored and decontaminated.	257, 288
		SPECIAL STATUS	There are many endangered, threatened, candidate, and sensitive species (refer to Appendix E). There are many historic and prehistoric sites scattered throughout the range (see Figures 2-14 and 2-15).	
		NOISE	Sources generating noise at harmful levels are monitored through various programs. Some identified noises cannot be eliminated, but measures have been implemented to prevent health effects from excessive levels. These measures include: identifying and posting noise hazard areas, providing hearing protection to personnel, and periodic audiometric testing. Some supersonic flights have been rerouted as well.	257, 258
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS	SOCIOECONOMICS (BASE)	STAFFING	Civilian : 4,487; Military : 1,209; Contractor : 3,759 Noontime population (on post): 10,908	268, 275
		PAYROLL	Civilian : $66,289,000; Military : $10,189,959; Contractor : No estimate available	268, 275
		HOUSING	Housing for military personnel available on base. Adequate off-base housing is available in the nearby communities of Las Cruces, El Paso, Alamogordo, and Socorro.	257

TABLE B-8 page 2 of 3		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE		REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS	SOCIO-ECONOMICS (REGIONAL)	POPULATION/EMPLOYMENT	Doña Ana County, New Mexico has an estimated 1986 population of 123,000 persons, which is almost a 28% increase over 1980 population totals of 96,340 persons. Doña Ana County had a 1982 total civilian labor force of 37,623 persons and a 9.6% unemployment rate. Otero County, New Mexico has an estimated 1986 population of 50,200 persons which is almost a 13% increase over 1980 population totals of 44,665 persons. Otero County had a 1982 total civilian labor force of 14,410 persons and an 8.0% unemployment rate. El Paso County, Texas has an estimated 1986 population of 561,500 persons, which is a 17% increase over 1980 population totals of 479,899 persons. El Paso County had a 1982 total civilian labor force of 190,343 persons and an 11.1% unemployment rate.	7
		INCOME	Doña Ana County has a per capita income of $7,881 (1986), which is almost a 49% increase over the 1981 figure of $5,284, and presemably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $14,914. Otero County has a per capita income of $7,967 (1985), which is almost a 48% increase over the 1981 figure of $5,379, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $14,711. El Paso County has a per capita income of $ 7,427 (1985), which is almost a 1% increase over the 1981 figure of $7,360, and presumably there is a similar increase over the 1979 median family income of $15,366.	7
		HOUSING	Doña Ana County has a total of 33,584 year-round housing units; Otero County has a total of 16,776 year-round housing units; and El Paso County has a total of 147,766 year-round housing units.	6
	INFRASTRUCTURE	ELECTRICITY	The El Paso Electric Company supplies 90% of the White Sands Missile Range's power. The remainder is supplied by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Elephant Butte hydroelectric plant.	257
		SOLID WASTE	Landfills are registered with the State of New Mexico, Environmental Improvement Division. There are landfills in Stallion, Rhodes Canyon, and North Oscura Peak, and a base-operated sanitary landfill approximately 3 miles east of the Main Post. In 1987, there were approximately 99,000 cubic yards of waste disposed. The trench method is used in the operation of the landfill. The Defense Property Disposal Office, located off base, also sponsors a waste recycling program.	257, 275
		SEWAGE TREATMENT	Designated capacity : 2.5 million gallons/day Current use : 600,000 gallons/day	275

TABLE B-8 Page 3 of 3		SELECTED ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE		REFERENCES
OPERATIONAL CHARACTER-ISTICS (Cont.)	INFRA-STRUCTURE	TRANS-PORTATION	The range has over 3,062 kilometers (1,903 miles) of roads, of which 1,252 kilometers (778 miles) are paved. U.S. Highway 70 (Las Cruces to Alamogordo) provides access to the range for most of the work force. Eight buses, operating 80-90%, go to the base from Las Cruces. On-range roads, including U.S. 70, may be blocked for up to 1 hour 20 minutes while certain tests are being conducted. Access to the headquarters area from El Paso is also provided along War Road to the south.	257, 275
		WATER SUPPLY	The main water supply is from 10 deep alluvial wells at the base headquarters area. The water table in the headquarters area is declining as a result of groundwater pumping. Additional groundwater sources near the headquarters area, in the Soledad Canyon reentrant, are being evaluated as a means to eliminate the current local overdraft situation. No groundwater contamination has been observed to date. Demand is 600,000 gallons/day Capacity is 1,000,000 gallons/day	248, 257, 275
PERMIT STATUS		AIR	No PSD permits. Air quality is very good in comparison with ambient air quality standards. Particulates, primarily a result of blowing dust, are the only real air pollutants of concern. Temporary air pollution may result from airplanes, helicopters, and rockets. No air pollution problems are known to occur from these sources.	257, 275
		WASTE WATER	No NPDES permits The range does have wastewater treatment systems.	257, 275
		HAZARDOUS WASTE	A cradle-to-grave management objective has been established for handling of hazardous waste materials for compliance with RCRA, TSCA, CERCLA, and Executive Order 12316, Responses to Environmental Damage. There are storage and transfer facilities on the range. Some hazardous or toxic wastes are: petroleum, oils, lubricants, liquid propellants, acids, PCB's, pesticides, and others. White Sands Missile Range has a spill prevention countermeasure and control plan, and a toxic and hazardous materials regulation is in effect. As of 1985, all toxic waste disposal was in compliance with EPA regulations.	257
COMMENTS		No survey has ever been done to record occurrence or populations of plants and animals. When firings are scheduled, residents and workers leave their homes and offices for a specified time. No overall compliance plan is available.		257, 268, 275, 287

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Environmental Office

2 1 OCT 1988

Mr. John Peterson
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ecological Services Division
3530 Pan American Highway, Suite D
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87101

Dear Mr. Peterson:

Enclosed for your review are two relevant sections of the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) project. The Project Description section provides an overview of the HEDI activities planned for several installations; pages 12, 16, and 18-24 address White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) phases. The second enclosure addresses project habitat and endangered species concerns for WSMR.

Concurrent requests for review have been sent to the New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and Natural Resources Department, Forestry Division, and the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish.

If you have technical questions regarding this project, contact Mr. Dru Barrineau, Project Proponent, at (205) 895-3632. Resource related questions may be directed to Daisan Taylor, Wildlife Biologist, at (505) 678-2224.

Since this project is operating under short funding deadlines, please send us your comments within two weeks if possible. Mr. Robert J. Andreoli, Chief, Environmental Office, may be contacted at (505) 678-2224 regarding any questions or comments involving your findings.

Sincerely,

FILE NAME: 1-HEDIFWS\TAB\19 OCT 88

EL-N RECORD COPY EL-N READ FILE EL READ FILE

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Milton L. Howell, Jr.
Colonel, U.S. Army
Director, Engineering
and Logistics

C-1

CONCURRENCES		
EL-U		
EL-N		

Enclosures

Environmental Office

19 OCT 1988

Mr. Andres Sandoval
New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
408 Galisteo Street
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

Dear Mr. Sandoval:

Enclosed for your review are two relevant sections of the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) project. The Project Description section provides an overview of the HEDI activities planned for several installations; pages 12, 16, and 18-24 address White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) phases. The second enclosure addresses project habitat and endangered species concerns for WSMR.

Concurrent requests for review have been sent to the New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and Natural Resources Department, Forestry Division, and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

If you have technical questions regarding this project, contact Mr. Dru Barrineau, Project Engineer, at (205)895-3632. Resource related questions may be directed to Daisan Taylor, Wildlife Biologist, at (505)678-2224.

Since this project is operating under short funding deadlines, please send us your comments within two weeks if possible. Mr. Robert J. Andreoli, Chief, Environmental Office, may be contacted at (505)678-2224 regarding any questions or comments involving your findings.

FILE NAME: I HEDI.LF Sincerely,
~~2 TUE\EXCEED~~\TAB\19 OCT 88

EL-N RECORD COPY EL-N READ FILE EL READ FILE

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Milton L. Howell, Jr.
Colonel, U.S. Army
Director, Engineering
and Logistics

CONCURRENCES		
EL-N		

Enclosure

2 1 OCT 1988

Environmental Office

Mr. Paul Knight
New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and
Natural Resources Department
Forestry Division, Resource Survey
408 Galisteo Street
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

Dear Mr. Knight:

Enclosed for your review are two relevant sections of the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) project. The Project Description section provides an overview of the HEDI activities planned for several installations; pages 12, 16, and 18-24 address White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) phases. The second enclosure addresses project habitat and endangered species concerns for WSMR.

Concurrent requests for review have been sent to the New Mexico Game and Fish Department, and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

If you have technical questions regarding this project, contact Mr. Dru Barrineau, Project Proponent, at (205) 895-3632. Resource related questions may be directed to Daisan Taylor, Wildlife Biologist, at (505) 678-2224.

Since this project is operating under short funding deadlines, please send us your comments within two weeks if possible. Mr. Robert J. Andreoli, Chief, Environmental Office, may be contacted at (505) 678-2224 regarding any questions or comments involving your findings.

Sincerely,

FILE NAME: 1-HEDIDNR\TAB\19 OCT 88

EL-N RECORD COPY EL-N READ FILE EL READ FILE

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
Milton L. Howell, Jr.
Colonel, U.S. Army
Director, Engineering, Housing
and Logistics

C-3

Enclosures.

CONCURRENCES		
ORG.	SIGNATURE	DATE
EL-N		
EL-N		
EL-N		

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Ecological Services
Suite D, 3530 Pan American Highway, NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87107

Cons. #2-22-88-I-005

November 15, 1988

Colonel Milton L. Howell
Director, Engineering, Housing and Logistics
U.S. Army White Sands Missile Range
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico 8800.-5076

Dear Colonel Howell:

This responds to your letter dated October 24, 1988 regarding the effects of the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor project at White Sands Missile Range on species Federally listed or proposed to be listed as threatened or endangered. We have also reviewed your Environmental Assessment for the project. The proposed action involves the flight testing of the Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor at White Sands Missile Range. Your geographic area of interest is east and north of Range headquarters and traverses portions of Otero and Dona Ana Counties, New Mexico.

We have used the information in your request to identify those species occurring in the project area which may be affected by your proposed action. Our data indicate no listed species would be affected by the proposed action.

This project has a flight path that crosses the San Andres National Wildlife Refuge, a refuge designed to protect the desert bighorn sheep. The current herd size is approximately 31 animals. The projected flight and fallout path will cover approximately one-third of the eastern and northern portions of the refuge. The Environmental Assessment has covered those steps that will be taken should it be necessary to recover debris from the test which may land on the refuge. The mitigation measures are adequate under the prescribed conditions listed in the report. The report identifies the period from March through May as the critical time for the bighorn sheep and we would reemphasize the fact that during lambing time as little disturbance as possible occur with this herd. Although the potential impacts from this project are minimal we are concerned with the fact that the project is aimed to fly over and impact a target area immediately adjacent to the refuge. This is the first time this type of action has occurred. We do have some concern that future operations may have more impact than this project on the refuge and the species it is designed to protect. In any event, we expect this project to have minimal impact on the refuge if it goes according to the outline. However, we suggest future projects be planned to avoid any impacts due to falling debris, particularly during the critical lambing season.

If we can be of further assistance, please call Mike Donahoo or Gerry Roehm at (505) 883-7877 or FTS 474-7877.

Sincerely yours,

John C. Peterson
Field Supervisor

cc:
Refuge Manager, San Andres National Wildlife Refuge, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Director, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico
Director, New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources, Forestry Division, Santa Fe, New Mexico
Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fish and Wildlife Enhancement, Albuquerque, New Mexico

M/L
EL-N

State of New Mexico

DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND FISH

VILLAGRA BUILDING
SANTA FE
87503

November 17, 1988

Colonel Milton L. Howell, Jr.
Director of Engineering, Housing and Logistics
Department of the Army
U.S. Army White Sands Missile Range
White Sands Missile Range, N. M. 88002-5076

Attn: STEWS-EL-N

Dear Colonel Howell:

The Department of Game and Fish has reviewed the draft environmental assessment (EA) for the High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) project. The proposed project will involve three (or possibly four) tests of the HEDI Kinetic Kill Vehicle Interceptor Technology Experiment (KITE 1-3) on White Sands Missile Range. Tests will begin in 1989, and are scheduled to occur annually during April-June.

The department concurs with the EA that detrimental impacts to most forms of wildlife and their habitat will be minimal. However, the department is concerned that the EA underestimates the potential negative impact that the tests may have on the state-endangered desert bighorn sheep located on the San Andres National Wildlife Refuge (SANWR) and adjacent areas.

The desert bighorn sheep population in the San Andres Mountains is delicately balanced between survival and extinction. Given this, our agencies must continue to take all prudent measures to protect and thus recover the bighorn sheep population to viable status. Within the scope of the current project, the means to best protect the sheep would be to alter the proposed trajectory of the HEDI KITE such that impact and debris fall-out would not occur on the SANWR. However, should this action not be possible, we recommend that

the Department of the Army employ flexibility in setting testing and debris recovery dates.

The proposed testing period (April-June) coincides with the peak of the lambing season for the desert bighorn sheep. The bulk of reproduction usually occurs from February through April, but may begin as early as December and end as late as June. Disturbance to the sheep during lambing could jeopardize lamb survival and therefore recruitment and the overall stability of the herd. Considering the sensitivity of this period for the sheep and the tenuous status of this particular population, the department recommends that testing be postponed until completion of the lambing season. Specific dates for testing should be established through coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service who will be able to provide location and reproduction information on the desert bighorn sheep population. This procedure should also be followed for any debris retrieval efforts, and for all activities occurring within the range of the desert bighorn sheep.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the EA for the HEDI project. Please contact Andrew Sandoval (827-7952) of this department for any future coordination.

Sincerely,

Bill Montoya
Director

BM/csp

cc: Mike Spear (Regional Director, USFWS)
John Peterson (Ecological Services, USFWS)
Patricia Hoban (SANWR Manager, USFWS)
Craig Nordyke (SW Area Supervisor, NMGF)
Mike Robertson (SW Area Game Manager, NMGF)
Dick McCleskey (Assistant Director, NMGF)
Jim Vaught (Field Operations Chief, NMGF)
Wally Haussamen (Research & Modeling Section Chief, NMGF)
John Hubbard (Endangered Species Section Chief, NMGF)
Andrew Sandoval (Environmental Section Chief, NMGF)
Chris Pease (Environmental Section Biologist, NMGF)

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
PACIFIC ISLANDS OFFICE
P.O. BOX 50167
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96850

APR 24 1989

Mr. Dru Barrineau, P. E.
General Engineer
U. S. Army Strategic Defense Command
Attn: CSSD-H-SSP
P. O. Box 1500
Huntsville, Alabama 35807-3801

Dear Mr. Barrineau:

This follows up your visit to our office on April 24, 1989 and our subsequent discussion of the Army's proposed HEDI Construction Project on Meck Island, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands. Specifically, you requested our comments on any impacts the project may have on species within this Service's jurisdiction.

After our discussions and our review of the information you provided on the scope of the project and in consideration of the biological surveys of Meck and adjacent islands recently conducted by Mr. Bill Brewer, we concur with your determination that the HEDI Project will have no effect on plant and animal species within our area of jurisdiction or concern. More specifically, the project would not be expected to affect any endangered or threatened species of plant or animals.

Thank you for allowing us to review and comment on this project.

Sincerely yours,

William R. Kramer

William Kramer
Deputy Field Office Supervisor
Office of Environmental Services

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

Southwest Region
300 South Ferry Street
Terminal Island, CA 90731

May 18, 1989 F/SWR14:ETN

Mr. Kisuk Cheung
Chief, Engineering Division
U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

Dear Mr. Cheung:

This responds to your letter of April 28, 1989 regarding preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll (USAKA) and new activities proposed under the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Your letter indicates that although sea turtles are known to rest and forage at Kwajalein Atoll they do not nest on any of the islands controlled by USAKA. We have reviewed survey reports produced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the University of Hawaii Sea Grant Extension Service for the Corps of Engineers regarding the natural resouces of Kwajalein Atoll, and previous documentation of sea turtle occurrence there. Based on our evaluation of the available information we concur with your determination that activities proposed for the USAKA islands will not likely to adversely affect threatened green turtles (Chelonia mydas) or endangered hawksbill turtles (Eretmochelys imbricata) at Kwajalein Atoll.

Although injury or mortality to green turtles or hawksbill turtles is unlikely, the following conditions should be included as part of the contract specifications for quarrying operations on the reef flats and the runway extension at Roi-Namur to minimize the potential for any adverse impacts.

1. The runway extension areas and quarry sites should be surveyed prior to each day's operations to ensure that no turtles are present.

2. Blasting in the quarries should be restricted to the smallest practical charge sizes. If turtles are detected within 100 m of the blast site, blasting should be postponed until the turtles have departed the area.

3. Should any turtle be injured or killed during construction, blasting or quarrying, the incident must

be documented and reported to the Pacific Area Office, NOAA Fisheries, 2570 Dole Street, Honolulu, HI 96822 (Tel. 808/955-8831) within one working day of the incident.

This concludes the Section 7 consultation process for this action. Please provide a copy of the draft EIS for review to Mr. Gene Nitta, Protected Species Management Branch, Pacific Area Office, 2570 Dole Street, Honolulu, HI 96822.

Sincerely,

E.C. Fullerton
Regional Director

cc:
F/SWR14, Nitta

APPENDIX D

MARINE BIOLOGY SURVEY AT MECK ISLAND, USAKA

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK





EXPLANATION

4 WATER QUALITY SAMPLING STATIONS

3 MECK QUARRIES 1 THRU 6

MAB DETAILED MARINE BIOLOGICAL SURVEYS



0 30 60 150
Meters

0 150 300 600
Feet

Marine Biological Assessment of Meck Island and Kwadack Island, USAKA

Figure D-1

TABLE D-1. ALGAE FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

DIVISION/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites* 1	2	3	4	5	6
CYANOPHYTA (BLUE-GREEN ALGAE)						
Hormothamnion sp.	-	x	x	-	x	x
Schizothrix sp.	-	x	-	-	x	x
Microcoleus sp.	-	x	x	-	x	x
unident. cyanophytes	-	-	-	x	-	-
RHODOPHYTA (RED ALGAE)						
Asparagopsis taxiformis	-	x	-	-	-	-
Jania sp.	x	x	-	-	-	x
Halyminia formosa	-	x	-	-	-	-
Hydrolithon reinboldii	x	x	-	-	x	x
Porolithon gardineri	x	x	-	-	-	-
Porolithon onkodes	-	x	-	-	x	x
CHLOROPHYTA (GREEN ALGAE)						
Halimeda opuntia	x	x	x	x	-	-
Dictyosphaeria versluysii	-	x	-	-	-	-
Enteromorpha sp.	-	x	x	-	-	-
Neomeris sp.	-	x	-	-	-	-
PHAEOPHYTA (BROWN ALGAE)						
Dictyota friabilis	x	x	-	-	-	-
Dictyota divaricata	-	x	-	-	-	-
Ralfsia sp.	-	x	x	x	-	-
Padina sp. (*tenuis?*)	-	x	-	-	-	-
No. Species	5	17	5	3	5	6

*Survey Sites

1 = Kwadack Lagoon Terrace
2 = Meck Quarries
3 = Meck Lagoon Terrace
4 = Meck Harbor Basin
5 = Missile Assembly Building
6 = Photography Tower

TABLE D-2. CORALS FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

FAMILY/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
SCLERACTINIA (HARD CORALS)						
PORITIDAE						
Porites lutea	x	x	x	x	-	-
Porites lichen	x	-	-	-	-	-
Porites lobata	x	x	x	-	-	-
Porites (S.) hawaiiensis	x	-	-	-	-	-
Porites (S.) convexa	x	-	-	-	-	-
Porites sp. 1 (massive, lobate)	x	-	-	-	-	-
Porites sp. 2 (massive, irregular)	x	-	-	-	-	-
Alveopora sp.	x	x	-	-	-	-
POCILLOPORIDAE						
Pocillopora meandrina	x	x	x	x	-	-
Pocillopora damicornis	x	x	x	x	-	-
Pocillopora danae	x	-	-	-	-	-
Pocillopora elegans	x	-	-	-	-	-
Pocillopora eydouxi	x	x	-	-	-	-
Pocillopora verrucosa	x	x	-	-	-	-
Pocillopora sp. 1	-	x	-	-	-	-
Seriatopora hystrix	x	-	-	-	-	-
Stylophora sp. 1	x	-	-	-	-	-
Stylophora sp. 2	x	-	-	-	-	-
ACROPORIDAE						
Acropora cytherea	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora formosa	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora humilis	x	x	x	-	-	-
Acropora hyacinthus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Acropora acuminata	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora convexa	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora monticulosa	x	x	-	-	-	-
Acropora delicatula	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora palifera	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora ramiculosa	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora striata	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora verrilli	x	-	x	-	-	-
Acropora cymbicyathus	x	-	x	-	-	-
Acropora sp. 1 (encrusting)	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora sp. 2	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora sp. 3 (encrusting)	-	x	-	-	-	-
Acropora sp. 4 (tables)	x	x	x	-	-	-

TABLE D-2. CORALS FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

FAMILY/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
ACROPORIDAE continued						
Acropora sp. 5 (foliose, tiny tips)	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acropora sp. 6 (low, bushy)	-	x	-	-	-	-
Astreopora listeri	x	-	-	-	-	-
Astreopora sp.	x	x	-	-	-	-
Montipora digitata	x	x	x	-	-	-
Montipora composita	x	-	-	-	-	-
Montipora danai	x	-	-	-	-	-
Montipora foveolata	x	-	-	-	-	-
Montipora tuberculosa	x	-	-	-	-	-
Montipora verrilli	x	-	-	-	-	-
Montipora sp. 1	x	-	-	-	-	-
Montipora sp. 2 (encrusting)	x	-	-	-	-	-
FAVIIDAE						
Cyphastrea sp.	x	x	-	-	-	-
Favia stelligera	x	-	-	-	-	-
Favia pallida	x	x	-	-	-	-
Favia speciosa	x	-	-	-	-	-
Favia sp.	x	x	-	-	-	-
Leptastrea purpurea	x	x	x	-	-	-
Hydnophora sp. 1	x	x	-	-	-	-
Hydnophora sp. 2	-	x	-	-	-	-
Platygyra sp.	-	x	-	-	-	-
MUSSIDAE						
Lobophyllia sp. 1	x	-	x	-	-	-
Lobophyllia sp. 2	x	-	-	-	-	-
Symphyllia sp.	x	-	-	-	-	-
DENDROPHYLLIIDAE						
Tubastrea coccinea	x	-	-	-	-	-
Turbinria						
FUNGIIDAE						
Fungia fungites	x	x	x	-	-	-
Fungia (Pleuractis) scutaria	-	-	x	-	-	-
Unident. fungiid	x	-	-	-	-	-
AGARICIIDAE						
Pavona varians	x	x	-	x	-	-
Pavona clavus	x	-	-	-	-	-
Pavona (P.) planulata	x	-	-	-	-	-
Pavona sp.	-	x	-	-	-	-

TABLE D-2. CORALS FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

FAMILY/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites* 1	2	3	4	5	6
ANTHOZOANS (SOFT CORALS)						
ZOANTHIDEA						
Palythoa tuberculosa	x	x	-	-	-	-
Unident. zoanthids (blue-green)	x	x	x	-	-	-
Unident. zoanthids (green)	-	x	-	-	-	-
ALCYONIIDAE						
Sarcophyton glaucum	x	x	-	-	-	-
Lobophytum sp.	x	-	-	-	-	-
Sinularia polydactyla	x	x	x	-	-	-
Sinularia rigida	-	x	-	-	-	-
Sinularia sp. 1	-	x	-	-	-	-
Sinularia sp. 2	-	-	x	-	-	-
HELIOPORIDAE						
Heliopora coerulea	x	x	x	-	-	-
(HYDROZOANS)						
MILLEPORIDAE						
Millepora exaesa	x	-	-	-	-	-
Millepora platyphylla	x	-	-	-	-	-
Millepora dichotoma	x	x	-	x	-	-
Total Families	12	8	8	4	0	0
Total Species	68	35	17	5	0	0

*Survey Sites
- 1 = Kwadack Lagoon Terrace
- 2 = Meck Quarries
- 3 = Meck Lagoon Terrace
- 4 = Meck Harbor Basin
- 5 = Missile Assembly Building
- 6 = Photography Tower

TABLE D-3. FISHES FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

FAMILY/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
CARCHARHINIDAE (REQUIEM/GRAY SHARKS)						
Carcharhinus melanopterus	x	-	-	-	-	-
MYLIOBATIDAE (EAGLE RAYS)						
Aetobatus narinari	-	-	-	x	-	-
ATHERINIDAE (SILVERSIDES)						
Unident. silversides	-	-	x	-	-	-
CIRRHITIDAE (HAWKFISHES)						
Paracirrhites arcatus	x	-	x	-	-	-
LETHRINIDAE (EMPERORS)						
Monotaxis grandoculis	x	-	-	-	-	-
MUGILOIDIDAE (SANDPERCHES)						
Parapercis clathrata	x	-	x	-	-	-
Parapercis cephalopunctatus	x	-	x	-	-	-
MULLIDAE (GOATFISHES)						
Mulloides flavolineatus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Mulloides vanicolensis	x	x	x	-	-	-
Parupeneus multifasciatus	x	x	x	x	-	-
Parupeneus cyclostomus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Parupeneus barberinus	-	x	-	-	-	-
Parupeneus sp. (juveniles)	x	-	-	-	-	-
ACANTHURIDAE (SURGEONFISHES)						
Acanthurus guttatus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Acanthurus achilles	x	x	-	x	-	-
Acanthurus pyroferus	-	x	x	-	-	-
Acanthurus nigrofuscus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Acanthurus nigroris	x	x	-	-	-	-
Acanthurus striatus	-	x	x	-	-	-
Acanthurus triostegus	x	x	x	x	x	x
Acanthurus olivaceus	x	x	-	x	-	-
Acanthurus lineatus	-	x	-	-	-	-
Acanthurus mata	x	x	x	-	-	-
Acanthurus sp. 1	x	-	-	-	-	-
Acanthurus sp. 2	x	-	-	-	-	-
Naso lituratus	x	x	-	-	-	-

TABLE D-3. FISHES FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

FAMILY/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
ACANTHURIDAE (SURGEONFISHES) continued						
Naso hexacanthus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Ctenochaetus strigosus	x	-	-	-	-	-
Ctenochaetus striatus	-	x	-	-	-	-
Zebrasoma scopes	x	-	-	-	-	-
Zebrasoma veliferum	x	-	x	-	-	-
BALISTIDAE (TRIGGERFISHES)						
Rhinecanthus rectangulus	x	x	x	x	-	-
Rhinecanthus aculeatus	x	x	x	x	-	-
Balistapus undulatus	x	-	-	-	-	-
Melichthys vidua	x	-	x	-	-	-
Sufflamen chysoptera	x	-	x	-	-	-
FISTULARIDAE (CORNETFISHES)						
Fistularia commersonii	-	x	-	-	-	-
SCOMBRIDAE (TUNAS)						
Unident. small tunas	x	-	-	-	-	-
ZANCLIDAE (MOORISH IDOLS)						
Zanclus cornutus	x	x	x	-	-	-
SCARIDAE (PARROTFISHES)						
Scarus sordidus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Scarus dubius	x	x	-	-	-	-
Scarus gibbus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Scarus oviceps	-	x	-	-	-	-
Scarus psittacus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Scarus sp. 1	x	-	-	-	-	-
Scarus sp. 2	x	-	-	-	-	-
Scarus sp. 3	x	-	-	-	-	-
Scarus sp. 4	x	-	-	-	-	-
Calotomus sp.	-	x	-	-	-	-
LABRIDAE (WRASSES)						
Anampses caeruleopunctatus	x	-	-	-	-	-
Anampses meleagrides	x	x	-	x	-	-
Bodianus axillaris	x	x	x	-	-	-
Bodianus bimaculatus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Cheilinus chlorurus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Cheilinus unifasciatus	x	-	-	-	-	-
Cirrhilabrus sp.	x	-	x	-	-	-
Coris aygula	x	x	x	-	-	-
Coris gaimard	x	x	x	-	-	-

TABLE D-3. FISHES FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

FAMILY/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
LABRIDAE (WRASSES) continued						
Coris sp. 1	-	x	x	-	-	-
Coris sp. 2	x	-	-	-	-	-
Gomphosus varius	x	x	-	-	-	-
Halichoeres chrysus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Halichoeres hortulanus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Halichoeres margaritaceus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Halichoeres marginatus	x	-	x	-	-	-
Halichoeres trimaculatus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Halichoeres sp.	x	-	-	-	-	-
Macropharyngodon meleagris	x	x	x	-	-	-
Thalassoma hardwicke	x	x	x	-	-	-
Thalassoma quinquevittatum	x	x	x	-	-	-
Thalassoma lutescens	x	-	x	-	-	-
Thalassoma amblycephalus	x	-	x	-	-	-
Thalassoma sp. 1	x	-	-	-	-	-
Thalassoma (?)	x	-	-	-	-	-
Novaculichthys taeniourus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Stethojulis bandanensis	x	x	-	x	-	-
Stethojulis axillaris	x	-	x	-	-	-
Labroides bicolor	x	x	x	-	-	-
Labroides dimidiatus	x	-	x	x	-	-
OSTRACIIDAE (TRUNKFISHES)						
Ostracion meleagris	x	x	-	-	-	-
Ostracion sp.	x	-	-	-	-	-
TETRAODONTIDAE (PUFFERS)						
Canthigaster solandri	-	x	-	-	-	-
BLENNIDAE (BLENNIES)						
Aspidontus taeniatus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Runula tapeinosoma	x	-	x	-	-	-
Unident. blenny 1 (stripes)	x	-	-	-	-	-
Unident. blenny 2 (mottled)	-	-	-	x	-	-
KYPHOSIDAE (SEA CHUBS)						
Kyphosus cinerascens	x	x	x	-	-	-
Kyphosus sp.	x	-	-	-	-	-
SIGANIDAE (RABBITFISHES)						
Siganus argenteus	-	x	-	x	-	-
POMACANTHIDAE (ANGELFISHES)						
Centropyge flavissimus	x	x	x	-	-	-

TABLE D-3. FISHES FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

FAMILY/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
MONACATHIDAE (FILEFISHES)						
Oxymonacanthus longirostris	-	x	x	-	-	-
CARANGIDAE (JACKS)						
Caranx melampygus	-	-	x	x	-	-
Caranx sp.	x	-	-	-	-	-
Trachinotus blochii	-	-	-	x	-	-
SERRANIDAE (GROUPERS)						
Cephalopholis argus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Epinephelus hexagonatus	-	x	x	-	-	-
Epinephelus merra	-	-	x	-	-	-
Unident. grouper	x	-	-	-	-	-
MURAENIDAE (MORAY EELS)						
Echidna nebulosa	-	-	-	-	x	-
HEMIRAMPHIDAE (HALFBEAKS)						
Hyporhampus sp.	-	x	-	x	-	-
CHAETODONTIDAE (BUTTERFLY FISHES)						
Chaetodon citrinellus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Chaetodon lunula	x	x	x	x	-	-
Chaetodon trifasciatus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Chaetodon auriga	x	x	-	-	-	-
Chaetodon ephippium	x	x	-	-	-	-
Chaetodon lineolatus	x	-	-	-	-	-
Chaetodon ornatissimus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Chaetodon reticulatus	-	x	-	-	-	-
Chaetodon sp. 1	x	-	-	-	-	-
Chaetodon sp. 2	x	-	-	-	-	-
Chaetodon sp. 3 (juveniles)	x	-	-	-	-	-
POMACENTRIDAE (DAMSELFISHES)						
Abudefduf sordidus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Abudefduf leucozona	x	x	x	-	-	-
Abudefduf leucopomus	x	-	-	x	-	-
Abudefduf sexfasciatus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Abudefduf sordidus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Abudefduf leucozona	x	x	x	-	-	-
Abudefduf leucopomus	x	-	-	x	-	-
Abudefduf sexfasciatus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Plectroglyphidodon dickii	x	x	-	-	-	-
Plectroglyphidodon lacrymatus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Stegastes fasciolatus	x	x	-	-	-	-

TABLE D-3. FISHES FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

FAMILY/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
POMACENTRIDAE (DAMSELFISHES) continued						
Stegastes nigricans	x	x	x	-	-	-
Chromis margaritifer	x	-	x	-	-	-
Chromis viridis	x	x	-	-	-	-
Chromis sp. 1	x	-	-	-	-	-
Chromis sp. 2	x	-	-	-	-	-
Chromis sp. 3	-	-	x	-	-	-
Dascyllus reticulatus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Dascyllus aruanus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Pomacentrus pavo	x	x	x	x	-	-
Pomacentrus jenkinsi	x	-	x	-	-	-
Pomacentrus vaiuli	x	-	x	-	-	-
Pomacentrus sp.	x	-	-	-	-	-
LUTJANIDAE (SNAPPERS)						
Lutjanus fulvus	x	x	-	-	-	-
Lutjanus ehrenbergii	x	-	x	-	-	-
Unident. snappers	x	-	-	-	-	-
SYNODONTIDAE (LIZARDFISHES)						
Synodus variegatus	-	x	x	x	-	-
Unident. lizardfish	-	x	-	-	-	-
HOLOCENTRIDAE (SQUIRRELFISHES)						
Myripristis sammara	x	x	x	-	-	-
Myripristis kuntee	x	x	-	-	-	-
Sargocentron diadema	x	x	-	-	-	-
Unident. holocentrid	x	-	-	-	-	-
AULOSTOMIDAE (TRUMPETFISHES)						
Aulostomus chinensis	x	x	-	-	-	-
GOBIIDAE (GOBIES)						
Valenciennea strigatus	-	-	x	x	-	-
Ptereleotris heteropterus (?)	-	-	-	x	-	-
Total Families	22	21	21	14	2	1
Total Species	115	81	60	21	2	1

*Survey Sites

1 = Kwadack Lagoon Terrace
2 = Meck Quarries
3 = Meck Lagoon Terrace
4 = Meck Harbor Basin
5 = Missile Assembly Building
6 = Photography Tower

TABLE D-4. INVERTEBRATES FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

TAXA/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
PHYLUM PORIFERA (SPONGES)						
CLASS DEMOSPONGIAE						
Unident. Sponge 1 (green)	x	x	x	-	-	-
Unident. Sponge 2 (grey-blue)	-	x	x	-	-	-
Unident. Sponge 3 (grey)	-	-	-	x	-	-
Unident. Sponge 4 (red encrusting)	-	x	-	x	-	-
PHYLUM MOLLUSCA						
CLASS GASTROPODA						
FAMILY NERITIDAE						
Nerita polita	-	-	-	-	x	x
Nerita plicata	-	-	-	-	x	x
FAMILY TROCHIDAE						
Trochus niloticus	x	x	x	-	-	-
FAMILY CYPRAEIDAE						
Cypraea moneta (shell only)	-	x	-	-	-	-
Cypraea depressa (shell only)	-	x	-	-	x	-
Cypraea sp. (worn shell)	-	-	-	-	x	-
FAMILY STROMBIDAE						
Lambis truncata	x	x	x	-	-	-
Lambis crocata	-	x	-	-	-	-
Strombus luhuanus	x	x	x	-	-	-
Strombus sp.	-	-	x	-	-	-
FAMILY VERMETIDAE						
Dendropoma maxima	-	-	x	-	-	-
FAMILY CONIDAE						
Conus distans	-	x	-	-	-	-
Conus ebraeus (shell only)	-	x	-	-	-	-
FAMILY THAIDIDAE						
Drupa morum	-	-	x	-	-	-
Drupa sp. (black)	-	-	x	-	-	-
Morula sp.	-	-	x	x	-	-
CLASS BIVALVIA						
FAMILY CHAMIDAE						
Chama sp.	-	-	x	-	-	-

TABLE D-4. INVERTEBRATES FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

TAXA/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
FAMILY TRIDACNIDAE						
Tridacna sp. (*maxima* ?)	-	x	-	-	-	-
Tridacna squamosa	x	x	-	-	-	-
PHYLUM ANNELIDA						
CLASS POLYCHAETA						
FAMILY SABELLIDAE						
Unident. sabellid (orange-red)	-	x	-	-	-	-
PHYLUM ARTHROPODA						
CLASS MAXILLOPODA						
SUBORDER BALANOMORPHA						
FAMILY BALANIDAE						
Tetraclita pacifica	-	-	-	-	-	x
FAMILY CALLIANASSIDAE						
Unident. callianassid (burrowing)	-	-	-	x	-	-
FAMILY ALPHEIDAE						
Alpheus sp. (burrows in coral)	x	-	x	-	-	-
FAMILY COENOBITIDAE						
Coenobita perlatus	-	-	-	-	x	x
Coenobita brevimanus	-	-	-	-	x	x
FAMILY PORCELLANIDAE						
Petrolisthes sp.	-	-	-	-	-	x
FAMILY DIOGENIDAE						
Calcinus elegans	-	-	x	-	x	-
Calcinus sp.	-	-	x	-	x	-
Clibanarius sp.	-	-	-	-	x	x
Unident. hermit crab	-	-	-	-	x	x
FAMILY GRAPSIDAE						
Grapsus tenuicrustatus	-	-	-	-	x	x
Pachygrapsus planifrons	-	-	-	-	x	x
FAMILY OCYPODIDAE						
Ocypode ceratophthalma	-	-	x	-	-	-

TABLE D-4. INVERTEBRATES FOUND ON MECK AND KWADACK ISLANDS, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

FAMILY/GENUS/SPECIES	Survey Sites* 1	2	3	4	5	6
PHYLUM ECHINODERMATA						
CLASS HOLOTHUROIDEA						
FAMILY HOLOTHURIIDAE						
Actinopyga echinites	-	x	x	-	-	-
Actinopyga mauritiana	-	x	x	-	-	-
Bohadschia argus	x	x	x	x	-	-
Holothuria atra	x	-	x	x	-	-
Holothuria leucospilota	-	-	x	-	-	-
Thelenota ananas	-	-	-	x	-	-
CLASS ASTEROIDEA						
FAMILY OPHIDIASTERIDAE						
Linckia multiflora	x	-	-	-	-	-
CLASS ECHINOIDEA						
FAMILY DIADEMATIDAE						
Diadema savignyi	-	x	x	-	-	-
Echinothrix diadema	x	x	x	-	-	-
FAMILY ECHINOMETRIDAE						
Echinometra mathaei	-	x	x	-	-	-
Echinometra oblonga	-	-	x	-	-	-
Echinostrephus aciculatus	-	x	x	-	-	-
Heterocentrotus mammillatus (spines)	-	x	-	-	x	x
PHYLUM CHORDATA						
CLASS ASCIDIACEA						
FAMILY DIDEMNIDAE						
Unident. didemnids	-	x	-	-	-	-
Total Species	10	22	25	7	13	11

*Survey Sites
- 1 = Kwadack Lagoon Terrace
- 2 = Meck Quarries
- 3 = Meck Lagoon Terrace
- 4 = Meck Harbor Basin
- 5 = Missile Assembly Building
- 6 = Photography Tower

TABLE D-5. WATER QUALITY PARAMETERS AROUND MECK ISLAND, KWAJALEIN ATOLL

STATION NO.	TIME (h)	DEPTH (m)	TEMP. (°C)	SALINITY (ppt)	DISS. OXYGEN (ppm)
4/18/89					
1	1035	0.1	33.4	33.2	8.90
	1039	0.1	33.4	33.2	8.87
2	1139	0.1	30.1	33.1	8.14
	1150	0.1	28.9	33.3	8.10
3	1042	0.2	28.9	33.1	7.84
	1155	0.2	28.9	33.2	8.13
4	1050	0.3	28.9	33.2	7.92
	1157	0.3	28.8	33.2	7.83
4/19/89					
5	0851	0.2	28.7	33.2	8.04
	1117	0.2	28.9	33.3	7.97
6	0906	0.5	28.9	33.2	8.20
	1040	0.5	28.9	33.0	7.94
7	0911	0.5	28.8	33.2	7.88
	0912	3.5	28.9	33.3	7.40
	1049	0.5	28.9	33.2	7.56
	1049	3.5	28.9	33.1	7.93
8	0929	0.5	28.9	33.2	8.03
	1055	0.5	28.8	33.3	8.14

*Measured 18-19 April 1989

Notes:

h = hours
m = meters
°C = degrees Celsius
ppt = parts per thousand
ppm = parts per million

APPENDIX E

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES POTENTIALLY AFFECTED BY THE HEDI KITE TEST ACTIVITIES AT WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE, NEW MEXICO

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES POTENTIALLY AFFECTED BY THE HEDI KITE TEST ACTIVITIES AT WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE, NEW MEXICO

Review of the scientific and regulatory literature and relevant environmental documents indicates that a large number of protected species are known or potentially occur at WSMR. Eight federally designated threatened or endangered species, 26 candidate species, and 3 species designated as sensitive by the State of New Mexico might be present. Those species designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (1986) as threatened or endangered species, along with "candidate species," are presented in Table E-1. Candidate species are those that may qualify for threatened or endangered status, but require further review. Table E-1 also lists additional species considered to be in jeopardy by the State of New Mexico.

Table E-2 lists those protected plants and animals that are or may be present in the specific areas to be used for the HEDI KITE tests. This listing reflects a refinement and narrowing of the list of protected species from the entire WSMR, as given in Table E-1. The protected species potentially within the HEDI KITE project area at WSMR occupy a wide variety of habitats. The physical and biological preferences of each species were investigated, and those species that may be present within the camera site and debris impact areas of the HEDI KITE project were retained for consideration in the field surveys and in the EA. These protected plant and animal species are listed in Table E-2.

Each of the protected species that could be affected by the HEDI KITE tests is discussed below. The rationale for omitting species from the master list (Table E-1) is given, and is based on the likelihood of its occurrence within the project area, considering the habitat preferences, seasonal range, and known distribution.

The following eight plants and animals designated by the Endangered Species Act may be present at WSMR.

The **bald eagle** (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) is an irregular transient to the WSMR during migration and in winter. Sightings have been reported from Lake Lucero. No impact on the bald eagle is expected, because no suitable habitat is present and the tests will not take place during the migratory periods or during winter.

The **northern Aplomado falcon** (Falco femoralis septentrionalis) is a bird of prairies and yucca flats that last nested in New Mexico in 1952. Although suitable habitat remains, it is now thought to be extirpated at WSMR, so no impacts will occur.

The **interior least tern** (Sterna antillarum athalassos) nests along the Mississippi River and other interior drainages of the central United States. It has been sighted on the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge, where it frequents sandbars on the Rio Grande. The State of New Mexico rates this bird in Group 2. Suitable habitat is absent from the WSMR, and this bird was omitted from further consideration.

TABLE E-1. PROTECTED SPECIES CONSIDERED FOR THE HEDI KITE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

Federally listed species

Animals:

Bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) Endangered
Aplomado falcon (Falco femoralis septentrionalis) Endangered
Interior least tern (Sterna antillarum athalassos) Endangered
Whooping crane (Grus americana) Endangered
American peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus anatum) Endangered

Plants:

Sneed pincushion cactus (Coryphantha sneedii var. sneedii) Endangered
Lloyd hedgehog cactus (Echinocereus lloydii) Endangered, Critical Habitat
Todsen's pennyroyal (Hedeoma todsenii) Endangered, Critical Habitat

Federal candidate species

Category 2

Fish:

White Sands pupfish (Cyprinodon tularosa)

Birds:

Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni)
Ferruginous hawk (Buteo regalis)
Western snowy plover (Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus)
White-faced ibis (Plegatus chihi) - Great Basin population
Mountain plover (Charadrius montanus)
Long-billed curlew (Numenius americanus)
Western yellow-billed cuckoo (Coccyzus americanus occidentalis)
Southern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis lucida)

Mammals:

Spotted bat (Euderma maculatum)
Occult bat (Myotis lucifugus occultus)
Southwestern cave bat (Myotis velifer brevis)
Organ Mountains chipmunk (Eutamias quadrivittatus australis)

TABLE E-1. PROTECTED SPECIES CONSIDERED FOR THE HEDI KITE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

Arizona prairie dog (Cynomys ludovicianus arizonensis)
White Sands pocket gopher (Geomys arenarius brevirostris)
White Sands woodrat (Neotoma micropus leucophaea)
New Mexican jumping mouse (Zapus hudsonius luteus)

Plants:

Dune unicorn plant (Proboscidea sabulosa)
Grama grass cactus (Pediocactus papyracanthus)
Nooding cliff daisy (Perityle cernua)
Alamo beard tongue (Penstemon alamosensis)
Gray sibara (Sibara grisea)
Organ Mountains evening primrose (Oenothera organensis)
Gypsum scalebroom (Lepidospartum burgessii)
Sand prickly pear (Opuntia arenaria)
Curl-leaf needle grass (Stipa curvifolia)

Category 3c

Birds:

Bell's vireo (Vireo bellii arizonae)

Plants:

Scheer's pincushion cactus (Coryphantha scheerii var. uncinata)

Additional species considered in jeopardy by the State of New Mexico

Reptiles:

Trans-Pecos rat snake (Elaphe subocularis) Group 2.

Birds:

Gray vireo (Vireo vicinior) Group 2.

Mammals:

Desert bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis) Group 1.

TABLE E-2. PROTECTED SPECIES KNOWN OR POTENTIALLY OCCURRING WITHIN THE HEDI KITE CAMERA STATION AND DEBRIS IMPACT AREAS AT WSMR

Category 2

Birds:

Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni)
Southern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis lucida)
Mountain plover (Charadrius montanus)

Mammals:

Spotted bat (Euderma maculatum)
Occult bat (Myotis lucifugus occultus)
Southwestern cave bat (Myotis velifer brevis)
Arizona prairie dog (Cynomys ludovicianus arizonensis)

Plants:

Dune unicorn plant (Proboscidea sabulosa)
Grama grass cactus (Pediocactus papyracanthus)
Nooding cliff daisy (Perityle cernua)
Alamo beard tongue (Penstemon alamosensis)
Gray sibara (Sibara grisea)
Organ Mountains evening primrose (Oenothera organensis)
Gypsum scalebroom (Lepidospartum burgessii)
Sand prickly pear (Opuntia arenaria)
Curl-leaf needle grass (Stipa curvifolia)

Category 3c

Plants:

Scheer's pincushion cactus (Coryphantha scheerii var. uncinata)

New Mexico Listed species

Reptiles:

Trans-Pecos rat snake (Elaphe subocularis) Endangered, Group 2.

TABLE E-2. PROTECTED SPECIES KNOWN OR POTENTIALLY OCCURRING WITHIN THE HEDI KITE CAMERA STATION AND DEBRIS IMPACT AREAS AT WSMR

Birds:

Gray vireo (Vireo vicinior) Endangered, Group 2.

Mammals:

Desert bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis) Endangered, Group 1.

The **whooping crane** (Grus americana) is thought to fly over WSMR on occasion during migration, but probably does not stop to rest or feed. The HEDI KITE tests are not expected to take place during the seasons that the whooping crane may be present in New Mexico, and there are no known occurrences, so it was not included in the impact analysis.

The **American peregrine falcon** (Falco peregrinus anatum) is a resident bird of prey in the higher mountains of southern New Mexico. Although no known nesting sites exist in the HEDI KITE project area, thorough surveys are lacking, and its occurrence remains a possibility. Lack of water and areas of concentration for birds, the primary prey of the peregrine falcon, are believed to limit the suitability of the habitat at WSMR. The impacts of falling debris were judged to be insignificant to wildlife in the San Andres NWR. This fact, along with the lack of records from the project area, resulted in the omission of the peregrine falcon from the impact analysis. If there are any of these birds in the San Andres Mountains, mitigation measures developed for the protection of desert bighorn will also apply to the American peregrine falcon.

It is unlikely but possible that **the Sneed pincushion cactus** (Coryphantha sneedii var. sneedii) is present at the WSMR. Its preferred habitat is in the Franklin Mountains north of El Paso and the southern Organ Mountains and Bishop's Cap east of Las Cruces on limestone ledges at elevations of 1,310 to 1,646 meters (4,300 to 5,400 feet). All known populations are from Dona Ana County, New Mexico, and El Paso County, Texas. It may also be found on relatively flat lower-elevation limestone outcrops in desert and grassland communities. Because this cactus is not present in areas designated for new construction, it was not included in the impact analysis.

The **Lloyd hedgehog cactus** (Echinocereus lloydii) has been reported from the southeast corner of WSMR, in the Jarillo Mountains near Orogrande. Its primary range appears to be in dry, rocky hills of limestone and granite at 1,524-meter (5,000-foot) elevations in Texas. The plant was first collected in 1909 near Tuna Springs, Texas.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service noted that the New Mexico locations for the Lloyd hedgehog cactus are probably in error, and that until further research proves otherwise, the range is confined to 20.7 square kilometers (8 square miles) in Texas. For this reason, along with the lack of suitable habitat in areas of new construction for the camera sites, this plant was not included in the impact analysis.

Todsen's pennyroyal (Hedeoma todsenii) is a small shrub of the mint family that has a very restricted known distribution, limited to WSMR. It occurs on steep, gravelly gypsum limestones. The critical habitat is limited to 2 square kilometers (0.8 square mile) and the estimated number of plants is 750. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service stated that there is little likelihood that the plants will be hit by missile debris in their protected canyon sites. Because Todsen's pennyroyal is believed to be a very narrow endemic restricted to the type locality, it was not included in the impact analysis. Even if suitable habitat and undiscovered populations do exist within the outer debris impact area on the east side of the San Andres Mountains, it is judged that falling debris will have an insignificant impact on the populations.

The Federal candidate species considered for the impact analysis are discussed below, along with the justification for retention in or exclusion from Table E-2.

The **White Sands pupfish** (Cyprinodon tularosa) is known only from Salt Creek, Mound Spring, and Malpais Spring. No suitable habitat exists within the HEDI KITE project area, and the pupfish was excluded from detailed consideration of biological impacts.

The **ferruginous hawk** (Buteo regalis) nests within New Mexico, and considerable foraging suitable habitat is present at WSMR. Because no nesting areas are known in the HEDI KITE project area and the flight tests are not expected to take place during the migratory and wintering periods, no impacts to this species are expected, and the ferruginous hawk was omitted from the impact analysis.

The **Swainson's hawk** (Buteo swainsoni) has been reported to nest near the Stallion site, and a possible nest was recently reported near the southern end of the Orogrande site (U.S. Department of the Army, 1985). Suitable habitat is absent from the HEDI KITE launch and debris impact areas, except for those migratory flocks that may fly over either area during the early spring and fall. The HEDI KITE flight tests are not expected to take place during the major migratory period, so the species is expected to be absent. However, this bird was retained for further consideration because of the possible overlap in seasonal distribution.

The **Western snowy plover** (Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus) is only a possible transient north of Lake Lucero, and suitable habitat is absent from the project area. This bird was therefore omitted from further consideration.

The **white-faced ibis** (Plegatus chihi, Great Basin population) is a waterbird that may occasionally fly over WSMR. No suitable nesting or foraging habitat is present within the area to be used by the HEDI KITE tests. It was omitted from the impact analysis.

The **mountain plover** (Charadrius montanus) has possible nesting habitat in the foothills of the San Andres Mountains and the grassland at the Stallion site. It might be present during the HEDI KITE flight tests, so was retained for further consideration in the biological impact analysis.

The **long-billed curlew** (Numenius americanus) is a possible transient near Malpais Spring, but does not have any suitable habitat in the camera station or debris impact area for HEDI KITE tests. No further consideration was given to this waterbird in the biological impact analysis.

The **Western yellow-billed cuckoo** (Coccyzus americanus occidentalis) occupies dense riparian vegetation along permanent watercourses. This type of habitat is lacking within the project area, and the cuckoo was omitted from the discussion of biological impacts.

The **southern spotted owl** (Strix occidentalis lucida) could have limited habitat in the San Andres Mountains. Because it might be present during the HEDI KITE flight tests within the debris impact area, it was retained for consideration of adverse biological impacts.

The **spotted bat** (Euderma maculatum) has a low potential for occurrence in the San Andres Mountains, although it prefers the higher elevation ponderosa pine community. It was retained for further consideration of biological impacts.

The **occult bat** (Myotis lucifugus occultus) also has potential habitat in the San Andres Mountains, although its primary range is to the west. Because it may be present in the mountainous regions of the outer debris impact area, it was retained for further consideration of biological impacts.

The **southwestern cave bat** (Myotis velifer brevis) might conceivably be found in the San Andres Mountains, although it is not known in this region. This bat is a colonial cave dweller, retained for further impact analysis, because of the possibility of occurrence.

The **Organ Mountains chipmunk** (Eutamias quadrivittatus australis) could be present in the southern San Andres Mountains. No surveys have been conducted for this chipmunk, so it was retained for consideration of biological impacts from the HEDI KITE project.

The **Arizona prairie dog** (Cynomys ludovicianus arizonensis) is reported by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to be a possibility at WSMR. However, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish recognizes the Tularosa Basin population of the black-tailed prairie dog (C. ludovicianus) as the protected animal, not stating whether it might be the nominate race (C. ludovicianus) or the Arizona race. In either case, prairie dog towns have been recently reported in the Tularosa Basin of WSMR in desert and grassland communities. No prairie dog towns were observed during the field inspection, but the possibility remains that active colonies might be present at the northern camera sites and within the debris impact zone. This species was retained for the impact analysis.

The **White Sands pocket gopher** (Geomys arenarius brevirostris) and **White Sands woodrat** (Neotoma micropus leucophaea) are races of these rodents that occupy only a small and specialized geographic range, namely the white gypsum sand dunes within the National Monument. Suitable habitat for these rodents is absent from the HEDI KITE project area, and they were omitted from the impact analysis.

The **New Mexican jumping mouse** (Zapus hudsonius luteus) is found locally in the Sacramento Mountains and in the central Rio Grande Valley. Its typical meadow habitat is lacking from the HEDI KITE test locations, and it was omitted from the impact analysis.

The **dune unicorn plant** (Proboscidea sabulosa) occupies sandy, mostly gypsum, soils. NASA and Orogrande are thought to provide habitat, and the sandy mesquite dunes near Launch Complex 37 could support populations, but none were seen during the field inspection. The possibility remains, however, that it could occur in the sandy habitat near the southern camera stations, and it was retained for the impact analysis.

The **grama grass cactus** (Pediocactus papyracanthus) prefers valleys and open slopes at elevations of 1,829 to 2,134 meters (6,000 to 7,000 feet), which are occupied by native grassland. The plant might be found within the debris impact area on the western foothills of the San Andres Mountains. It was retained for the impact analysis.

The **Nodding cliff daisy** (Perityle cernua) has been reported from crevices of limestone caprock mesas in the Organ Mountains at 1,981 meters (6,500 feet). This species may be present in the foothills of the San Andres Mountains, within the debris impact area, and was retained for the impact evaluation.

The **Alamo beard tongue** (Penstemon alamosensis) is a little-known plant reported from rocky mountainous areas of southern New Mexico and Texas at elevations of 1,371 to 1,524 meters (4,500 to 5,000 feet). It has a low possibility of occurrence within the debris impact area of the HEDI KITE flights, so was retained for the impact analysis.

The **gray sibara** (Sibara grisea) is a plant that could occur at WSMR in the Oscura Mountains. It prefers talus slopes at the base of cliffs, and suitable habitat is lacking within the HEDI KITE camera sites and debris impact areas. It was therefore omitted from further impact evaluation.

The **Organ Mountains evening primrose** (Oenothera organensis) is restricted to permanent seeps on canyon floors in the Organ Mountains at elevations of 1,828 to 2,286 meters (6,000 to 7,500 feet). The presence of this plant is very unlikely but possible at higher elevations of the San Andres Mountains, and so was retained for further environmental analysis.

The **gypsum scalebroom** (Lepidospartum burgessii) has not been reported from WSMR but potential habitat exists near Orogrande. No suitable habitat exists within the HEDI KITE project area, and the scalebroom was omitted from further environmental consideration.

The **sand prickly pear** (Opuntia arenaria) is known from sandy mesquite dunes and floodplains near El Paso at elevations of 1,067 to 1,372 meters (3,500 to 4,500 feet). It has been reported from similar habitat on Fort Bliss. Although very unlikely, this cactus may be present in the mesquite dunes near Launch Complex 37, and was retained for impact evaluation.

The **curl-leaf needle grass** (Stipa curvifolia) is known from rocky limestone outcrops in the Guadalupe Mountains at elevations of 1,524 to 1,828 meters (5,000 to 6,000 feet). The species may be present in the San Andres Mountains or foothills, and was retained for impact evaluation.

The **Bell's vireo** (Vireo bellii) is a migratory songbird that frequents riparian areas and mesquite thickets near water. Although the Arizona race of the Bell's vireo is no longer listed as a Federal candidate species, the State of New Mexico has placed this bird (of any race) in Endangered status, Group 2. The most likely race within WSMR would be the Texas Bell's vireo (Vireo bellii medius). No suitable habitat is present within the HEDI KITE debris impact area or at the Launch Complex. Therefore, the Bell's vireo was not retained for further consideration of potential adverse impacts.

The **Scheer's pincushion cactus** (Coryphantha scheerii var. uncinata) is known from sandy mesquite dunes near El Paso and has been reported from similar habitat on Fort Bliss. A chance exists that this plant could occur within the mesquite dune community present at Launch Complex 37, the location of many of the camera sites for the HEDI KITE project. Because this cactus is no longer a Federal candidate species, it was omitted from further evaluation.

The following additional protected species are designated by the State of New Mexico:

The **Trans-Pecos rat snake** (Elaphe subocularis) may inhabit the eastern slopes of the San Andres Mountains, the shrub-grassland community in the foothills, and adjacent desert communities. Because it may be present within the debris impact area, it was retained for the impact analysis.

The **Gray vireo** (Vireo vicinior) probably inhabits the eastern slopes and foothills of the San Andres Mountains. The area visited during the field inspection appeared to be suitable breeding habitat, although no individuals were seen. Because it may be present within the debris impact area, this bird was retained for impact analysis.

The **desert bighorn sheep** (Ovis canadensis) is known from the San Andres Mountains within the debris impact area. It is a species thought to be sensitive to noise and other possible disturbances from the HEDI KITE tests. It was therefore retained for further impact analysis and discussion in the EA.

TABLE E-3. DEFINITIONS OF STATUS DESIGNATIONS

FEDERAL DESIGNATIONS

E = Endangered. Any species that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

T = Threatened. Any species that is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

Critical Habitat = All air, lands, and water deemed essential to the continued survival of an endangered or threatened species. The legal description of Critical Habitat is published in the Federal Register.

C1 = Category 1 candidate species. Taxa for which the Service currently has on file substantial information on biological vulnerability and threat(s) to support the appropriateness of proposing to list them as endangered or threatened species.

C2 = Category 2 candidate species. Taxa for which information now in possession of the Service indicates that proposing to list them as endangered or threatened is possibly appropriate, but for which substantial data on biological vulnerability and threat(s) are not currently known or on file to support the immediate preparation of rules.

C3a = Extinct.
C3b = Taxonomically invalid.
C3c = Too widespread and/or not threatened. No longer considered as a federal candidate for listing.

NEW MEXICO DESIGNATIONS

Endangered, Group 1. Any species or subspecies whose prospects of survival or recruitment within New Mexico are in jeopardy.

Endangered, Group 2. Any species or subspecies whose prospects of survival or recruitment within New Mexico are likely to be in jeopardy within the foreseeable future.

REFERENCES

Britton, N.L., and J.N. Rose, 1963. The Cactaceae, Dover Publications, New York.

Correll, D.S., and M.C. Johnston, 1970. Manual of the Vascular Plants of Texas, Texas Research Foundation, Renner, Texas.

Fenton, M.B., D.C. Tennant, and J. Wyszecki, 1984. A survey of the distribution of Euderma maculatum (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae) throughout its known range in the United States and Canada by monitoring its audible echolocation calls, prepared for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Endangered Species, Albuquerque, New Mexico (contract #14-16-0002-82-210).

Hall, E. R., 1981. The Mammals of North America, Vol. I, II, John Wiley & Sons, New York, New York.

Kearney, T., and R.H. Peebles, 1960. Arizona Flora, University of California Press, Los Angeles.

Lundell, C.L., 1969. Flora of Texas, Texas Research Foundation, Renner, Texas.

Martin, W. C., and C.R. Hutchins, 1980. A Flora of New Mexico, Vol. I, II. J. Cramer, Germany.

Martin, W. C., and C.R. Hutchins, 1984. Spring Wildflowers of New Mexico, (The New Mexico Natural History Series), University of New Mexico Press.

Martin, W. C., and C.R. Hutchins, 1986. Summer Wildflowers of New Mexico, (The New Mexico Natural History Series), University of New Mexico Press.

Monson, G., and L. Sumner, (Eds.), 1980. The Desert Bighorn. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

New Mexico Rare Plant Advisory Committee, 1986. Handbook of Rare and Endemic Plants of New Mexico, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, 1988. Handbook of Species Endangered in New Mexico, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, 1988. Spotted Owl Guidelines, Final Supplement to the EIS for an Amendment to the Pacific Northwest Regional Guide, USFS, Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, Oregon.

U.S. Department of the Army, 1985. U.S. Army White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, Installation Environmental Assessment (including Technical Appendices).

U.S. Department of the Army, 1983. U.S. Army White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, Natural Resources Management Plan.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1982. Status Report on Twelve Raptors, Special Scientific Report - Wildlife No. 238, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1979. Determination that Echinocereus lloydii is an endangered species, Federal Register 44 (209):61916-61918.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1979. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination that Coryphantha sneedii var. sneedii is an Endangered Species, Federal Register 44 (217): 64741-64743.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1981. Endangered and threatened plants; determination of two New Mexico plants to be endangered species and threatened species, with critical habitat, Federal Register 46 (12):5730-5733.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1981. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; deferral of effective dates, Federal Register 46 (151):40025-40026.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1985. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: review of plant taxa for listing as endangered or threatened species, Federal Register 50 (188):39526-39584.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1985. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: review of vertebrate wildlife, Federal Register 50 (181):37958-37967.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1986. Species List, letter provided to the Department of the Army, Fort Worth District, Corps of Engineers, for the Technology Integration Experiment, White Sands Missile Range, on file in the Environmental Office, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX F

HAZARDOUS OR TOXIC MATERIALS USED IN HEDI KITE FLIGHT TESTS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX F. HAZARDOUS OR TOXIC MATERIALS USED IN HEDI KITE FLIGHT TESTS

HEDI KITE 3 will involve a small amount (approximately 45 liters [12 gallons]) of MMH/N_2O_4 hypergolic liquid propellants, which are toxic and highly flammable. Use of a less dangerous substitute fuel for KV maneuvering is not feasible; however, plans for handling and use of the fuel do minimize any safety or environmental risk.

The KV will be fueled at a fueling bay (Building S-23363 at Launch Complex 36), which is especially designed to trap any spilled fuel in a catch basin. The catch basin drains into a sealed sump that holds leaked fuel until it is pumped into a disposal container for transportation to a disposal facility. The fueling process uses vacuum, and any spilled fuel is immediately diluted with water. The use of vacuum instead of pressure minimizes the possibility of an external leak. Dilution of spilled fuel with water reduces its toxicity, renders it nonflammable, and makes it safe to handle by conventional means.

During the time the missile is on the launch pad (a period of 4 to 6 weeks), the fuel tanks will not be pressurized, thus minimizing the possibility of a leak. Should leakage occur, the leaked fuel will be collected and disposed of as described above for fueling bay operations.

Other potentially hazardous or toxic materials (e.g., explosives, battery packs, cleaning fluids) utilized at the launch complex will be handled in accordance with existing WSMR regulations and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). Any excess materials will be removed from WSMR by the contractor at the conclusion of testing. Any wastes will be transported and disposed of by approved contractor(s), in accordance with State of New Mexico and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations.

The hypergolic liquid propellants aboard the missile will either be used up in the flight or consumed by the explosion of the missile warhead and/or the flight termination explosive package. There is a very remote possibility that an empty fuel tank might reach the ground in a relatively intact condition. If this were to happen, the fuel tank (a pressure vessel) might contain some fuel residue that would amount to less than 30 milliliters (1 ounce). The recovery team will be trained and equipped to deal with this possibility.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX G

STATISTICAL DATA - DEBRIS IMPACT AREAS
WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATISTICAL DATA - DEBRIS IMPACT AREAS, WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

The McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company (MDSSC) has calculated the trajectory and the debris impact zones of the HEDI KITE flight tests to be conducted at the White Sands Missile Range, White Sands, New Mexico (Figure 3-3). In order to evaluate safety requirements, the number of potentially lethal fragments that would fall within these impact areas resulting from the destruction of the kill vehicle (KV) was calculated. It is impossible to determine, exactly, the number of lethal fragments, but a number of models were developed that could be used to estimate the fragment characteristics that would result from the breakup of a vehicle. These models were used to estimate the number, size, weight, density, and construction of lethal fragments resulting from the destruction of the HEDI KV. The analysis that follows presents the data and calculations that were used in determining the various characteristics of the HEDI KITE debris and the probability of that debris falling into particular impact areas.

KILL VEHICLE WEIGHT

A breakdown of the KV by weight is presented below.

Item	lbs	kg
Total KV weight	806	366
Expendables	-77	-35
Residual expendables	-12	-5
Warhead installation	-81	-37
Warhead structure (skin)	-8	-4
External insulation erosion	-7	-3
Total weight of remaining debris	621	282

Expendables are assumed to be consumed by the KV's maneuvering and cooling during the flight, or expelled into the atmosphere as a result of breakup of their containment structure. The warhead mass is assumed to be consumed as a result of its detonation during the destruct event; testing has shown that the warhead breaks into small, light pieces that have a ground impact kinetic energy of less than the safety criterion of 58 foot-pounds.

LETHAL FRAGMENT WEIGHT AND SIZE

The KV is principally constructed of aluminum, steel, and titanium. A breakdown of the KV by material is presented below.

KV subsystem/component	Material
Controls	
Propellant tank	Steel
Lines, Thrusters	Titanium
Cooling	
Tank	Graphite composite
Valve, Lines	Titanium/Steel
Pressurization	
Case	Titanium
Valve, Manifold	Titanium
Avionics	
Various	Various
Main structure	
Skin	Graphite Polimide
Frames, Support	Aluminum
Bulkhead, Sta. 100	Titanium
Air Duct	to be decided
Window	Sapphire
Forebody	Steel
External insulation	RMSP

Based on the models, and the predominance of steel, titanium, and aluminum, the following fragment weights and lengths were determined:

Material	Weight	Length
Aluminum	0.234 lb (0.11 kg)	1.348 in (3.4 cm)
Steel	0.114 lb (0.05 kg)	0.739 in (1.9 cm)
Titanium	0.156 lb (0.07 kg)	

Fragments with a kinetic energy equal to the safety criterion (58 foot-pounds) were assumed to be cubic in shape.

NUMBER OF LETHAL FRAGMENTS

The number of lethal fragments was determined by: first, assuming that the fragments were divided into three density groups: titanium (283 lb/ft^3), aluminum (165 lb/ft^3), and those lighter than aluminum (100 lb/ft^3). Each component of the KV was then placed in one of these three density groups. A summary of the distribution of these three groups by weight is as follows:

Density Group	Density (lb/ft^3)	Weight lb (kg)	Percent Weight
Titanium	283	129 (59)	20
Aluminum	165	212 (96)	35
Less than Aluminum	100	280 (127)	45
		621 (282)	100

If it is assumed that the KV will break into equal mass fragments, a limit value for the number of fragments can be determined. Mathematically this formula can be stated:

$$N = \frac{WT}{WF}$$

N = the number of fragments

WT = the total weight

WF = the fragment weight

Using the above figures as an example, if the total KV weight is 621 pounds and each aluminum fragment weighs 0.234 pounds, the limit value for the number of aluminum fragments will be:

$$N = \frac{621}{0.234}$$

N = 2,653 pieces of aluminum debris

This calculation is then made for each of the density groups, resulting in the following limit values:

Titanium	-	limit value = 3,980
Aluminum	-	limit value = 2,653
Less than aluminum	-	limit value = 1,899

In addition, MDSSC has generated a model value for each of the models used in this analysis. This model value, when multiplied by the percent of weight for each density group, yields the proportional number of lethal fragments that will be found in the KV (Table G-1).

Although the actual total number of lethal fragments calculated for the KV is shown as 183 in the table, for safety analysis purposes, 190 lethal fragments will be assumed.

In addition to the above calculations, planimetry was used to calculate the debris impact areas. They are as follows:

Sigma 1	=	55,460	acres
Sigma 3	=	119,236	acres
Sigma 3 minus Sigma 1	=	63,776	acres

As well, the percentage of debris pieces that will fall into a given area has been calculated:

Sigma 1	=	68 percent (68% of 190 fragments equals 129)
Sigma 3	=	95 percent (95% of 190 fragments equals 181)
Sigma 3 minus Sigma 1	=	27 percent (27% of 190 fragments equals 51)

Using these planimetered areas and the known number of fragments of lethal debris, the probability (P) of lethal debris falling into any given acre can be determined:

$$P = \frac{\text{percent of total debris pieces}}{\text{number of acres}}$$

TABLE G-1. SUMMARY OF NUMBER OF LETHAL FRAGMENTS

Density Group	Lethal Weight, M (lb)	Percent of Weight	CUMULATIVE NUMBER OF FRAGMENTS GREATER THAN M Limit Value (a)	Model Value (a)	Proportional Value (b)
Titanium	0.156	20	3,980	271	54
Aluminum	0.234	35	2,653	189	66
Less than aluminum	0.327	45	1,899	141	63
				TOTAL	183

(a) Limit value and model value assume all weight (621 pounds) is in the specific density group.

(b) Model value for density group times percent of weight in density group. Must sum the density groups for total number of fragments.

SIGMA 3

$$P = \frac{95\% \text{ of } 190}{119{,}236} = 0.002 = 2 \text{ out of } 1{,}000$$

P = **1 out of 500** chances that lethal debris will fall into any given acre

Using the same figures, the probability (P) of lethal debris hitting a bighorn sheep within the debris impact areas can be calculated. (For statistical purposes a bighorn sheep is considered as a 5-square-foot area.)

$$P = \frac{\text{percent of total debris pieces X 5 (sq. feet)}}{\text{43,560 sq feet in an acre X number of acres}}$$

SIGMA 1

$$P = \frac{68\% \text{ X } 190 \text{ X } 5}{43{,}560 \text{ X } 55{,}460} = \frac{646}{2{,}415{,}837{,}600} = 0.000000267 = 2.6 \text{ in ten million or}$$

1 in 4 million chances that a sheep would be hit by lethal debris in the Sigma 1 debris impact area.

SIGMA 3

$$P = \frac{95\% \text{ X } 190 \text{ X } 5}{43{,}560 \text{ X } 119{,}236} = \frac{903}{5{,}193{,}920{,}160} = 0.000000174 \text{ or } 1.7 \text{ in 10 million or}$$

1 chance in 5.8 million that a sheep would be hit by lethal debris in the Sigma 3 impact area.

SIGMA 3 minus SIGMA 1

$$P = \frac{27\% \text{ X } 190 \text{ X } 5}{43{,}560 \text{ X } 63{,}776} = \frac{257}{2{,}778{,}082{,}560} = 0.000000093 \text{ or } 9 \text{ in 100 million or}$$

1 chance in 11 million that a sheep would be hit by lethal debris in the Sigma 3 area outside of the Sigma 1 area.

Source: McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Corporation, 1988. High Endoatmospheric Defense Interceptor (HEDI) Kinetic Kill Vehicle Integrated Technology Experiment (KITE), Range Safety Data Package (U) CDRL AT12, July.

APPENDIX H

DISTRIBUTION LIST

THIS PAGE 'NTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Department of Defense Agencies

SDIO/EA
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-7100

SDIO/S/PL-CE
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-7100

OSD/PA
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-7100

SAF/AQSD
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330

SAF/RQ
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330

HQ USAF/LEEVP
Bolling AFB, DC 20332

OASA (I&L) - ESOH
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310

Department of the Army
HQDA, SARD-T-S
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0103

CSSD-DP
Crystal Mall, Bldg 4
Arlington, VA 22215

Army Environmental Office
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-1000

Department of the Army
The Judge Advocate General
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-1000

Department of the Army
Office of the Chief Legislative Liaison
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-1000

Department of the Army
Office of the Surgeon General
5 Skyline Place
5111 Leesburg Pike
Falls Church, VA 22041

Department of the Army
Office of the Chief of Public Affairs
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-1000

Deputy Director for Environment
Office of Director of Installations and
Facilities, Department of the Navy
Crystal Plaza, Bldg 5
Arlington, VA 20360

Environmental Protection Agency
Safety and Occupation Health Division
(OP-45)
Crystal Plaza, Bldg 5
Arlington, VA 20360

HQ AFSC/DEV
Andrews AFB, MD 20331-5000

HQ AFSC/PA
Andrews AFB, MD 20331-5000

HQ SAC/DEV
Offutt AFB, NE 68113-5001

HQ SAC/PA
Offutt AFB, NE 68113-5001

HQ AFLC/DEV
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-5001

HQ AFLC/PA
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-5001

HQ ESD/DE
Hanscom AFB, MA 01731

HQ ESD/PA
Hanscom AFB, MA 01731

HQ AFSPACECOM/DEPV
Peterson AFB, CO 80914-5001

HQ AFSPACECOM/PA
Peterson AFB, CO 80914-5001

HQ MAC/DEV
Scott AFB, IL 62225-5000

HQ MAC/PA
Scott AFB, IL 62225-5000

HQ USA SDC
Technical Director CSSD-TD
CM-4 1841 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202

Chief of Public Affairs
Arnold AFB, TN 37389-5000

Base Civil Engineer
Arnold AFB, TN 37389-5000

Chief of Public Affairs
2nd Space Wing
Falcon AFB, CO 80912-5000

Base Civil Engineer
2nd Space Wing
Falcon AFB, CO 80912-5000

1003 SSG/DEEV
Peterson AFB, CO 80914-5000

Chief of Public Affairs
2849 ABG
Hill AFB, UT 84056-5000

Base Civil Engineer
2849 ABG
Hill AFB, UT 84056-5000

Chief of Public Affairs
1606 ABW/PA
Kirtland AFB, NM 87117-5000

Base Civil Engineer
1606 ABW/DE
Kirtland AFB, NM 87117-5000

Chief of Public Affairs
Naval Surface Warfare Center
10901 New Hampshire Avenue
Silver Springs, MD 20903

Base Civil Engineer
Naval Surface Warfare Center
10901 New Hampshire Avenue
Silver Springs, MD 20903

Chief of Public Affairs
4392 ASW
Western Space and Missile Range
Vandenberg AFB, CA 93437-5000

Base Civil Engineer
4392 ASW
Western Space and Missile Range
Vandenberg AFB, CA 93437-5000

1 STRAD/ET
Environmental Management Division
Vandenberg AFB, CA 93437-5000

U.S. Army Material Command
AMCEN-A
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

U.S. Army Material Command
Attn: Public Affairs
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

U.S. Army Material Command
Attn: STEWS-EL-N
Building 1740, Room 100
White Sands Missile Range, NM
88002-5076

U.S. Army Material Command
Attn: Public Affairs
White Sands Missile Range, NM
88002-5076

U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll
CSSD-H-K/KA/KL/KS/KO/KT/KX
P.O. Box 26
APO San Francisco, CA 96555-2526

U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency
HSHB-MR-LM
Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD 21010-5442

U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command
CSSD-H-SSP
Huntsville, AL 35807-3801

Related Activities

McDonnell Douglas
Space Systems Co.
HEDI Project Office
5301 Bolsa Chica Ave.
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Teledyne Brown Engineering
Cummings Research Park
300 Sparkman Drive
Huntsville, AL 35807-5301

Federal, State, and Local Government Agencies

U.S. Department of Justice
Room 2133
10th & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Council on Environmental Quality
722 Jackson Place, SW
2nd Floor
Washington, DC 20503

Office of Federal Activities
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street SW
Mail Code A104
Washington, DC 20460

Department of Interior
Office of Public Affairs
C Street
Washington, DC 20240

Department of Energy
Director of Environment
Safety and Quality Assessment
GTN
U.S. Interstate 270
Germantown, MD 20545

PM-SNP
Department of State
Main State Building
Washington, DC 20520

National Security Council
Old Executive Office Building
Room 389
Washington, DC 20506

Arms Control and Disarmament
Agency
Office of Public Affairs
320 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20541

Office of Planning and Research
1400 10th Street
Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

Director
Colorado State Clearinghouse
Division of Local Government
1313 Sherman Street
Room 520
Denver, CO 80203

Director
Maryland State Clearinghouse
for Intergovernmental Assistance
Department of State Planning
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, MD 21201-2365

Director
Tennessee State Planning Office
John Sevier State Office Building
Room 307
500 Charlotte Avenue
Nashville, TN 37219

Division of Environmental Health
288 North 1460 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84116-0690

Federal Facilities Liaison Coordinator
Environmental Protection Agency
215 Fremont Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Federal Facilities Liaison Coordinator
Environmental Protection Agency
999 18th Street
Suite 500
Denver, CO 80202-2405

Federal Facilities Liaison Coordinator
Environmental Protection Agency
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Federal Facilities Liaison Coordinator
Environmental Protection Agency
345 Courtland N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30365

Federal Facilities Liaison Coordinator
Environmental Protection Agency
1445 Ross Avenue
12th Floor, Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2800 Cottage Way
Room 1803E
Sacramento, CA 95825

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pacific Islands Office
P.O. Box 50167
Honolulu, HI 86850

Department of the Environment
Division of Air Monitoring/
Engineering
201 West Preston Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

Libraries

Alamogordo Public Library
920 Tenth and Oregon
Alamogordo, NM 88310

Albuquerque Public Library
501 Copper N.W.
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Branigan Memorial Library
200 E. Picacho
Las Cruces, NM 88001

Coffee County Lannon
Memorial Public Library
312 North Collins
Tullahoma, TN 37388

Coffee County Manchester Public
Library
1005 Hillsboro Highway
Manchester, TN 37355

El Paso Public Library
501 North Oregon
El Paso, TX 79901

Layton Public Library
155 North Wasatch Drive
Layton, UT 84041

The Lompoc Public Library
501 East North Avenue
Lompoc, CA 93436

Montgomery County
Department of Public Libraries
99 Maryland
Rockville, MD 20850

Ogden Public Library
2464 Jefferson Avenue
Ogden, UT 84401

Penrose Public Library
P.O. Box 1579
20 North Cascade
Colorado Springs, CO 80901

Office of Freely Associated
States Affairs (FAS)
Room 5317
Department of State
22nd & C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520

U.S. Representative Office
P.O. Box 680
Republic of the Marshall Islands
Majuro, Marshall Islands 96960

Alele Museum/Library
c/o Ministry of the Interior and
Outer Island Affairs
Republic of the Marshall Islands
Majuro, Marshall Islands 96960

Defense Technical Information Center
FDAC Division
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22304-6145

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK