Draft

Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Activities and Operations at Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona

Prepared For U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground

Prepared by

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District

August 2013

This page intentionally left blank.

How to Read This Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

This Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS) for Activities and Operations at Yuma Proving Ground contains both programmatic analyses and detailed analyses of specific actions. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) has identified a Proposed Action that includes (1) well-defined short-term activities, projects that could be implemented upon completion of this National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis that are analyzed in detail, (2) short-term projects with unspecified locations for which programmatic analysis is appropriate, and (3) long-term, less well defined activities for which programmatic analysis is appropriate. As the projects become better defined, tiered NEPA documents (Record of Environmental Consideration for Categorical Exclusions, Environmental Assessments, or Environmental Impact Statements) can be completed for these projects. This document identifies which Proposed Action activities were analyzed in detail and which were analyzed programmatically. Initially, this PEIS was developed from projects identified for development of a draft Real Property Master Plan (RPMP). That draft RPMP was not fully developed and additional projects have been identified that YPG proposes to implement. Therefore, this DPEIS addresses planned activities and operations at YPD and will be suitable to support future development of a RPMP at YPG.

There are multiple areas on YPG that are identified and named as impact areas. This terminology is not related to the definition of "impact" as it is typically used in a NEPA analysis. These are areas into which explosive and inert munitions are fired. For clarity, named or proposed named impact areas are referred to herein as "munitions impact areas" to distinguish them from areas where impacts from the Proposed Action could occur, which could be anywhere on the installation.

This DPEIS is organized into the following sections and appendices:

- Executive Summary Includes information about the purpose and need for the Proposed Action, the project location, a description of the alternatives considered in the DPEIS, a description of the public outreach process, a summary of the environmental consequences of each alternative, and a description of proposed mitigation measures.
- Section 1 Purpose and Need: Presents the purpose of the Proposed Action and outlines Army requirements that drive and influence the need to modify testing and training activities at YPG. This section also describes the scope of the DPEIS, the decision to be made by the Army, and public and agency coordination that influenced development of the scope of the DPEIS and the analysis.
- Section 2 Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives: Describes the relevant study area, describes the Proposed Action, explains the criteria used to develop reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action, identifies alternatives that were considered but not analyzed in the DPEIS, and presents the alternatives considered in the DPEIS with a summary of their consequences. This section also discusses the Army's Preferred Alternative.
- Section 3 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences: Describes the priorities for environmental analysis based on the resources that could be affected by the Proposed Action. The baseline or existing condition for each resource area is provided,

regardless of the potential for impact. Following the description of existing conditions, impacts are discussed. For each resource area, significance criteria for impacts are identified and the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of implementing the alternatives are analyzed. Impacts resulting from the testing and training activities and construction and demolition of facilities are presented for each alternative, as appropriate.

- Section 4 List of Preparers: Identifies the primary individuals responsible for preparation of the DPEIS and their qualifications, and indicates the sections of the DPEIS to which they contributed.
- Section 5 Distribution List: Presents the distribution list for the DPEIS.
- Section 6 References: Lists the sources referenced in the DPEIS.
- Section 7 Agencies and Persons Contacted: Lists the relevant entities contacted during preparation of the DPEIS.
- Section 8 Public, Agency, and Tribal Comments and Responses: Presents all correspondence relevant to the DPEIS and the Army responses to comments received.
- Section 9 Index: Presents a page number index to the key issues and topics addressed in this DPEIS.
- Appendix A Public Outreach
- Appendix B Activities Conducted Under the No Action Alternative
- Appendix C Quick Look Answers
- Appendix D Air Emissions Calculations
- Appendix E Programmatic Agreement
- Appendix F Noise Contour Figures from the Installation Operational Noise Management Plan
- Appendix G Sensitive Species Tracked by State of Arizona with Potential to Occur in Yuma and La Paz Counties

United States Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District have prepared this Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS) to assess the potential impacts associated with activities and operations at YPG. This DPEIS analyzes construction, testing, and training activities and presents the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the Proposed Action to continue ongoing activities and to implement new facilities, infrastructure, and programs to meet anticipated future needs and maintain YPG as a multi-purpose installation that serves a broad customer base. The proposed action would also support cross-functional training allowed by the Department of Defense. The DPEIS will support development of a future Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) at YPG by providing a basis for the Visioning Plan and by providing a programmatic framework for the Capital Investment Strategy and the Area Development Plans. The analysis in the EIS also will support the alternatives analysis for the RPMP.

Activities anticipated on YPG include construction and demolition of facilities and infrastructure and changes to current types and levels of testing and training. The DPEIS addresses the following types of activities:

- Short-term, well-defined activities at known locations that could be implemented without additional National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) [42 United States Code (U.S.C.) 4321-4347] analysis once a decision is made
- Short-term, well-defined activities for which locations are not known that would receive additional site-specific NEPA analysis prior to project implementation
- Long-term, less well-defined activities that would occur later in time and would receive additional site-specific NEPA analysis prior to project implementation

This document examines the sum of the activities that will occur or are likely to occur on YPG for the next several years. It is not always possible to predict accurately specific projects in specific years, but the Army is confident about the types of activities that will occur and the general technology trends that will establish the testing and training workloads in coming years; therefore, the Army is adopting a programmatic approach to this analysis to comply with NEPA and set the framework for future tiered documents if required. The analysis focuses on the anticipated impacts of categories of actions on the natural and human environment. Accordingly, the analysis examines military testing activities, military training activities, construction, and demolition, as appropriate for each activity.

This document identifies which activities were analyzed in detail and which were analyzed programmatically. The analysis evaluates all projects proposed for the foreseeable future. It is likely that not all evaluated activities would be implemented and the decision could indicate that only a portion of the activities analyzed will be selected. The alternatives for specific activities considered include testing, training, and construction/demolition options to meet the evolving mission requirements of YPG.

ES.1 Project Setting

YPG is a U-shaped Army facility located in southwestern Arizona (Figure ES-1). The land between the arms of the "U" is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge (Kofa NWR). YPG is subdivided into five functional units, with each unit performing a different function in relation to the mission:

- Laguna Region
- Cibola Region
- Kofa Region, including Kofa Firing Range (KFR) and East Arm
- Airspace
- Off-post Locations

Laguna, Cibola, and Kofa Regions are shown on Figure ES-2. Off-post locations are not addressed in this DPEIS since no changes are proposed for use of offsite areas.

YPG has restricted military airspace over most of YPG and over most of the Kofa NWR (Figure ES-3). Restricted airspace places priority on military operations, but can be used by private or commercial flights during periods of non-use by YPG or other military users provided proper clearance is obtained in advance. YPG allows use of its airspace by other military services for training activities when not in use by the installation.

ES.2 Alternatives

Two alternatives are carried forward for evaluation in this DPEIS:

- 1. The No Action Alternative is the continuation of existing operations on YPG. Under the No Action Alternative, testing and training would continue at the current levels and utilize existing facilities and infrastructure with no new construction. Ongoing testing and training occur in specific areas within YPG, and the locations of current activities are depicted on Figures ES-4 through ES-12. Tables identifying the testing and training activities included under the No Action Alternative are provided in Appendix B, as Tables B-1 through B-3, which are presented by region (Laguna, Cibola, and Kofa Regions). No test areas, munitions impact areas, or drop zones (DZs) would be expanded under the No Action Alternative. No construction or demolition would occur under the No Action Alternative.
- 2. The Proposed Action includes the activities identified under the No Action Alternative and the short-term and long-term projects identified by YPG that would be necessary to meet anticipated future needs, including new construction and associated demolition, testing, and training activities occurring on YPG, and new testing and training proposed by supported components to meet anticipated testing or training needs.

The locations of components of the Proposed Action planned to occur in the Laguna Region are shown on Figure ES-13. Fifty-six proposed activities have been identified for this region of YPG, including 42 short-term and 14 long-term. Identifiers for the activities are located in Table ES-1. These activities include infrastructure construction, expansion of test areas to accommodate additional testing, and planned changes in testing and training activities.

The construction, testing, and training activities planned to occur in the Cibola Region are identified in Table ES-2 and the locations are shown on Figure ES-14. Sixty-five short-term

projects have been identified. The identifiers for each project in Table ES-2 correspond to the identifiers on Figure ES-14. These activities include (1) infrastructure construction, (2) expansion of test areas to accommodate additional testing, (3) planned changes in testing and training activities, and (4) provision of appropriate supporting infrastructure for continued testing and training activities, such as appropriate petroleum, oil, and lubricants (POL) storage at remote testing locations.

Construction, testing, and training activities planned for the Kofa Region are listed in Table ES-3, with the locations shown on Figure ES-15. Thirty-one short-term projects have been identified. The identifiers for each project in Table ES-3 correspond to the identifiers on Figure ES-15. These activities include infrastructure construction, expansion of test areas to accommodate additional testing, and planned changes in testing and training activities.

In addition to specific short-term projects, the Proposed Action includes programmatic analysis of the proposed long-term projects that are likely to be implemented following further design and analysis or implemented on an as-needed basis for specific testing needs.

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
			Short Term Projects		
L001	L001-a: Construct building, concrete pad, shade structure, and install solar lights at K-9 Village L001-b: Install hard power/fiber, and communication service at K-9 Village.	L002	L002-a: Construct Runway 18/36 extension, and realign Barranca Road at Laguna Army Airfield (LAAF) L002-b: Install hard power at LAAF.	L003	Construct outdoor eating area at the Roadrunner Café.
L004	Construct office building next to Building 2968.	L005	L005-a: Construct medium and large storage buildings next to Building 2970. L005-b: Construct 2 office buildings next to Building 2970. L005-c: Construct Air Delivery Guided Test Facility next to Building 2970.	L006	L006-a: Construct Flight Detachment Maintenance Building L006-b: Construct Wild Horse Café L006-c: Construct antiterrorism/force protection (AT/FP) parking improvements.
L007	L007-a: Construct helicopter parking at Castle Dome Heliport (CDH) L007-b: Construct unmanned aircraft system (UAS) parking, UAS storage facility, and UAS maintenance hangar at CDH L007-c: Construct privately owned vehicle parking at CDH	L008	L008-a: Construct access control point (ACP) at CDH L008-b: Construct roadway drainage improvements at CDH.	L009	Construct warehouse at Yuma Test Center (YTC)

TABLE ES-1 Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region ^a

Yuma Proving Ground

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
	L007-d: Relocate C-130 CALA to CDH.				
L010	Construct Instrumentation Development Facility at YTC.	L011	L011-a: Construct tracked vehicle trail at YTC L011-b: Construct office at YTC.	L012	L012-a: Construct hotel at the Main Administrative Area (MAA) L012-b: Construct Emergency Operations Center (EOC) at MAA L012-c: Construct addition to youth services center at MAA L012-d: Construct ACP improvements at MAA L012-e: Construct child development center for school-aged services L012-f: Construct outdoor eating area at Coyote Lanes bowling alley.
L013	L013-a: Construct additional fencing and support facilities to the Threat Systems and Target Simulations Buildings 3572 and 3574 L013-b: Install hard power, fiber, and phone service to the Threat Systems and Target Simulations Buildings 3572 and 3574.	L014	L014-a: Construct aircraft shelter, command and control building, and clear a UAS launch/recovery area at Comanche Flats L014-b: Construct multiple buildings, concrete pad, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking area at Comanche Flats L014-c: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Comanche Flats.	L015	L015-a: Repair landing pad and construct building at K- 9 Village L015-b: Install hard power, fiber, and communication service at K-9 Village.
L016	L016-a: Construct building, concrete or asphalt pad, shade structure, and install solar lights at Site 2 L016-b: Install hard power, fiber, and communication service at Site 2.	L017	Construct ground control stations for UAS operations at Telemetry (TM) Site 4.	L018	Construct concrete or asphalt pad and sensor tower east of existing sensor test building at Sidewinder Sensor Site.
L019	Expand and combine West LA Light Maneuver Training Area (LTA), K-9 Village LTA, Site 2 LTA, and Site 4 LTA.	L020	Upgrade equipment at Tire X-Ray Facility (Building 2310). ^a	L021	Construct solar chamber at Climatic Simulation Facilities (Building 3527).
L022	Relocate dust chamber from Building 3352 to near Buildings 3357 and 3494 (Rough Handling).	L023	L023-a: Improve ACP at the Kofa cantonment L023-b: Construct joint wash rack for tracked and government owned vehicles (GOVs) at the	L024	Relocate Semi-trailer Delivery Safe Haven.

Kofa cantonment

TABLE ES-1

Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region ^a Yuma Proving Ground TABLE ES-1Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region aYuma Proving Ground

	Description	חו	Description	חו	Description
	Description	שו		U	Description
			substation protection and electronics expansion at the Kofa cantonment L023-d: Construct Howitzer Support\ Acceptance Facility at the Kofa cantonment L023-e: Construct open storage facility at the Kofa cantonment.		
L025	L025-a: Construct Aberdeen Road flood upgrades L025-b: Construct range road improvements.	L026	Construct munitions treatment facility.	L027	Construct gun storage facility at the Kofa cantonment.
L028	Construct five ammunition magazines near the Kofa cantonment.	L029	Construct optical maintenance facility, graded parking area with power pole farm, and perimeter fencing centered at YTC.	L030	L030: Expand LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuvers at Muggins/Middle East: L030-a: 16,640 ac L030-b: 6,331 ac
L031	L031: Construct MFFS Dining Facility (DFAC) (one option to be selected): L031-a:Location Option 1 L031-b: Location Option 2 L031-c: Location Option 3	L032	Expand Bravo LTA.	L033	Expand Hill 630 LTA
L034	L034: Construct MFFS Ready Room (one option to be selected): L034-a: Location Option 1 L034-b: Location Option 2 L034-c: Location Option 3	L035	Construct Armament Test Operations and Analysis Facility.	L036	Construct Shower Facility at LAAF Forward Operating Base area.
L037	Construct vehicle test course.	L038	Construct vehicle test course.	L039	Construct vehicle test course
L040	Construct drop zone near LAAF (DZ) (984-foot [ft] x 1,969-ft)	L041	Construct air delivery storage and laboratory facility behind Building 2970	L042	Upgrade facility to an office and hangar in Building 3025 ^a
			Long-Term Projects		
L100	L100-a: Construct addition to Building 3021 L100-b: Construct Future Combat Systems (FCS) Rotary Class IV hangars, and FCS large Class IV hangar west of LAAF L100-c: Construct large transient UAS hangar with pad access west of LAAF	L101	L101-a: Construct motor pool to the north of LAAF L101-b: Construct addition to ammunition building rigging bay to the north of LAAF L101-c: Construct access from Ocotillo Road and ammunition building access road	L102	L102-a: Construct new MFFS Terminal at LAAF/MAA L102-b: Construct consolidated rigger facility at LAAF/MAA L102-c: Construct UAS airfield, hangars, taxiways, and UAS flight test area and other supporting

Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region ^a Yuma Proving Ground

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
	L100-d: Construct aviation growth hangar L100-e: Construct administrative support building to the west of LAAF L100-f: Construct U.S. Army Special Operations Command Tactical Hangar at LAAF.		improvements to the north of LAAF L101-d: Construct storage yard improvements to the north of LAAF.		infrastructure at LAAF/MAA L102-d: Construct CASA Transport Aircraft Hangar at LAAF/MAA.
L103	L103-a: Construct fire station at CDH L103-b: Construct fuel point at CDH L103-c: Construct C-130 parking at CDH L103-d: Construct hot cargo refueling area at CDH L103-e: Construct dining facility at CDH L103-f: Construct airship hangar at CDH.	L104	Construct water and wastewater treatment facilities at CDH.	L105	Construct crosswind runway at CDH.
L106	L106-a: Construct 4 administrative support buildings at YTC L106-b: Construct Installation Logistics Complex at YTC.	L107	Construct improvements to Cox Field, AT/FP, and Garrison headquarters, and convert Street D to pedestrian walkway.	L108	L108-a: Improve truck ACP at the Kofa cantonment L108-b: Expand range communication at the Kofa cantonment L108-c: Expand sand blasting at the Kofa cantonment L108-d: Consolidate optics at the Kofa cantonment L108-e: Construct second GOV and tracked vehicle maintenance facility at the Kofa cantonment.
L109	Construct wax plant expansion at the Kofa cantonment.	L110	Construct additional ammunition plant similar to Building 3482 and air- conditioned chamber near the Kofa cantonment.	L111	Upgrade equipment and electrical supply at Physical Test Facility (Buildings 3490 and 3130). ^a
L112	Upgrade equipment in vibration test facilities (Buildings 3496, 3495, and 3594) ^a	L113	Upgrade equipment at radiography facility (Building 3493) ^a		

^a Work that would occur within existing buildings is not identified on maps because there would be no environmental impacts.

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Those that include a letter with the identifier are considered independent activities. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

TABLE ES-2Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region a,b,cYuma Proving Ground

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
	Short Term Projects				
C001	Construct vehicle test course.	C002	C002-a: Construct South Urban DZ (1,640-ft radius) south of Urban DZ, C002-b: Construct Tomahawk Circular DZ 769 (2,297-ft radius), C002-c: Construct Tombstone DZ (984-ft radius), C002-d: Construct Village Circular DZ (984-ft radius), C002-e: Construct Abken DZ (1,640-ft radius), C002-f: Construct Urban Circular Joint Precision Airdrop System DZ (984-ft radius).	C003	C003-a: Establish small arms impact areas for inert munitions at (Joint Experimentation Range Complex) JERC I. Small arms impact area would use collection boxes for fired ammunition and would be cleaned between tests. C003-b: Establish small arms impact areas for inert munitions at JERC II. Small arms impact area would use collection boxes for fired ammunition and would be cleaned between tests. C003-c: Establish small arms impact areas for inert munitions at JERC III. Small arms impact area would use collection boxes for fired arms impact areas for inert munitions at JERC III. Small arms impact area would use collection boxes for fired ammunition and would be cleaned between tests.
C004	C004-a: Construct facilities at Gauna Peak C004-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Gauna Peak.	C005	C005-a: Construct building at Site 18 C005-b: Install hard power, water, sewer and communication service at Site 18.	C006	Establish Phoenix West Impact Area.
C007	C007-a: Construct runway extension, aircraft shelter, and POL storage at Phoenix UAS site C007-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Phoenix UAS site.	C008	C008-a: Construct building at Site 16 C008-b: Install hard power, water, sewer, and communication service at Site 16.	C009	Establish North UAS Impact Area.

Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region ^{a,b,c} Yuma Proving Ground

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
C010	Construct aircraft shelter, POL storage, and graded parking lot at North Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) complex.	C011	Establish La Posa West Impact Area.	C012	C012-a: Construct building and concrete pad at Persistent Surveillance Systems Test Area (west of La Posa DZ) C012-b: Install hard power/fiber at Persistent Surveillance Systems Test Area (west of La Posa DZ).
C013	Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Electronic Common Use Test area.	C014	C014-a: Install shade structure to Stinger Pole Target Area C014-b: Install hard power to Stinger Pole Target Area.	C015	Construct Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance/Electro -optical (ISR/EO) Ground Truth Reference Sites at: C015-a: Yuma Wash centered at (33.156, - 114.485) C015-b: Middle Mountain Road centered at (33.063, - 114.358) C015-c: Mule Wash centered at (33.432, - 114.503) C015-d: Centered at (33.446, -114.471) C015-e: Centered at (33.446, -114.471) C015-e: Centered at (33.447, -114.286) C015-f: Centered at (33.448, -114.275) C015-g: Centered at (33.448, -114.275) C015-h: Centered at (33.421, -114.279) C015-i: Centered at (33.408, -225.360) C015-j: Centered at (33.389, -114.303) C015-k: Centered at (33.387, -114.366) C015-l: Centered at (33.347, -114.286) C015-n: Centered at (33.297, -114.395) C015-n: Centered at (33.165, -114.480) C015-o: Centered at (33.122, -114.299) C015-p: Centered at (33.090, -114.447) C015-q: Centered at (33.091, -114.353)

Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region ^{a,b,c} *Yuma Proving Ground*

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
					C015-r: Centered at (33.967, -114.422)
C016	Rebuild target for long- range missile firing at Maverick Target.	C017	C017-a: Construct building, bomb-proof shelter, shade structure, concrete or asphalt pad, and sensor tower at camera mount (CM) 4 C017-b: Install phone service at CM 4.	C018	Construct landing pad at CM 1.
C019	Construct building and concrete pad at Z-12.	C020	C020-a: Construct sensor tower, buildings, and concrete pad at Site 9 C020-b: Install hard power and communication service at Site 9.	C021	C021-a: Construct secure building with reinforced concrete floors and ramp to building centered at (- 114.356, 33.077) C021- b: Construct multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking centered at (-114.356, 33.077) C021-c: Construct aircraft shelter centered at (-114.356, 33.077) C021-d: Clear a launch/recovery area centered at (-114.356, 33.077) C021-e: Install hard power/fiber and communication service centered at (-114.356, 33.077).
C022	C022-a: Construct building, concrete slab, walkways, and fencing centered at (-114.36, 33.074) C022-b: Construct aircraft shelter centered at (-114.36, 33.074) C022-c: Construct POL storage centered at (- 114.36, 33.074) C022-d: Relocate meteorological tower centered at (-114.36, 33.074) C022-e: Construct runway expansion and taxiway centered at (-	C023	C023-a: Construct multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking centered at (- 114.363, 33.051) C023-b: Construct aircraft shelter centered at (- 114.363, 33.051) C023-c: Clear a launch/recovery area centered at (-114.363, 33.051) C023-d: Install hard power/fiber and communication service centered at (-114.363, 33.051)	C024	C024-a: Construct shelter, concrete pad, graded parking area near Inverted Range Control Center (IRCC) Tank Maintenance and Storage Ramada C024-b: Install fence and solar lights around IRCC Tank Maintenance and Storage Ramada compound.

114.36, 33.074).

Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region ^{a,b,c}
Yuma Proving Ground

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
C025	C025-a: Construct runway, taxiway, aircraft shelter, and building adjacent to existing helicopter pad at IRCC C025-b: Install hard power/fiber adjacent to existing helicopter pad at IRCC.	C026	C026-a: Construct ramp to existing building, rollup door to existing building, and install solar lights at Site 10 Missile Test Facility C026-b: Construct concrete landing pad at Site 10 Missile Test Facility C026-c: Install hard power/fiber at Site 10 Missile Test Facility.	C027	C027-a: Expand flat area on top of hill, and construct facility, concrete pad, and sensor tower at Site 12. C027-b: Construct road leading from the sensor building on the top of the hill at Site 12A down to the Persistent Threat Detection System Site.
	C028 °	C029	C029-a: Construct buildings and concrete pad at Aerostat Mooring Site C029-b: Install generators and hard power/fiber at Aerostat Mooring Site.	C030	C030-a: Construct aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, graded parking area, and clear a launch/recovery area east of Rocket Alley C030-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service east of Rocket Alley.
C031	Utilize Site 6 as a meteorological station.	C032	Renovate Large Multi- Purpose Environmental Chamber (Building 6015). ^a	C033	C033-a: Construct aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, concrete pad, water tank, POL storage area, graded parking area and clear a launch/recovery area at C-17 C033-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at C-17.
C034	C034-a: Expand size of Graze Range Impact Areas by consolidating 7 individual impact areas into a single larger area C034-b: Install hard power to Graze Range.	C035	Expand Combined Live Fire Exercise Range at OP- 9 by consolidating 2 designated impact areas and Prospect Square.	C036	Increase use of Prospect Square for bombing or aircraft gunnery.
C037	Install hard power to 40- foot (ft) drop tower.	C038	Construct MEDEVAC pad at Castle Dome Annex (CDA)	C039	Construct air- conditioned storage facility at CDA.
C040	Install hard power to Cibola Region North Range.	C041	Expand Light Maneuver Training Area (LTA) to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at Middle Mountain.	C042	C042-a: Install relocatable instrumentation trailers along all JERC I roads. Instrumentation trailers would be moved to accommodate specific

Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region a,b,c
Yuma Proving Ground

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
					testing requirements. Each 20-foot instrumentation trailer requires a staging area with a 20-foot radius. C042-b: Install relocatable instrumentation trailer along all JERC II roads with the same properties as described for C042-a. C042-c: Install relocatable instrumentation trailer along all JERC III roads with the same properties as described for C042-a.
C043	C043-a: Temporarily bury simulated missiles, explosives, etc. off all JERC I roads for sensor testing. Locations for temporary burials would vary and be determined by specific testing requirements. C043-b: Temporarily bury simulated missiles, explosives, etc. off all JERC II roads for sensor testing. Locations for temporary burials would vary and be determined by specific testing requirements. C043-c: Temporarily bury simulated missiles, explosives, etc. off all JERC III roads for sensor testing. Locations for temporary burias for sensor testing. Locations for temporary burials would vary and be determined by specific testing requirements.	C044	C044-a: Clear medical evacuation (MEDEVAC) helicopter landing pad at JERC I for evacuations. C044-b: Clear MEDEVAC helicopter landing pad at JERC II for evacuations. C044-c: Clear MEDEVAC helicopter landing pad at JERC III for evacuations.	C045	Construct MFFS Forward Staging Area.
C046	North UAV Compound Expansion C046-a: Construct concrete pad C046-b: Grade project area and install fencing	C047	Create 23 new Transient Gun Positions (TGPs) at: C047-a: Rocket Alley C047-b: CM9 East C047-c: Cibola Target Boundary GP	C048	Install hard power to Detection and Recognition Target Array target in the Cibola Range.

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
	asphalt taxiway		C047-e: CM9 West C047-f: C17 North and South C047-g: Mound C Archer GP C047-h: Mound C GP C047-h: Mound C GP C047-i: CM1 West C047-j: La Posa DZ C047-k: Site 8 GP C047-k: Site 8 GP C047-k: West Target Road GP C047-m: BM1072 C047-n: Excalibur SW GP C047-n: Excalibur SW GP C047-n: LADZ GP C047-p: Site 18 GP C047-g: 2.75 Rocket GP C047-g: 2.75 Rocket GP C047-s: DFR GP C047-s: DFR GP C047-t: La Posa South DZ C047-u: Water Tank GP C047-w: C17 North M777LWH GP		
C049	Install acoustic and seismic sensor at Horizontal Impact Area.	C050	C050-a: Construct building at Simulated Minefield Site to support UAS operations C050-b: Install hard power, water, sewer, and communication service at Simulated Minefield Site.	C051	Install shade structure at Lightweight Shock Facility.
C052	Establish CM 7 Impact Area.	C053	Establish CM 4 North Impact Area.	C054	Construct Yuma Wash ECUT expansion
C055	Establish Multi-Purpose North Impact Area.	C056	Establish Multi-Purpose South Impact Area.	C057	Expand Rocket Alley Impact Area.
C058	Establish Aerial Weapons Impact Area.	C059	Establish East Target Road Impact Area.	C060	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at TOW Town.
C061	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at JERC I/Saderville.	C062	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at JERC II.	C063	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at JERC III.

Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region ^{a,b,c} *Yuma Proving Ground*

Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region a,b,c
Yuma Proving Ground

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
C064	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at Yuma Wash.	C065	C065: Create LRA Impact Area C065-a: LRA Impact Area 1 C065-b: LRA Impact Area 2 C065-c: LRA Impact Area 3 C065-d: LRA Impact Area 4	C066	C066-a: Construct aerial cable drop site for drop testing in mountains north of Prospect Square. Activity includes two cables suspended between mountain peaks, winches and pulleys for each cable, 328-ft radius target area C066-b: Construct an approximately 2.5-mile access trail to the target area in mountains north of Prospect Square.

^a Measurements are approximate.

^b Work that would occur within existing buildings is not identified on maps because there would be no environmental impacts

^c The project proposed as C028 has been removed from direct analysis in this document. Due to a time critical need for implementation, this activity was analyzed through a separate and specific NEPA document. This activity is considered in the analysis of cumulative impacts in this document.

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Those that include a letter with the identifier are considered independent activities. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region ^a Yuma Proving Ground

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description			
	Short-Term Projects							
K001	Construct a 1,640-ft radius DZ for personnel and cargo drops in southern portion of East Arm.	K002	Construct 1,250-ft radius DZ for personnel and cargo drops northeast of East Smart Weapons Test Range (SWTR) Impact Area.	K003	Expand munitions impact area from north boundary of Echo and Foxtrot to north boundary of contaminated area (Advanced Munitions Range).			
K004	K004-a: Construct aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, graded parking area, and clear a launch/recovery area at SWTR K004-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at SWTR.	K005	Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Tower L.	K006	Install launch/recovery systems and a ground control station trailer at Tower 48.			
K007	K007-a: Construct runway west of S-15 Command and Control Shelter. K007-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service west of S-15 Command and Control Shelter.	K008	Expand munitions impact area to encompass area between Impact Areas Delta and Echo.	K009	Install fiber and permanent Improved Vehicle Tracking System (IVTS) and telemetry relays at Windy Hill.			
K010	Expand munitions impact area north of North Boundary Road between GP (gun position) 21A and Impact Area Alpha (Advanced Munitions Range).	K011	Renovate site and construct new control room and firing chamber at GP 5.	K012	K012-a: Construct two permanent reinforced concrete buildings to house personnel, equipment and ammunition, and new access road at GP 18 K012-b: Install hard power and communication services at GP 18.			
K013	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building and additional building to house weapons GP 21.	K014	Construct ISR/EO Ground Truth Reference Sites at: K014-a: centered at (32.846, -114.336) K014-b: centered at (32.967, -114.239) K014-c: centered at (32.932, -114.151) K014-d: centered at (32.822, -114.196) K014-e: centered at (32.990, -113.955) K014-f: centered at (32.930, -113.926) K014-g: centered at (32.836, -114.016)	K015	Construct permanent building at GP 21A.			

Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region ^a Yuma Proving Ground

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
			K014-h: centered at (32.867, -113.922) K014-i: centered at (32.841, -113.866) K014-j: centered at (32.986, -113.812) K014-k: centered at (32.904, -113.791) K014-l: centered at (32.020, -113.758) K014-m: centered at (32.957, -113.666)		
K016	Construct permanent building at GP 17A.	K017	Construct permanent building at GP on Growl Road in southeast corner of Echo Munitions Impact Area.	K018	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building at GP Splinter.
K019	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building at GP 19.1.	K020	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building at GP 11.1.	K021	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at East Arm.
K022	Establish up to 12 TGPs within Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, Delta, Echo or Foxtrot munitions impact areas on Kofa Firing Range annually.	K023	Install hard power and communication services to Hazard Classification Deflagration test area.	K024	K024-a: Construct aerial cable drop site for drop testing in mountains south of Pole Line Road. Activity includes two cables suspended between mountain peaks, winches and pulleys for each cable, 328-ft target area K024-b: Construct an approximately 0.6-mile access trail to the target area in mountains south of Pole Line Road.
K025	K025-a: Construct East Kofa Operations Center which includes a small building complex, perimeter fencing, vehicle maintenance area, storage areas, tactical vehicle wash rack, and 40-ton crane K025-b: Install hard power, communication, water well, and septic system at East Kofa Operations Center.	K026	Expand LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at SWTR.	K027	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at Tower 71.
K028	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training	K029	Extend water line from Countermine Test and Training Range to Bldg	K030	Construct runway, taxiway, aircraft shelter, command and control

ID	Description	ID	Description	ID	Description
	at SCAM Flats.		3970 and Bldg 3971. Install fire suppression system in Bldg 3971.		room, simulator training room, class room, maintenance area, POL storage area, graded area for parking, concrete or asphalt pad, and clear area for UAS launch/recovery at East Arm.
K031	Construct lagoon for Kofa Sewage Lagoon Expansion.				

TABLE ES-3 Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region ^a

^a Measurements are approximate.

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Those that include a letter with the identifier are considered independent activities. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

One project is under development and being subjected to separate project-specific NEPA analysis. This is a solar renewable energy project. YPG has begun investigating the possibility of developing an enhanced use lease (EUL) with a private company to develop a commercial-scale solar-powered renewable electrical generation facility on the installation. An EA is being prepared for this project and an EUL for solar power generation is not a component of the Proposed Action. The possibility of the future development of a solar facility was considered in the assessment of potential cumulative impacts, based on proposed specifications at the time this document was prepared. Construction, operation, and maintenance of a solar electric generation facility could contribute to cumulative impacts to air quality, cultural resources, energy and utilities, hazardous materials, land use, recreation, socioeconomics, soils, threatened and endangered species, traffic/transportation, vegetation, visual resources, surface water and groundwater resources, and wildlife. Should design specifications become better defined prior to the decision on this action being made and if those design changes would result in changes to the analysis of cumulative impacts provided herein, this document will be revised prior to the decision document being signed.

ES.3 Alternatives to the Proposed Action

In addition to the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative, other alternatives were considered and eliminated from further consideration as impracticable or beyond the authorized scope of this action. These alternatives are discussed in Section 2.7 and include:

- Discontinue Use of Yuma Proving Ground as a Military Proving Ground
- Expand the Size of Yuma Proving Ground
- Increase the Military Testing Mission to Encompass Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Activities
- Proceed with New Construction with No Increase in Testing and Training

• Proceed with Increased Testing and Training with No New Construction or Demolition

ES.4 Alternatives for Activities in the Proposed Action

Reasonable alternatives for individual projects included in the Proposed Action were evaluated. Potential alternatives for specific proposed projects included in the Proposed Action subjected to detailed analysis in this document are provided in Section 2.5. This section identifies those proposed activities where reasonable alternatives exist and provides a description of alternatives considered. Proposed projects for which no feasible alternatives exist also are identified and the justification for not considering other alternatives is provided.

No alternatives, other than the Proposed Action, were carried forward for analysis for projects subjected to programmatic analysis. The programmatic analysis was based on analysis of the likely maximum potential impacts of the considered activities on a broad scale. Because detailed analysis was not possible, due to the generally undefined nature of these activities, they would be subjected to site-specific NEPA analysis prior to implementation.

While the analyses in this PDEIS address all the proposed component projects, the final decision may be to implement only a subset of the Proposed Action components. The U.S. Army has the option of selecting only certain of the proposed construction, testing, and training activities for implementation, and to re-evaluate options at a future time. Should a subset of Proposed Action components be selected, the impacts of that subset would be compared to the No Action Alternative and the alternative of implementing the Proposed Action. It also is possible and likely that some selected projects would not be implemented due to changes in needs or technology

ES.5 Comparison of Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action and Alternatives and Summary of Mitigation Measures

A summary of potential impacts from implementation of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative is presented in Table ES-4 along with a brief summary of measures that would be implemented to minimize or mitigate potential negative effects.

ES.6 Preferred Alternative

The U.S. Army has not identified a Preferred Alternative at this time. As the analysis continues and the Army receives additional input from government agencies, tribal organizations, and the public, a Preferred Alternative will be identified in the Final PEIS.

 TABLE ES-4

 Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternatives and Mitigation Measures Proposed

 Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a
Air Quality	No change from existing conditions. Benefits from reduced use of portable generators would not occur.	Minor impacts from increased emissions due to operation of minor permanent sources of air emissions created by proposed construction activities, operation of new facilities, vehicle operation to travel to new facilities, and testing and training activities that would be conducted. Temporary negative impacts due to fugitive dust from construction. Negligible short-term impacts to local air quality as a result of emissions from construction equipment. Minor beneficial impacts from installation of hard power and telecommunications lines with associated reduction in the use of portable generators for testing and training.	Construction best management practices (BMPs) would minimize fugitive dust emissions. Monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting will be required by the Title V permit for POL storage facilities and construction activities. Title V permit modification for the expansion of the sandblasting area will be required for alignment with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality regulations and Title V monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting
Airspace Management	No change from existing conditions.	No change from existing conditions.	Under either alternative, YPG would continue coordination with Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Yuma and private/commercial air traffic controllers.
Cultural Resources	Potential impact from inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during testing or training activities at current approved locations and levels. Potential for damage to cultural resources from vandalism. As appropriate, surveys, SHPO consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and mitigation would be implemented	Potential impacts to cultural resources in areas not previously surveyed. As appropriate, surveys, SHPO consultation under the NHPA, and mitigation would be implemented. Potential for minor to moderate impacts from construction and training activities and from increased potential for inadvertent discovery due to increase in area where activities would be implemented. Potential for damage to cultural resources from vandalism.	Implement the inadvertent discovery process specified in the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) as appropriate. Avoidance of areas with known significant sites or areas with paleobotanical resources. Physically protect sites and monitor protection measures. For areas proposed for activities where previous cultural resource surveys have not been conducted, measures may include surveys, tribal consultation, compliance with stipulations in the Section 106 programmatic agreement (PA), and activity-specific NEPA analysis. Implement Environmental Awareness Training for persons working in areas where paleobotanical

TABLE ES-4 Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternatives and Mitigation Measures Proposed Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a
			resources may occur.
Energy/Utilities	Portable generators would continue to be used at current levels and locations.	Energy/Electricity Beneficial impacts from construction of more energy-efficient buildings.	Incorporate energy efficient design into new buildings. Use solar lights where practicable.
	Continued use of utilities at current levels. Continued use of bottled water and	Increase in energy demand would result in minor to moderate impacts to energy use in the region.	Recycle and reuse to the extent practicable.
	individual reverse osmosis systems outside of MAA.	Minor beneficial impacts from use of solar- powered lights. Moderate long-term beneficial	
	Satellite uplinks powered by portable generators would continue to be used for telecommunications.	impacts to regional energy consumption from installing hard power to locations currently using portable generators.	
	Benefits from reduced use of portable generators would not occur.	Minor beneficial impacts to air quality from reduced emissions and to hazardous materials management from reduced transport and handling of fuels following installation of hard power to testing and training locations with associated reduction in generator use. Water Minor impacts to groundwater from anticipated increased usage. Minor beneficial impact from water plant at CDH, reducing reliance on bottled and bulk water.	
	No change from existing conditions for solid waste. No significant increase in non-hazardous waste is anticipated to occur. No significant impacts to the non-hazardous waste landfill capacity would be anticipated.		
	Potential for conflicts in scheduling multiple users with needs to conduct testing in areas free of		
	electromagnetic interference from cellular/radio towers.	Wastewater New wastewater treatment system at CDH and new sewage lagoon at Kofa cantonment area would have minor beneficial impacts on wastewater utilities.	
		Telecommunications Minor beneficial impacts to air quality from reduced emissions and to hazardous materials management from reduced transport and handling of fuels following installation of hard power to testing and training locations	

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a
		with associated reduction in use of generators and satellite uplinks. Greater flexibility in scheduling users needing test areas free of electromagnetic interference.	
		Solid Waste No significant increase in non-hazardous waste is anticipated to occur. No significant impacts to the non-hazardous waste landfill capacity or regional construction and demolition landfills are anticipated.	
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	No change from existing conditions.	No changes from existing conditions and no impacts.	No mitigation measures are proposed for this resource area.
Fire Management	Fire Management No change from existing conditions. The potential for wildfires would continue and fire management activities would continue. Fire management from new EOC in the Laguna Region would not occur.	Minor increase in potential for wildfires due to increased testing and training.	Develop and implement program to monitor invasive plants.
		Minor to moderate potential for increased fuel load from growth of exotic invasive plant	Continue implementation of Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM).
		species. New EOC in the Laguna Region would benefit fire management.	Coordinate with Bureau of Land Management, Kofa NWR, and U.S. Forest Service on fire management strategies. Develop and interpret wildfire data with other agencies.
Geological Resources	No change from existing conditions.	No change from existing conditions and no impacts.	No mitigation measures are proposed for this resource area.
Hazardous Materials/ Hazardous Waste	No change from existing conditions. No changes in volumes of hazardous materials used or hazardous wastes generated. Potential for leaks from on-road and off-road vehicle use and maintenance, POL spills, and chemical decomposition of munitions constituents of concern (MCOCs)	Impacts described for the No Action Alternative would occur, plus additional potential for minor impacts from leaks associated with vehicle use and maintenance, POL spills, and chemical decomposition of MCOCs as a result of increased testing and training. Minor short-term increase in hazardous waste	Continue management of handling and disposal of hazardous materials using existing programs and guidance.
			Appropriate protective measures would be taken if construction were to occur in a previously contaminated area. Any contaminated soils encountered during construction would be removed and properly disposed of in accordance

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a
	would remain.	generation due to demolition of buildings containing asbestos-containing materials (ACMs).	with appropriate regulations. Appropriate protective procedures would be implemented to reduce potential exposure to ACM
		Potential for minor impacts from increased use and disposal of certain hazardous materials during testing and training activities.	and to dispose of ACM. The YPG Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan would be implemented to
		Potential for impacts from installation of air conditioning components.	minimize potential for impacts from accidental spills.
		Minor beneficial effects from construction of appropriate down-range facilities to store and contain POLs and reduce the potential for spills.	If an inadvertent discovery of unexploded ordnance (UXO) occurs, a qualified individual would assess the situation and implement appropriate disposition.
		Minor beneficial effects from installation of hard power and telecommunications to testing and training sites that would reduce use of portable generators and also reduce the transport of fuel.	1996 Federal Regulations require Class I or II refrigerants for new air conditioning equipment. YPG will procure non-ozone depleting chemicals refrigerants for new air conditioning components.
Land Use	No change from existing conditions.	Minor changes from conversion of open space to other uses, but consistent with military land uses.	Continue to coordinate and participate with local plans to avoid incompatibilities with adjacent lands.
		The slight changes in the noise zones associated with large artillery would not require any changes to the land uses designated in the Yuma County 2020 Comprehensive Plan.	
Noise	No change from existing conditions. Continued sporadic impacts to wildlife from noise during testing and	The slight changes in the noise zones associated with large artillery would not adversely affect use of surround lands outside	Use of appropriate hearing protection by construction and YPG workers when working with or around machinery and equipment.
	Continued potential for complaints	the installation boundary. Minor long-term impact on wildlife from	Maintain aircraft operations in compliance with established Air Installation Compatible Use Zone.
	from the Martinez Lake area.	disturbance from sporadic noise from increased testing and training.	Locate noise-generating activities away from sensitive receptors and use natural barriers to the
		Minor temporary impact to wildlife from noise	

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a
		due to construction activities.	extent practicable.
		Potential for minor disturbance of outdoor conversations due to construction noise. No permanent sensitive human receptors in proximity to construction areas.	Enclose small caliber ranges with berms or walls to reduce noise propagation.
			Conduct noise-intensive activities during favorable weather conditions where feasible.
			Implement fly-neighborly programs.
			Adjust timing of potentially disruptive activities.
			Inform the public of unusual increases in intensity of testing and training.
			Establish safety zones and hazardous noise areas, as needed, and use noise level meters and warning signs to reduce human exposure.
			Continue the noise complaint management procedure.
Recreation	No change from existing conditions.	No impacts to off-post recreational	No mitigation is proposed for this resource area.
	No new recreation facilities would be constructed.	Potential for minor to moderate impacts to recreational hunting in the Cibola Hunting Area, Martinez Hunting Area, and the East Arm Hunting Area due to increased testing and training.	
		Beneficial impacts to other on-post recreation from construction of new park, youth center addition, and improvements to other passive recreational opportunities.	
		Loss of greenspace in MAA that is used by residents for passive recreation from Cox Field improvements.	
		Potential disruption of some on-post recreation during construction.	
Safety	No change from existing conditions.	Potential for minor increase in safety incidents	Workers involved with construction would use

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a
	Safety benefits that would result from the Proposed Action would not occur.	due to increase in testing and training, but the rate of incidents (expressed per worker hour) would not be expected to change.	appropriate protection measures and adhere to Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements and guidelines to minimize
		Minor potential increase in frequency of wildfire ignition due to increase in testing and training.	and reduce safety incidents. YPG and military personnel would implement the YPG safety program to minimize risk and potential
		Potential for minor short-term impacts to construction worker safety.	for safety incidents. Each testing and training activity would have
		Potential minor temporary impacts to traffic safety due to construction-related traffic.	specific safety protocols that would be adhered to.
		Moderate benefits to operational safety due to AT/FP improvements, MEDEVAC helicopter pads, flood upgrades on Aberdeen Road, pedestrian safety from D Street conversion to walkway, and installation of shading at multiple locations.	
		Minor benefit to personnel safety from installation of hard power and telecommunications in the Cibola and Kofa Regions due to decreased transportation of fuel and portable generators.	
		Moderate benefit from relocating safe haven away from YPG personnel.	
Socioeconomics	No change from existing conditions. Short-term benefits to local economy from construction would not occur.	Minor short-term beneficial impacts to local economy from purchase of building materials, short-term construction jobs, and secondary spending by construction workers.	No mitigation measures are proposed for this resource area.
		Potential for negligible to minor impacts on local fuel and water retailers from reduction in demand for these services on YPG.	
Soils	No change from existing conditions. Continued impacts to soils from testing and training activities at	Impacts described for the No Action Alternative would continue, but with increased potential for impacts due to increase in testing	Planning, site selection, and site design would include criteria to avoid the disturbance of highly

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a
	authorized locations and levels.	and training activities and expansion or creation of testing and training areas.	erodible soils.
		Increase in disturbed area and disturbance to	potential for onsite erosion.
		soils used for dismounted maneuver training, munitions impact areas, DZs, and UAS launch/recovery areas resulting in negligible to minor impacts to soils that are not susceptible	Implement post-construction stormwater controls to reduce the long-term potential of erosion and sedimentation from proposed construction sites.
		to erosion to moderately erodible and moderate impacts to highly erodible soils that are disturbed.	Continue implementation of ITAM and the Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) to reduce potential to impact soils
		Minor impact from establishment of TGPs in the Cibola and Kofa Regions.	through proper land management.
		Long-term indirect impact from degradation of munitions into soils in munitions impact areas.	
		Disturbance due to construction resulting in negligible to minor impacts to soils that are not highly erodible to moderately erodible and moderate impacts to highly erodible soils.	
		Minor impacts from disturbances to soils during installation of utilities.	
Threatened and Endangered	No change from existing conditions. Potential for minor impacts to	Transient or Incidental Species Negligible to minor impacts likely from	Avoid known sensitive habitats during siting process.
Species and Species of	threatened, endangered, or sensitive (TES) species, as testing and	displacement during construction, testing, or training activities	Avoid impacts to water sources.
Concern	training activities continue at existing locations and levels.	Sonoran Desert Tortoise	Schedule construction projects to avoid or minimize conflicts with reproduction.
		habitat and potential for incidental mortality.	Avoid implementing activities in areas where sensitive species occur to the extent practicable.
		Long-term minor impacts to the experimental population due to loss of habitat and disturbances from testing and training activities.	Schedule construction outside the nesting and denning period, when practicable. If proposed work or activities could not be done outside the nesting/denning periods for TES species. If possible, delay disturbance until after young of

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a
-		Banded Gila Monster	mobile species have fledged or departed the area.
		Minor long-term impacts from loss of habitat and disturbances from construction, testing, and training activities.	For desert tortoise, either delay work until the young have hatched and can be relocated or shelter the nest in place using the appropriate
		TES Bat Species Negligible to minor long-term impacts due to	protocols through coordination with Arizona Game and Fish Department.
		loss of foraging habitat. Loggerhead Shrike	Relocate or deter species to minimize impacts if necessary; implement INRMP procedures.
		Moderate long-term impacts from loss of habitat and disturbances caused by construction, testing, and training activities.	Limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable. Avoid vegetation where feasible.
		Western Burrowing Owl Moderate long-term impacts due to loss of habitat and disturbances from construction, testing, and training activities.	Should the Sonoran desert tortoise be listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), then activities proposed in areas where the tortoise may occur on YPG would be re-evaluated with regard to potential impacts and appropriate consultation with the
		Parish Onion Negligible to minor long-term impacts from incidental mortality and due to the slow growth	disturbing activities. Should the experimental Sonoran pronghorn
		rate of these species. Other TES Plants Minor long-term impacts from clearing of vegetation for construction, testing, and training purposes.	reclassified under the ESA, then activities proposed in areas where the pronghorn may occur on YPG would be re-evaluated with regard to potential impacts and appropriate consultation with the USFWS would be conducted prior to any land-
		Wild Horses and Burros Minor temporary impacts due to construction activities. Minor long-term impacts due to displacement and loss of habitat from increased testing and training areas.	disturbing activities.
		No impacts to other species.	
Traffic/ Transportation	No change from existing conditions. No new impacts would occur.	Potential increase in temporary road closures and construction-related traffic. Minor short- term impact.	Use of appropriate traffic control procedures, which may include detours, timing of construction to avoid peak traffic volume times, and flaggers

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a
		Long-term beneficial impacts from improved traffic safety due to flood upgrades, intersection improvements, and range road improvements.	would minimize disruption of traffic flow.
		Long-term benefits from increased air transportation efficiency due to new infrastructure.	
Vegetation	No change from existing conditions. Continued impacts to vegetation from testing and training activities at	Minor to moderate impacts due to removal of vegetation for construction, increases in testing and training, and use of new impact areas.	Implement appropriate construction and post- construction stormwater controls to reduce scour from increased stormwater volume and flow rate.
	current locations and levels.		Use appropriate construction BMPs to stabilize soils and prevent erosion.
			Continued implementation of the INRMP and ITAM program to maintain vegetation and reduce spread of invasive plants in training area.
			Limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable. Avoid vegetation where feasible.
Visual Resources	No change from existing conditions. Current testing and training activities	Temporary minor impacts from construction- related airborne dust.	Dust suppression and other construction BMPs to minimize airborne dust and other visual obscurants
	would continue to have negligible to	Recurring temporary minor impacts from dust and other obscurants caused by testing and training.	during construction.
	minor impacts to visual resources.		Design new buildings to blend with the existing visual landscape.
		Potential long-term minor impacts from increased use of lighter-than-air UASs.	Continue to implement Environmental Awareness program to minimize potential impacts to areas of
		Potential minor long-term impacts from appearance of new buildings.	aesthetic and visual value during ground-based testing and training activities.
Water Resources	Continued impacts from contaminants and water consumption due to testing and training activities	Potential temporary minor adverse impacts to water quality resulting from sediment runoff during construction and an increase in	Implement construction and post-construction stormwater controls to reduce runoff, facilitate infiltration, and reduce potential for scour.
	at current locations and levels.	impervious surfaces following construction, reduced with use of appropriate BMPs	Develop and implement Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans to reduce potential for
		Minor to moderate increased potential for	environmental exposure to pollutants in

Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternatives and Mitigation Measures Proposed Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action	Proposed Action	Mitigation ^a	
		impacts to groundwater from degradation of munitions.	stormwater.	
		Minor potential for offsite impacts due to transport of contaminants and sediments generated from testing and training activities	associated with any Clean Water Act Section 404 permit/Section 401 Water Quality certification prior to construction in jurisdictional waters.	
		by stormwater runoff.	Continue implementation of the INRMP.	
		recharge rates due to new impervious area.		
Wildlife and Fisheries	No change from existing conditions. Minor impacts to wildlife would continue under current levels of	Minor short-term impact from incidental mortality, displacement, and disturbance due to construction.	Avoid wildlife concentration areas and sensitive habitats when selecting locations for activities where possible.	
	testing and training activities at current locations.	testing and training activities at current locations.	Potential for minor to moderate long-term impacts from incidental mortality,	Schedule construction outside the nesting and denning period, when practicable.
		displacement, and disturbance due to increased testing and training.	Continue to implement the INRMP to maintain wildlife habitat needs and wildlife movement	
		Minor to moderate long-term indirect impacts from loss of habitat due to construction LIAS	corridors.	
		launch/recovery areas, utilities, and TGPs and only minor impacts from disturbance of habitat due to use of DZs.	Limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable. Avoid vegetation where feasible.	

^a Mitigation includes avoidance and minimization measures, including BMPs, in addition to rehabilitation/restoration activities.

This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

Section

Ex	ecutive Su	mmary.		ES-1
	ES.1	Project	t Setting	ES-2
	ES.2	Altern	atives	ES-2
	ES.3	Altern	atives to the Proposed Action	ES-16
	ES.4	Altern	atives for Activities in the Proposed Action	ES-17
	ES.5	Comp	arison of Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Act	tion
		and A	Iternatives and Summary of Mitigation Measures	ES-17
	ES.6	Prefer	red Alternative	ES-17
Ac	cronyms an	d Abbr	eviations	ix
1	Purpose a	nd Nee	d for the Proposed Action	1-1
	1.1	Introd	uction	1-1
	1.2	Purpo	se and Need	
		1.2.1	Purpose of the Proposed Action	1-2
		1.2.2	Need for the Proposed Action	1-3
	1.3	Scope	and Content of the Programmatic Environmental Impact	
		Statem	ient	
		1.3.1	Approach to Proposed Action Description	1-5
		1.3.2	Approach to Environmental Analysis	1-5
		1.3.3	Categories and Relative Ranking of Valued Environmenta	1
			Components	- 1-6
	1.4	Decisi	on to Be Made	
	1.5	Public	Participation	
2	Description	on of Pr	conosed Action and Alternatives	2-1
-	21	Yuma	Proving Ground	2-1
	2.1	211	Functional Units	2-1 2_1
		2.1.1	Military Mission and Support Directorates	
	2.2	Appro	winter y wission and Support Directorates	2- 4 2 7
	2.2	No Ac	tion Altornativo	
	2.5	110 AC	Description of the No Action Alternative	2-7 2 7
		2.3.1	Provious Analysis of the No Action Alternative	2-7 2 7
		2.3.2	Existing Activities	·····2-7
		2.3.3	Status of the Analysis of the No Action Alternative	2-9 0 16
	2.4	2.3.4 Dropo	status of the Analysis of the No Action Alternative	2-10
	2.4	Altorn	atives for Activities of the Bronesed Action	2-10
	2.3 2.4	Altor	ative to Implement a Subset of the Proposed Action	
	2.0	Alter	ative to implement a subset of the Proposed Action	
	2.7	Altern	Discontinuo Llos of Vuma Proving Crown das a Military	2-70
		2.7.1	Discontinue Use of Fund Froving Ground as a Military	2 70
		272	Frond the Size of Virme Dressing Crossed	
		2.1.2	Expand the Size of Tuina Proving Ground	2-70

		2.7.3 Increase the Military Testing Mission to Encompass Nuclear,	
		Biological, and Chemical Activities	2-70
		2.7.4 Proceed with New Construction with No Increase in Testing	
		and Training	2-70
		2.7.5 Proceed with Increased Testing and Training with No New	
		Construction or Demolition	2-71
		2.7.6 Relocate Certain Activities to Other Installations	2-71
	2.8	Comparison of Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action	
		and Alternatives	2-72
	2.9	Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Procedures	2-77
	2.10	Preferred Alternative	2-81
3	Affected	Environment and Environmental Consequences	3-1
	3.1	Introduction	3-1
		3.1.1 Presentation of VECs	3-1
		3.1.2 Framework for Impact Analysis	3-2
		3.1.3 Cumulative Effects Analysis	3-4
		3.1.4 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	3-6
		3.1.5 Short-term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and	
		Enhancement of Long-term Productivity	3-7
	3.2	Air Quality	3-7
		3.2.1 Existing Conditions	3-7
		3.2.2 Environmental Consequences	3-12
	3.3	Airspace Management	3-16
		3.3.1 Existing Conditions	3-16
		3.3.2 Environmental Consequences	3-16
	3.4	Cultural Resources	3-17
		3.4.1 Regulatory Setting	3-17
		3.4.2 NHPA Section 106 Consultation	3-19
		3.4.3 Existing Conditions	3-20
		3.4.4 Environmental Consequences	3-23
		3.4.5 Significance Criteria	3-23
		3.4.6 Impacts of the No Action Alternative	3-24
		3.4.7 Impacts of the Proposed Action	3-24
		3.4.8 Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation	3-28
	3.5	Energy/Utilities	3-29
		3.5.1 Existing Conditions	3-29
		3.5.2 Environmental Consequences	3-32
	3.6	Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	3-37
		3.6.1 Existing Conditions	3-37
		3.6.2 Environmental Consequences	3-40
	3.7	Fire Management	3-40
		3.7.1 Existing Conditions	3-40
		3.7.2 Environmental Consequences	3-41
	3.8	Geological Resources	3-45
		3.8.1 Existing Conditions	3-45
		3.8.2 Environmental Consequences	3-46
		▲	

3.9	Hazaro	dous Materials/Hazardous Waste	
	3.9.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.9.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.10	Land U	Jse	
	3.10.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.10.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.11	Noise.	-	
	3.11.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.11.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.12	Recrea	tion	
	3.12.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.12.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.13	Safety	1	
	3.13.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.13.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.14	Socioe	conomics	
	3.14.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.14.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.15	Soils	1	
	3.15.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.15.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.16	Threat	ened or Endangered Species and Species of Concern	
	3.16.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.16.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.17	Traffic	/Transportation	
	3.17.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.17.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.18	Vegeta	ation	
	3.18.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.18.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.19	Visual	Resources	
	3.19.1	Existing Conditions	3-145
	3.19.2	Environmental Consequences	3-146
3.20	Water	Resources	
	3.20.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.20.2	Environmental Consequences	3-155
3.21	Wildli	fe and Fisheries	
	3.21.1	Existing Conditions	
	3.21.2	Environmental Consequences	
3.22	Summ	ary of Impacts and Mitigation	
	3.22.1	Cumulative Effects Summary	
	3.22.2	Mitigation Summary	
List of Day			11
LISU OF PTG	eparers.		
Distributi	ion List		5-1
Reference	es		6-1

7	Public Ir	volvement and Persons Contacted	7-1
	7.1	Introduction	7-1
	7.2	Notice of Intent	7-1
	7.3	Coordination	7-1
	7.4	Scoping and Information Meetings	7-4
	7.5	Distribution of the DPEIS	7-4
	7.6	Point of Contact	7-5
8	Public, A	gency, and Tribal Comments and Responses	8-1
9	Index		9-1

Tables

ES-1	Proposed Action Activities - Laguna Region ^a	ES-3
ES-2	Proposed Action Activities - Cibola Region a.b	ES-7
ES-3	Proposed Action Activities - Kofa Region ^a	ES-14
ES-4	Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternatives and Mitigation	
	Measures Proposed	ES-18
2-1	Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region	2-17
2-2	Proposed Action Activities - Cibola Region	
2-3	Proposed Action Activities - Kofa Region	
2-4	Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities - Laguna Region	
2-5	Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities - Cibola Region	
2-6	Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities - Kofa Region	
2-7	Project Components Subjected to Programmatic Analysis	
2-8	Impacts by Resource Area	2-72
2-9	Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures for Each Resource Area	
3-1	Characterization of Valued Environmental Components	
3-2	NAAQS for Criteria Pollutants	
3-3	Proposed Activities in the Yuma County PM10 Non-attainment Area	
3-4	Comparison of Yuma Proving Ground Air Emissions to Yuma County Air	
	Emissions	3-10
3-5	Restricted Airspace	3-16
3-8	Activities that Could Impact Paleobotanical Resources	
3-13	Proposed Activities that Would Result in Utility Improvements	
3-14	2010 Census Racial Data by Area	
3-15	2010 Census Percentage of Children and Individuals Living Below	
	Poverty Level	3-39
3-16	YPG Installation Compatible Use Zones	
3-17	Anticipated Risk of Noise Complaints from Predicted Peak Sound Levels	
3-18	Percentage of Public Likely to be Highly Annoyed by Aircraft Noise	
3-19	Firing Conditions Related to Noise Propagation	
3-20	Population Data for Local Cities and Counties, the State of Arizona, and	
	the United States	3-85
3-21	Soil Complexes on YPG	3-89
3-22	Federally Protected Species Known to Occur in Yuma and La Paz Count	ties,
------	---	-------
	Arizona	
3-23	Proposed LTAs in Cibola	
3-24	Impacts by Resource Area	
3-25	Summary of Cumulative Effects	
3-26	Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures for Each Resource Area	

Figures

- ES-1 Project Location Map
- ES-2 Designated Areas on Yuma Proving Ground
- ES-3 Yuma Proving Ground Restricted Airspace
- ES-4 No Action Alternative Impact Areas Laguna Region
- ES-5 No Action Alternative Training Courses and Airfields Laguna Region
- ES-6 No Action Alternative Points of Interest: Towers, Stations, Instrumentation, and Helipad Sites – Laguna Region
- ES-7 No Action Alternative Impact Areas Cibola Region
- ES-8 No Action Alternative Training Courses and Airfields Cibola Region
- ES-9 No Action Alternative Points of Interest: Towers, Stations, Instrumentation, and Helipad Sites Cibola Region
- ES-10 No Action Alternative Impact Areas Kofa Region
- ES-11 No Action Alternative Training Courses and Airfields Kofa Region
- ES-12 No Action Alternative Points of Interest: Towers, Stations, Instrumentation, and Helipad Sites – Kofa Region
- ES-13 Proposed Action Activities Laguna Region
- ES-14 Proposed Action Activities Cibola Region
- ES-15 Proposed Action Activities Kofa Region
- 2-1 Project Location Map
- 2-2 Designated Areas on Yuma Proving Ground
- 2-3 Yuma Proving Ground Restricted Airspace
- 2-4 No Action Alternative Impact Areas Laguna Region
- 2-5 No Action Alternative Buildings, Training Courses, and Airfields Laguna Region
- 2-6 No Action Alternative Points of Interest: Towers, Stations, Instrumentation, and Helipad Sites Laguna Region
- 2-7 No Action Alternative Impact Areas Cibola Region
- 2-8 No Action Alternative Buildings, Training Courses, and Airfields Cibola Region
- 2-9 No Action Alternative Points of Interest: Towers, Stations, Instrumentation, and Helipad Sites Cibola Region
- 2-10 No Action Alternative Impact Areas Kofa Region
- 2-11 No Action Alternative Buildings, Training Courses, and Airfields Kofa Region
- 2-12 No Action Alternative Points of Interest: Towers, Stations, Instrumentation, and Helipad Sites Kofa Region
- 2-13 Proposed Action Activities Laguna Region
- 2-14 Proposed Action Activities Cibola Region
- 2-15 Proposed Action Activities Kofa Region
- 3-1 Portion of Yuma Proving Ground Classified s Non-attainment for PM10

- 3-2 Soils on Yuma Proving Ground
- 3-3 Tentative Location for EUL Project

Appendices

- A Public Outreach
- B Activities Conducted Under the No Action Alternative
- C Quick Look Answers
- D Air Emissions Calculations
- E Programmatic Agreement
- F Noise Contour Figures from the Installation Operational Noise Management Plan
- G Sensitive Species Tracked by State of Arizona with Potential to Occur in Yuma and La Paz Counties

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AAC	Arizona Administrative Code	
ABC	aggregate base coat	
ac	acre	
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	
АСМ	asbestos-containing material	
АСР	access control point	
ADNL	A-weighted day-night average noise level	
ADEQ	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality	
ADOT	Arizona Department of Transportation	
ADWR	Arizona Department of Water Resources	
AERC	Arizona Emergency Response Commission	
AES	Arizona Ecological Services	
AGFD	Arizona Game and Fish Department	
AGL	above ground level	
AMC	Army Materiel Command	
AMC-R	Army Materiel Command Regulation	
AR	Army Regulation	
Army	United States Army	
ASET	Aviation Systems and Electronic Test	
AST	aboveground storage tank	
AT/FP	antiterrorism/force protection	
AZ	Arizona	
AZPDES	Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System	
bgs	below ground surface	
BLM	Bureau of Land Management	
BMP	best management practice	
BSA	Boy Scouts of America	
C5ISR	command, control, communications, computers, combat systems, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance	
CA	California	

CAA	Clean Air Act	
CACTIS	Compact Automatic Centroid Tracking Instrumentation System	
CALA	Combat Aircraft Loading Area	
CASQA	California Stormwater Quality Association	
C&D	construction and demolition	
CDA	Castle Dome Annex	
CDH	Castle Dome Heliport	
CDNL	C-weighted average day-night noise level	
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality	
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act	
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations	
CH ₄	methane	
CALFEX	Combined Arms Live Fire Exercise	
СМ	camera mount	
СО	carbon monoxide	
CO ₂	carbon dioxide	
CO ₂ e	CO ₂ equivalents	
Colorado Desert	Lower Colorado River Valley Subregion of the Sonoran Desert	
CRAM	Counter Rocket Artillery and Mortar	
CSW	Crew Served Weapon	
CWA	Clean Water Act	
CREW	Counter Radio Controlled Improvised Explosive Device Electronic Warfare	
D.A.R.E.	Drug Abuse Resistance Education	
dB	decibel	
dBA	A-weighted decibel	
dBC	C-weighted decibel	
dBP	peak, unweighted sound pressure level	
DET/REC	Detection and Recognition Target Array	
DFAC	Dining Facility	
Dish Stirling	dish-engine system based on the Stirling thermodynamic cycle	
DoD	Department of Defense	

DPW	Directorate of Public Works	
DU	depleted uranium	
DPEIS	Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement	
DZ	drop zone	
EA	Environmental Assessment	
ECUT	Electronic Common Use Test	
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	
EISA	Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007	
EM	electromagnetic	
EO	Executive Order	
EOC	Emergency Operations Center	
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act	
EQSD	explosive quantity safety distance	
ESA	Endangered Species Act	
EUL	enhanced use lease	
EW	electronic warfare	
FARP	Forward Area Arming and Refuel Point	
FCS	Future Combat Systems	
FOB	Forward Operating Base	
FPEIS	Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement	
ft	foot	
ft ²	square feet	
GCS	ground control station	
GHG	greenhouse gas	
GMU	Game Management Unit	
GOV	government-owned vehicle	
GP	gun position	
gpd	gallons per day	
H ₂ O	water	
HAPs	hazardous air pollutants	
HAZMART	Hazardous Material Control Center	
HE	high explosive	
HFCs	hydrofluorocarbons	

HMTA	Hazardous Material Transportation Act	
HSMS	Hazardous Substances Management System	
HWSF	Hazardous Waste Storage Facility	
HWTS	hazardous waste tracking system	
I-8	Interstate Highway 8	
I-10	Interstate Highway 10	
ICRMP	Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan	
ICUZ	Installation Compatible Use Zone	
IED	improvised explosive device	
IMCOM	U.S. Army Installation Management Command	
INRMP	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan	
IONMP	Installation Operational Noise Management Plan	
IR	infrared	
IRCC	Inverted Range Control Center	
ISR	intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance	
ISR/EO	intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance/electro-optical	
ITAM	Integrated Training Area Management	
IVTS	Improved Vehicle Tracking System	
JERC	Joint Experimentation Range Complex	
JPADS	Joint Precision Airdrop System	
JPMO	Joint Program Management Office	
JTTR	Joint Test Tunnels Range	
KFR	Kofa Firing Range	
kV	kilovolts	
LAAF	Laguna Army Airfield	
LAW	light antitank weapon	
lb	pound	
LBP	lead-based paint	
LCPA	Lower Colorado Planning Area	
lf	linear feet	
LID	low-impact development	
LPWS	Land-Based Phalanx Weapon System	
LRA	Long Range Artillery	

LTA	Light Maneuver Training Area	
LWC	low water crossing	
MAA	Main Administrative Area	
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act	
MCAS	Marine Corps Air Station	
MCOC	munitions constituent of concern	
MEDEVAC	medical evacuation	
MFFS	Military Freefall School	
µg/m³	micrograms per cubic meter	
mg/L	milligrams per liter	
mg/m ³	milligrams per cubic meter	
mgd	million gallons per day	
mm	millimeters	
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement	
MOUT	military operations in urban terrain	
mph	miles per hour	
MPRC	Multi-Purpose Range Complex	
MRAP	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected	
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheet	
msl	mean sea level	
MTI	Moving Target Indicator	
MW	megawatt	
MW-h	megawatt-hour	
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards	
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act	
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act	
NOI	Notice of Intent	
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide	
NO _x	nitrogen oxides	
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide	
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System	
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission	
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service	

NRCD	Natural Resource Conservation District	
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places	
NWR	National Wildlife Refuge	
NZ	Noise Zone	
O ₃	ozone	
OB/OD	open burn/open detonation	
ODCs	ozone-depleting chemicals	
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration	
PA	Programmatic Agreement	
PAO	Public Affairs Office	
РСВ	polychlorinated biphenyl	
PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement	
PEPs	propellants, explosives, and pyrotechnics	
PFCs	perfluorocarbons	
РК	peak or maximum, single event sound level measurement without weighting.	
PK15 (met)	peak sound level, using statistical variations caused by weather that is likely to be exceeded only 15 percent of the time	
PM_{10}	particulate matter smaller than 10 microns	
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter smaller than 2.5 microns	
POL	petroleum, oil, and lubricants	
POV	privately owned vehicle	
ppb	parts per billion	
ppm	parts per million	
PSS	Persistent Surveillance Systems	
PTDS	Persistent Threat Detection System	
PV	photovoltaic	
PVC	polyvinyl chloride	
RACM	Reasonably Available Control Measure	
RCIED	radio controlled improvised explosive device	
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act	
RDTE	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	
RO	reverse osmosis	

ROD	Record of Decision	
RPG	rocket-propelled grenade	
RPMP	Real Property Master Plan	
RSTA	reconnaissance, surveillance, and target acquisition	
RV	recreational vehicle	
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act	
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act	
SF ₆	sulfur hexafluoride	
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office	
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure	
SOTACC	Special Operations Tactical Attack Controller Course	
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide	
SPCCP	Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan	
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan	
SR	State Route	
SVOCs	semivolatile organic compounds	
SWMU	solid waste management unit	
SWTR	Smart Weapons Test Range	
TEMO	Training Exercise Management Office	
TES	threatened, endangered, or sensitive	
ТСР	Traditional Cultural Property	
TGP	transient gun position	
TM	tracking mount	
TOW	Tube-launched, Optically Tracked, Wire Command	
tpy	tons per year	
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act	
UAS	unmanned aircraft system	
UAV	unmanned aerial vehicle	
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	
USAEC	U.S. Army Environmental Command	
US 95	U.S. Highway 95	
U.S. Army	United States Army	
USASOC	U.S. Army Special Operations Command	

USCB	U.S. Census Bureau	
U.S.C.	United States Code	
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	
USFS	U.S. Forest Service	
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey	
UST	underground storage tank	
UV	ultraviolet	
UXO	unexploded ordnance	
VEC	valued environmental component	
VOCs	volatile organic compounds	
WAPA	Western Area Power Administration	
WP	white phosphorus	
WSC	Wildlife of Special Concern in Arizona	
WTP	water treatment plant	
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant	
YDNL	Yearly Day-Night A-weighted day-night average noise level	
YMPO	Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization	
YPG	Yuma Proving Ground	
YPG HP	Yuma Proving Ground Hunting Program	
YPGR	Yuma Proving Ground Regulation	
YTC	Yuma Test Center	

1.1 Introduction

This Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DPEIS) analyzes the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of current and planned activities and operations at United States (U.S.) Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). This DPEIS analyzes construction, testing, and training activities and presents the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the Proposed Action to continue ongoing activities and to implement new facilities, infrastructure, and programs to meet anticipated future needs and maintain YPG as a multipurpose installation that serves a broad customer base. The proposed action would also support cross-functional training allowed by the Department of Defense. The DPEIS will support development of a future Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) at YPG by providing a basis for the Visioning Plan and by providing a programmatic framework for the Capital Investment Strategy and the Area Development Plans. The analysis in the EIS also will support the alternatives analysis for the RPMP. This action would meet the changing needs of the U.S. military and would maintain YPG as a multi-purpose installation that performs a wide variety of missions.

Activities anticipated on YPG include construction and demolition of facilities and infrastructure, and changes to current types and levels of testing and training. This DPEIS addresses the following types of activities:

- Short-term, well-defined activities at known locations that could be implemented without additional National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) [42 United States Code (U.S.C.) 4321-4347] analysis once a decision is made
- Short-term, well-defined activities for which locations are not known that would receive additional site-specific NEPA analysis prior to project implementation
- Long-term, less well-defined activities that would occur later in time and would receive additional site-specific NEPA analysis prior to project implementation

This document provides thorough analysis under NEPA for the short-term projects and allows longer-term projects to be implemented following a focused, site-specific NEPA analysis that would tier from this analysis. This document will serve as a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the longer-term projects per Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations 1502.20 (40 CFR 1502.20) and 32 CFR 651.14(c).

While many analyzed activities are assumed to occur at a specified location, future mission needs may require that one or more such activities be conducted in a different location or at multiple locations. This programmatic analysis will provide a preliminary basis for subsequent focused NEPA analysis to allow YPG to conduct activities in areas that have not previously been specified for those activities.

This document examines the activities that will occur or are likely to occur on YPG for the next several years. It is not always possible to predict accurately specific projects in specific

years, but the U.S. Army is confident about the types of activities that will occur and the general technology trends that will establish the testing and training workloads in coming years; therefore, the Army is adopting a programmatic approach to this analysis to comply with NEPA and set the framework for future tiered documents if required. The analysis focuses on the anticipated impacts of categories of actions on the natural and human environment. Accordingly, the analysis examines military testing activities, military training activities, construction, and demolition, as appropriate for each activity.

The information and analysis in this DPEIS are presented in accordance with NEPA, the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA [40 CFR 1500 et seq.], U.S. Army Installation Management Command guidance (IMCOM Circular 200-10-1), and regulations issued by the Department of Defense (DoD) and the U.S. Army to implement CEQ regulations. 32 CFR Part 651 requires the integration of environmental considerations into U.S. Army planning and decision making (32 CFR §651.29).

Any activities and projects selected for implementation following analysis in this DPEIS will require additional evaluation and processing prior to implementation. Prior to implementation, specific project proponents must submit a work order (DA 4283) or service order and other required documents, such as a dig permit, for approval by YPG Environmental Services Division for the proposed project. Further, a specific proposed project may require Real Property Planning Board approval, additional NEPA review (as determined by this analysis), NHPA Section 106 consultation, or environmental permit applications, and state or federal regulatory agency approvals prior to implementation.

The Proposed Action, including alternatives for specific activities, is presented in detail in this document. Alternatives eliminated from consideration are summarized. If additional U.S. Army initiatives result in programs proposed for YPG that are not covered by this DPEIS, additional NEPA documentation would be prepared, as appropriate, in advance of implementing any such actions.

1.2 Purpose and Need

1.2.1 Purpose of the Proposed Action

The last Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that addressed mission components on YPG was completed in 2001. New technologies and equipment and more powerful weapons and munitions are being developed for use by the U.S. military. Prior to use in combat, these technologies and items must be tested under realistic conditions comparable to what would be experienced in combat so that the Soldier can rely upon them. YPG is the premier hot, arid-environment year-round test center for the U.S. military and is responsible for determining the performance and reliability of military vehicles, equipment, weapons, and munitions in these climatic conditions under test and operational scenarios.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to enable YPG to continue to provide adequate facilities for military testing and training activities and for private industry partnerships that are capable of accommodating current and foreseeable technological advances. Testing activities include military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, ammunitions, sensors, and guidance systems. YPG must provide realistic training for units, including but not limited to forward observer training, ground combat training, and operational training

to provide real-world testing scenarios. The Army participates in private industry partnerships that are compatible with the military mission, such as the General Motors Test track where private vehicles and military vehicles both are tested for performance capabilities.

1.2.2 Need for the Proposed Action

Current testing and training facilities on YPG are inadequate to test emerging technologies, equipment, weapons, and munitions under appropriate conditions to meet military needs. Some facilities on YPG are outdated and the cost to rehabilitate or upgrade these facilities to meet current technology needs exceeds the cost of new construction. As the demand for testing and training has increased, facilities on YPG have become over-utilized and this has reduced the efficiency of, or otherwise constrained, testing and training activities. The Proposed Action would allow YPG to develop appropriate facilities to meet the foreseeable future needs for year-round military testing and training. The overall need for the Proposed Action is to ensure the readiness of U.S. forces and materiel to meet the demands of theaters around the world, especially those in hot, arid environments. Construction of new buildings and infrastructure and modified or increased testing and training would enable YPG to meet future military needs in response to changing conditions and technologies in the theater of combat. New buildings are needed to upgrade facilities that are unsuitable for modification to accommodate emerging military technologies, alleviate space limitations that can cause testing delays or inefficiencies, and allow more efficient alignment of personnel on YPG.

Electronic technology to aid the Soldier, including sensors, detection systems, rangefinders, and guidance systems, are continually being improved with regard to range, sensitivity, and ability to overcome detection/intercept systems. In addition, technology to disrupt or disable an adversary's sensors and detection systems is being improved. The range and power of weapons tend to increase as systems are improved, resulting in a need for larger areas for testing and training. Combat vehicles and internal vehicle systems are being improved and enhanced. Some of these improvements are driven by internal technological advances derived from basic research, while others are driven as a response to new weapons or systems encountered on the field of battle. YPG must be able to adapt testing and training to address these technological changes as they arise to fulfill its mission.

Army Regulation (AR) 210-20 [*Real Property Master Planning for Army Installations*], soon to be superseded by AR 420-1, requires installations to develop an RPMP as part of the Army master planning process. Many of the long-term projects analyzed programmatically in this DPEIS would likely be components of an RPMP that would be developed and adopted by the U.S. Army subsequent to completion of this analysis. The Final EIS would be used as a basis for future tiered analyses to support the adoption and implementation of an RPMP at YPG.

1.3 Scope and Content of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

The U.S. Army has determined that carrying out the mission of YPG, as it evolves to meet the demands of new technologies and emerging in-theater needs, and implementation of construction projects proposed, has the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. Consequently, the U.S. Army has prepared this DPEIS to assess the impacts of those actions. This section presents the scope of the DPEIS, including the general approach to the evaluation of alternatives for implementing the Proposed Action.

YPG uses areas outside its boundaries to conduct specific military testing under conditions not found on YPG. These off-post locations used to conduct mission-related activities include:

- Senator Wash Reservoir (Imperial County, California [CA])
- Blaisdell Railroad Siding (Yuma County, Arizona [AZ])
- Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Yuma (Yuma County, AZ)
- Imperial Sand Dunes (Imperial County, CA)
- Death Valley (Inyo County, CA)
- Oatman Hill (Mohave County, AZ)
- Camp Navajo (Coconino County, AZ)
- Prescott Airport (Yavapai County, AZ)

Off-post locations are not addressed in this DPEIS since no changes are proposed for use of offsite areas. Impacts of off-post testing and training were evaluated in the Range Wide EIS (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001) and are confined to the specific test areas. Because off-post locations do not provide the same ecoclimatic conditions as YPG, these locations are not suitable for the testing and training increases proposed for YPG. As a result, the off-post areas used by the U.S. Army in conjunction with YPG are not included in the development of alternatives for this DPEIS.

The YPG mission continues to evolve and cannot be frozen while this EIS is prepared. YPG is completing a separate project specific NEPA analysis of the potential development of a solar renewable energy resource on the installation to increase YPG's energy security and meet federal mandates and legislative requirements to increase production and consumption of renewable energy resources. This development would be through an enhanced use lease (EUL) with a private company. Solar technologies under consideration by the Army include solar photovoltaic (PV), a dish-engine system based on the Stirling thermodynamic cycle (Dish Stirling), and dry-cooled concentrating solar thermal technologies. Two proposed locations have been identified: a Northeast Cibola Site and a West Kofa Site (see Figure 3-3). The Northeast Cibola Site would support a facility capable of producing up to 200 megawatts (MW) and the West Kofa Site would support a facility capable of producing up to 60 MW. Total solar development on YPG lands are not expected to exceed 1,000 acres (ac) at these locations (U.S. Army Environmental Command [USAEC], 2012). An EUL for solar power generation is not a component of the Proposed Action and an EA is being prepared for this project. The potential for cumulative impacts from development and operation of such a facility was considered in the assessment of potential cumulative impacts in this analysis, based on what was known at the time this document was prepared. Should design specifications become better defined prior to the decision on this action being made and if those design changes would result in changes to the analysis of cumulative impacts provided herein, this document will be revised prior to the decision document being signed.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project is proposed approximately 10 miles north of Quartzite, Arizona in LaPaz County. The preferred alternative is to construct, operate, maintain, and

decommission a 100-MW solar thermal generation power plant using dry-cooling technology with a 1.5-mile generator tie-line, switchyard, and access road. An EIS was prepared and a Record of Decision (ROD) for this project was signed in May 2013. This solar energy project is not a component of the Proposed Action, but the potential for cumulative impacts from development of this project was considered in the assessment of potential cumulative impacts in this analysis.

There are four proposed solar projects within approximately 10 miles of YPG that would be implemented on BLM lands. The Palomas project would be a concentrated solar power trough that would be east of YPG adjacent to the Aqua-Caliente solar project. The LaPosa Solar Terminal and Quartzite project are proposed to be a concentrated solar power trough that would be along U.S. Highway 95 (US 95) between Cibola and the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. The Windcat Quartzite project would be a concentrated solar power tower that would be along US 95 between Cibola and the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. The Windcat Quartzite project would be a concentrated solar power tower that would be along US 95 between Cibola and the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. These solar projects are not components of the Proposed Action, but the potential for cumulative impacts from development of these projects was considered in the assessment of potential cumulative impacts in this analysis.

1.3.1 Approach to Proposed Action Description

This document identifies which Proposed Action activities were analyzed in detail and which were analyzed programmatically. The analysis evaluates projects proposed for the foreseeable future. It is likely that not all evaluated activities would be implemented and the decision could indicate that only a portion of the activities analyzed will be selected. The alternatives for specific activities considered include testing, training, and construction/demolition options to implement the Proposed Action.

This DPEIS also evaluates a No Action Alternative as required under CEQ regulations and NEPA.

1.3.2 Approach to Environmental Analysis

This subsection summarizes the approach applied in this DPEIS for identifying the resources that could be affected by the Army's Proposed Action.

This DPEIS considers relevant resource areas in the context of valued environmental components (VECs), which are the resources and human communities of concern that could be affected by the Proposed Action. Initially, YPG considered the following comprehensive list of VECs (sorted alphabetically):

- Air Quality
- Airspace Management
- Cultural Resources
- Energy/Utilities
- Environmental Justice
- Fire Management
- Geological Resources
- Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste
- Land Use
- Noise
- Recreation

- Safety
- Socioeconomics
- Soils
- Threatened or Endangered Species and Species of Concern
- Traffic/Transportation Systems
- Vegetation
- Visual Resources
- Water Resources (Surface Water and Groundwater, including wetlands)
- Wildlife and Fisheries

The VECs were screened and ranked based on their relative potential to be affected by the Proposed Action. An assessment of potential cumulative effects to VECs from implementation of the alternatives also is included. The results of this analysis are presented in the next section.

1.3.3 Categories and Relative Ranking of Valued Environmental Components

Following the public scoping process (Section 1.5), the Army developed and applied a deliberative process to rank the VECs according to their potential to be affected by the Proposed Action. This approach concentrates the environmental analysis on VECs that could be significantly affected by the Proposed Action (primary VECs) and also provides consideration of other less affected (or not affected) VECs at an appropriate level of detail, in compliance with CEQ and Army guidance. The categories of VECs and the associated level of analysis necessary are based on the potential for impacts to occur. For this DPEIS, VECs are grouped into primary, secondary, and low potential for impact categories based on the significance of impacts that may be expected to occur (see Section 3). These VECs are grouped as follows:

- Primary VECs (high potential for impacts):
 - Cultural Resources
 - Energy/Utilities
 - Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste
 - Land Use
 - Noise
 - Safety
 - Soils
 - Threatened or Endangered Species and Species of Concern
 - Vegetation
 - Visual Resources
 - Wildlife and Fisheries
- Secondary VECs (moderate potential for impacts):
 - Air Quality
 - Recreation
 - Socioeconomics
 - Water Resources
- Low VECs (low to very low potential for impacts):
 - Airspace Management

- Environmental Justice
- Fire Management
- Geological Resources
- Traffic/Transportation

Primary and secondary VECs, those considered to have moderate to high potential for impacts, are subjected to detailed impact assessment, while the VECs considered to have low to very low potential for impacts were considered but not analyzed in detail. Section 3 presents the existing conditions and impacts analysis for each VEC with regard to direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts.

1.4 Decision to Be Made

The decision to be made is whether to adopt the list of projects, as presented, to adopt a subset of the proposed activities, or to take no action and continue operations on YPG at current testing and training levels using existing infrastructure.

1.5 Public Participation

Consideration of the comments of all interested persons promotes open communication and enables better decision-making. All agencies, tribal entities, organizations, and members of the public with a potential interest in the Proposed Action, including minority, low-income, disadvantaged, and tribal groups, were provided the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process.

The scoping process officially began with the publication of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register on May 25, 2011. Two public scoping meetings were held following publication of the NOI. The NOI and the announcement of the public scoping meetings are provided in Appendix A. Open house public scoping meetings were conducted on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 from 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM at the Building 6, the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, and on Wednesday, June 15, 2011 from 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM at the Yuma Library located at 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma, AZ 85364. All interested parties were invited to attend the public meetings and to submit comments throughout the NEPA process. Public scoping comments were solicited through June 30, 2011, which was 15 days following the last scoping meeting and 35 days following publication of the NOI.

YPG has been engaging and consulting with federally recognized Native American tribes regarding the PEIS. An initial tribal meeting was held in June 2011, with additional tribal meetings occurring in August 2012 and April 2013.

The public will be invited to review and comment on the DPEIS and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (FPEIS). During preparation of the PEIS, comments or questions may be submitted by mail or e-mail to Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator, U.S. Army Garrison YPG, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, ypgnepa@conus.army.mil. Comments from the public will be considered before any decision is made regarding implementing the Proposed Action on YPG. Comments received from the public, government agencies, and tribal organizations and the Army response to these comments will be provided in Section 8. This page intentionally left blank.

Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

This section provides a description of YPG and presents the alternatives considered in this DPEIS. The No Action Alternative is described first to identify clearly the existing activities conducted under the ongoing mission that would continue absent implementation of any action alternative. The Proposed Action includes the activities identified under the No Action Alternative, as well new construction, testing, and training proposed for implementation. After the description of the Proposed Action, there is a description of additional action alternatives that were considered.

2.1 Yuma Proving Ground

2.1.1 Functional Units

YPG is a U-shaped Army facility located in southwestern Arizona (Figure 2-1). The land between the arms of the "U" is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge (Kofa NWR). YPG is subdivided into five functional units, with each unit performing a different function in relation to the mission:

- Laguna Region
- Cibola Region
- Kofa Region, including Kofa Firing Range (KFR) and East Arm
- Airspace
- Off-post Locations

Laguna, Cibola, and Kofa Regions are shown on Figure 2-2. The Range Wide EIS (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001) and the Yuma Proving Ground Environmental Assessment (Mittlehauser Corporation, 1994) provide descriptions of YPG operations and that information is summarized in the following sections.

Throughout the YPG Ranges there are numerous fixed sites that are used for a variety of purposes. Some were originally designed to support radar or optical instrumentation, camera sites, pads for equipment emplacement, landing pads, observation posts for visual observers, firing points, GPs, and impact areas. All of these sites also are used, as needed, to support unmanned aircraft system (UAS) testing, to include temporary installation and employment of UAS launch/recovery systems, ground control station (GCSs), command and control infrastructure, and refueling operations. UAS testing may include optical tracking (ground or aerial), laser rangefinder, and laser designator operations. Tests are conducted at these areas on ground- or tower-mounted sensors, balloon- or aerostat (blimp)-mounted sensors, electro-optical sensors, infrared sensors, radar sensors, and unattended ground sensors, as well as wireless communications. These areas are also used for establishment of temporary firing positions to conduct ground weapons firing into approved impact areas, including small arms, shoulder-fired arms, guided munitions,

artillery and mortars, rockets, rocket-propelled grenades (RPGs), AT-4 light antitank weapons (LAWs), and other direct fire weapons.

2.1.1.1 Laguna Region

The Laguna Region includes the three main cantonment areas within YPG: the Main Administrative Area (MAA), Yuma Test Center (YTC), and the Kofa cantonment. The cantonments within the Laguna Region are generally level, interspersed with low hills and washes. Mobility courses, which are tracks to test performance and reliability of automotive components, are located in more mountainous areas within the Laguna Region. The Laguna Region is bordered on the west and south by Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and privately owned lands. Laguna covers approximately 68,720 ac and includes the MAA, the Yuma Test Area, Laguna Army Airfield (LAAF), Castle Dome Heliport (CDH), and the Air Cargo Complex. The eastern edge of Laguna is Firing Front Road, which abuts the Kofa Firing Front. Most of the existing mobility courses are in the Laguna Region.

2.1.1.2 Cibola Region

The Cibola Region encompasses approximately 438,195 ac and is the largest functional unit on YPG. The Cibola Region is mostly west of US 95. The boundaries include the western border of YPG and the inner eastern border (the eastern boundary of the western arm of the "U") adjacent to BLM and privately owned lands. This terrain comprises large plains surrounded by mountainous areas. The Cibola Region is primarily used by the Air Combat Systems Directorate for the following:

- Air cargo delivery testing
- Precision guided and non-precision guided personnel parachute systems testing
- Precision guided and non-precision guided cargo parachute systems testing
- Airdrop certification of equipment and ammunition
- Certification of aircraft for airdrop operations
- External transportability testing
- General Soldier systems testing
- UAS testing
- Moored aerostat testing
- Sensor systems and laser testing
- Aircraft armament and weapons testing
- Counter-improvised explosive device (IED) technology testing
- Electronic warfare (EW) systems testing
- Training activities

The Cibola Region also supports the Military Freefall School (MFFS) parachute training courses, the Special Operations Tactical Air Controller Course (SOTACC), various activities conducted by the Training Exercise Management Office (TEMO), and a variety of testing for the Ground Combat Directorate, including guided and unguided long-range artillery and mortar testing and tactical vehicle testing.

Isolated mountainous areas are used for air-to-ground testing and training. There are 32 munitions impact areas in the Cibola Region, which occupy approximately 33,000 ac (approximately 7.5 percent of the area). Prospect Square is the largest munitions impact area in the Cibola Region (approximately 22,250 ac), and the others range in size from less than 1 ac to approximately 3,750 ac. All munitions impact areas in the Cibola Region are capable of

receiving explosive rounds. Portions of the Cibola Region are used extensively by nonmilitary components, including industrial/private partnerships, military contractors, and the U.S. Department of Justice Aerostat. The U.S. Department of Justice Aerostat, which is operated by the U.S. Air Force, is a tethered UAS mounted with sensors to provide surveillance to detect low-altitude aircraft crossing the border.

2.1.1.3 Kofa Region

The Kofa Region is the largest instrumented firing range in the United States, encompassing approximately 331,259 ac, and includes the Kofa Region Administrative Area and Ammunition Storage Area. These lands primarily consist of a flat basin surrounded by mountains, providing ideal conditions for testing, training, and evaluating direct and indirect fire weapon systems and their associated ammunition. The Kofa Region also supports the testing and evaluation of various types of sensor systems, including, but not limited to, sensor systems mounted on towers or on the ground, on moored aerostats, and on vehicles, aircraft, or UAS. Types of systems can include electro-optical, infrared, radar, acoustic, and unattended ground sensors, as well as wireless communication. Kofa also supports UAS and manned aviation flight test, both in support of Kofa munitions firing programs and for developmental test and evaluation of UAS and aviation systems (Franklin, 2013, personal communication). The East Arm of YPG is in the Kofa Region. The eastern and southern outer boundaries of the Kofa Region border BLM, State, and privately owned lands. The Kofa Firing Front is immediately east of Firing Front Road and forms the western boundary of the Kofa Region; it contains GPs that fire onto KFR. A Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)-licensed depleted uranium (DU) firing area is located within KFR, along with other munitions impact areas. There are 23 munitions impact areas in the Kofa Region, which occupy approximately 110,000 ac (approximately 33 percent of the area). There are 23 munitions impact fields located within munitions impact areas Alpha, Bravo, Delta, Echo, Foxtrot, Ramsdell, and East. Delta and Echo, each approximately 32,000 ac, are the largest munitions impact areas in the Kofa Region and the others range in size from less than 1 ac to approximately 17,000 ac. Two Kofa Region munitions impact areas, Red Bluff and the Combat Systems Test Complex Direct Firing Range, are for inert fire only. The others are capable of receiving explosive rounds.

2.1.1.4 Airspace

YPG has restricted military airspace over most of YPG and over most of the Kofa NWR (Figure 2-3). Restricted airspace places priority on military operations, but can be used by private or commercial flights during periods of non-use by YPG or other military users provided proper clearance is obtained in advance. YPG allows use of its airspace by other military services for training activities when not in use by the installation.

2.1.1.5 Off-Post Locations

YPG uses areas outside its boundaries to conduct or support a variety of military testing and training missions under conditions not found on YPG. Activities conducted at off-post locations are independent of testing and training activities on YPG. Off-post locations used to conduct mission-related activities were identified in Section 1.3. Camp Navajo is used for testing automotive and combat systems at 7,000-foot (ft) elevation. The Prescott Airport is used for similar tests at 5,000-ft elevation. Senator Wash Reservoir was under an agreement with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to test and evaluate amphibious vehicles and also as a drop zone (DZ) for training and evaluating personnel in airdrop skills and procedures. The

Blaisdell Railroad Siding area (BLM right-of-way 30293) is used for railroad shipping and receiving and to evaluate equipment loads under various railway transport conditions. Imperial Sand Dunes is part of the California Desert Conservation Area managed by the BLM and is occasionally used to conduct vehicle and equipment testing projects and some troop training activities. Death Valley is used periodically for automotive testing because of features such as extended mountain grades and high temperatures. Oatman Hill is used under a special permit to conduct performance tests on trucks exceeding the maximum size and weight limits for public roads. YPG has a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with MCAS Yuma to test counter-battery radar systems by placing them in the vicinity of commercial and military air traffic on MCAS Yuma and the surrounding area.

The command at YPG also oversees two test centers located outside of the southwestern U.S. These off-post locations are not addressed in this DPEIS. No changes are proposed for use of offsite areas. The Cold Regions Test Center is located in Alaska and the Tropic Region Test Center is located in Panama and several other countries. These centers are used to conduct tests under cold weather and tropical conditions.

2.1.2 Military Mission and Support Directorates

YPG supports both military and non-military testing and training, as well as foreign militaries. Activities are conducted by a variety of organizations, as discussed below.

Munitions and Weapons Division – tests and evaluates military weapons, detection and neutralization equipment, ammunition, and related systems and equipment throughout the item's lifecycle from concept demonstrations, to development, type classification operational evaluations, production acceptance, product improvements, and malfunction investigations. Munitions and Weapons Division directs the planning and execution of tests for:

- Mortar weapons, mortar ammunition, mortar systems and components
- Artillery weapons, artillery ammunition, artillery systems and components
- Mines, mine components, and mine clearing systems
- Tank weapons, munitions, associated ordnance material
- Weapons-related general combat equipment
- Countermine systems and components
- Demolition materiel
- Counter-fire systems and components
- Counter fire sensors
- Radars

Munitions and Weapons Division also tests other materials under development and under a product improvement initiative. This division also conducts acceptance testing of the items listed above, which involves sampling each lot. The samples are tested to ensure they meet government performance, reliability, and safety standards.

Aviation Systems and Electronic Test (ASET) Division – conducts most airborne activities and some ground-related activities. ASET Division is the primary location for Army developmental air transport and airdrop tests, which focus on development of new or improved methods for transport and delivery of personnel, equipment, and munitions. This division develops, tests, and analyzes parachute systems, aerial retardation systems, aircraft systems, aircraft airdrop systems, aircraft escape systems, internal and external air transportability of equipment and materials, descending and retrieval systems, vertically controlled impacts, and the effects of the desert environment on aviation and airdrop material. ASET Division also tests aircraft armament systems, aircraft weapons and fire control systems, precision navigation systems, airborne and ground target acquisition systems, ground and aerial rockets and rocket systems, general support equipment, Soldier equipment, and chemical-biological defense equipment. UAS operations testing includes UAS launch/recovery, command and control, as well as administration of UAS tests. Additionally, ASET Division conducts sensor testing of systems mounted to towers or on the ground, on moored aerostats, and on vehicles, aircraft, or UAS. Types of systems can include electro-optical, infrared, radar, acoustic, and unattended ground sensors, and wireless communication.

Testing of EW is conducted by the ASET Aviation Systems Branch and involves but is not limited to, Counter Radio Controlled IED (RCIED) Electronic Warfare (CREW) jamming systems, several systems designed to detect threats prior to detonation, and systems to identify, locate, and track enemy personnel for emplacing the threats. Testing includes performance, interoperability, and communications for potential, pending, and currently fielded counter-IED and counter-terrorism technologies, as well as EW systems.

Combat and Automotive Systems Division – tests and evaluates tracked and wheeled vehicles, weapons systems, including tank weapons and other vehicle-mounted weapons and ammunition, other mobile equipment, fuel and water transfer systems, unmanned/robotic systems for both government and private industry, as well as human factors in combat scenarios. Testing involves vehicle systems performance and reliability under desert conditions. The division also assists private industry by providing services and use of test facilities. The division also provides Human Factors Engineering support to other test areas. Vehicle testing is governed by *Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Conducting Automotive Testing* (YP-YTC-P-5001) (YPG, 2008a) and weapons testing is governed by *SOP for Conducting Combat Vehicle Weapons Systems and Ammunition* (YP-YTC-P-5100) (YPG, 2008b).

Persistent Surveillance Systems (PSS) –tests and evaluates command, control, communications, computers, combat systems, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C5ISR) systems on aerostat platforms moored as high as 15,000 ft above the ground. Testing includes the use of various military and civilian vehicles and simulated insurgents with live fire from firearms, small artillery, and explosives.

Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) - testing of UAS conducted by the ASET Aviation Systems Branch and involves all aspects of UAS, including sensors, communications, weapons firing, and aircraft operation on UAS platforms ranging from 1 pound to more than 15,000 pounds. Testing occurs during all stages of the development cycle and includes test firing of weapons systems.

Training Exercise Management Office (TEMO) – responsible for visiting unit coordination and management of training activities on YPG. TEMO also conducts training activities and provides support services to its test divisions and supported components. YPG is used for a variety of training objectives by the Army as well as the U.S. Marines, U.S. Air Force, and U.S. Army Reserve units. Training activities include:

- MFFS
- Periodic Golden Knights parachute training
- Visiting units training
- Field exercise training
- Night maneuvers training
- Live fire training and exercises
- Military working dog training
- Driver/convoy training
- Air to ground aircraft gunnery
- Unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV)/UAS training
- Aerostat training
- Land navigation
- Airmobile tactical training

Training activities prepare units for the terrain and unique physical characteristics of the desert environment. Some training activities on YPG are combined with testing to determine the performance of weapons and equipment under field conditions rather than test conditions. This operational testing is conducted to support other testing activities, such as when live fire is needed to provide appropriate test conditions. Field exercise training may include mounted or dismounted maneuvers, live-fire activities, and bivouacs for extended activities. Training occurs in designated areas in all three regions of YPG.

Military-support Contractors – military contractors allowed to use YPG to test new technologies or equipment being developed for one or more branches of the military under desert conditions. Military-support Contractors have identified future needs on YPG, and these activities are included in the Proposed Action.

Private Partnerships/Industrial Operations – non-military components allowed to develop and use facilities on the installation. Private partnerships must comply with all Federal, State, and Army regulations and requirements. No new private partnership actions are proposed and such actions are not evaluated in this DPEIS. Future private partnership projects will be assessed on a project- and site-specific basis. Private project proponents will be responsible for implementing NEPA, if required, and any mitigation of impacts required as a result of sitespecific analysis. Some industries may use existing military facilities.

The activities currently conducted by the four test divisions, TEMO, and military-support contractors are described in Section 2.1.2 and Appendix B. There are no proposed changes in activities conducted by industrial operations and these entities are not further considered.

In addition to these supported components, YPG also allows use of portions of the installation by the Boy Scouts of America (BSA) and by Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) for camps and group activities.

Support organizations provide all structures and facilities for mission, logistical, and personnel support. Mission and logistical support encompasses communication networks, data control, ammunition storage, physical security, meteorology, vehicle maintenance, safety, environmental support, and fabrication facilities. Personnel and general support includes housing, food services, recreation, administrative and medical services, and facility maintenance.

2.2 Approach to Alternative Development

The No Action Alternative is described in Section 2.3, as supported by Appendix B. The Proposed Action is described in Section 2.4.

Potential alternatives for specific proposed projects included in the Proposed Action subjected to detailed analysis in this document are provided in Section 2.5. This section identifies those proposed activities where reasonable alternatives exist and provides a description of alternatives considered. Proposed projects for which no feasible alternatives exist also are identified and the justification for not considering other alternatives is provided. It also is possible that the decision-maker would select a subset of the activities included within the Proposed Action and other activities from Section 2.5.

For proposed projects subjected to programmatic analysis, no alternatives were considered. Rather, to the extent practical the maximum potential impacts of the project activities were analyzed on a broad scale. These activities would be subjected to site-specific NEPA analysis prior to implementation that could include analysis of other reasonable alternatives to the identified action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action that were considered but eliminated from further consideration are described in Section 2.7.

2.3 No Action Alternative

2.3.1 Description of the No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative is the continuation of existing operations on YPG. Under the No Action Alternative, testing and training would continue at the current levels and utilize existing facilities and infrastructure with no new construction. Ongoing testing and training occur in specific areas within YPG, and the locations of current activities are depicted on Figures 2-4 through 2-12. Tables identifying the testing and training activities included under the No Action Alternative are provided in Appendix B, as Tables B-1 through B-3, which are separated according to the three regions (Laguna, Cibola, and Kofa Regions). No test areas, munitions impact areas, or DZs would be expanded under the No Action Alternative. No construction or demolition would occur.

2.3.2 Previous Analyses of the No Action Alternative

The testing and training activities of the No Action Alternative have been evaluated previously through multiple NEPA documents:

- Environmental Assessment, Yuma Proving Ground United States Army. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Michael Brandman Associates, Inc., revised by Mittlehauser Corporation. Original Document 1987, revised 1994. (Mittlehauser Corporation, 1994)
- Environmental Assessment for the Combat Systems Test Complex, May 30, 2000. Command Technology Directorate CSTE-DTC-YP-CD. Jason Associates Corporation. May 2000. (Jason Associates Corporation, 2000)
- Final Range Wide Environmental Impact Statement, U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, Yuma and La Paz Counties, Arizona. Command Technology Directorate CSTE-DTC-YP-

CD-ES; Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation. July 2001. (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001)

- Environmental Assessment for Mohave Drop Zone. Prepared for U.S. Army Proving Ground Command Technology Directorate. September, 2001. (Jason Associates Corporation, 2001)
- Environmental Assessment for the Joint Experimental Range Complex. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, Environmental Sciences Directorate. March 2, 2004. (YPG, 2004)
- Environmental Assessment for the Joint Experimentation Range Complex II. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, Environmental Sciences Directorate. August 2006. (YPG, 2006)
- Environmental Assessment for the Joint Experimentation Range Complex (JERC) III, Operational Road Course and Service/Access Road. Jason Associates Corporation. December 2007. (Jason Associates Corporation, 2007)
- Final Environmental Assessment for the Unmanned Aircraft Systems Test Center. Jason Associates Corporation. January 2008. (Jason Associates Corporation, 2008a)
- Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Cobra Flats, Comanche Flats, and Site 2 Military Training Areas. Jason Associates Corporation. January 2008. (Jason Associates Corporation, 2008b)
- Final Environmental Assessment for the Army Test Tracks. Prepared for U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Jason Associates Corporation. March 2008 (Jason Associates Corporation, 2008c)
- Environmental Assessment for Improvised Explosive Devices (IED) Test Environment. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG Directorate of Public Works [DPW]). January 2010. (YPG DPW, 2010a)
- Environmental Assessment for Impact Areas Expansion. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. March 2010. (YPG DPW, 2010b)
- Environmental Assessment for Cibola Impact Areas. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. April 2011. (Gutierrez Canales Engineering, P.C., 2011)
- Environmental Assessment for Fuel Facilities Optimization. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. November 2011. (YPG DPW, 2011a)
- Environmental Assessment for Persistent Surveillance Systems Program. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. December 2011. (YPG DPW, 2011b)
- Environmental Assessment for Long Range Munitions. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. April 2013. (YPG DPW, 2013a)

• Environmental Assessment for Military Training Area Expansion, Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. May 2013. (YPG DPW, 2013b)

The evaluations and analyses presented in these previous NEPA documents provide the baseline for comparison of potential impacts considered in this DPEIS. The descriptions and analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed above are incorporated into this DPEIS by reference.

2.3.3 Existing Activities

The following sections describe the types of activities conducted by the various testing and training entities on YPG. Common to all testing and training is the use of electromagnetic (EM) radiation, including communication systems and lasers, as system components for communication, range finding, target acquisition, and other purposes. An EM gun is tested at the EM GP in the Kofa Region.

Sources of EM radiation are used and tested on YPG for a wide number of tasks. EM radiation may be used from both ground and aviation platforms. EM radiation systems operate at all frequencies and at a variety of power levels ranging from microwatts to megawatts.

Lasers of all classes are used and tested on YPG, primarily for target acquisition, training, fire control, and directed energy applications. Lasing may be used from ground or aviation platforms and may terminate on either ground or air targets.

There would be continued use of lasers and EM radiation under the No Action Alternative.

Throughout the YPG Ranges there are numerous fixed sites that are used for a variety of purposes. Some were originally designed to support radar or optical instrumentation, camera sites, pads for equipment emplacement, landing pads, observation posts for visual observers, firing points, GPs, and impact areas. All of these sites also are used, as needed, to support UAS testing, to include temporary installation and employment of UAS launch/recovery systems, GCSs, command and control infrastructure, and refueling operations. UAS testing may include optical tracking (ground or aerial), laser rangefinder, and laser designator operations. Tests are conducted at these areas on ground- or towermounted sensors, balloon- or aerostat-mounted sensors, electro-optical sensors, infrared sensors, radar sensors, and unattended ground sensors, as well as wireless communications. These areas are also used for establishment of temporary firing positions to conduct ground weapons firing into approved impact areas, including small arms, shoulder-fired arms, guided munitions, artillery and mortars, rockets, RPGs, AT-4 LAWs, and other direct fire weapons. YPG would continue to conduct these types of activities at these locations under the No Action Alternative.

2.3.3.1 Munitions and Weapons

These activities include the testing and evaluation of weapons, ammunition, explosive ordnance, and related items. The primary test site for these operations is KFR, with both conventional and specialized facilities and instrumentation sites. Electro Thermal/EM weapons tests are conducted in a dedicated facility in KFR.

YPG tests airborne weapons systems, combat vehicle weapons and related munitions, direct and indirect fire programs, vertical firings, illumination programs, and inert items. Munitions, weapons, mines, and other materiel tested on YPG include experimental tube artillery and gun systems and associated ammunition from 120 millimeter (mm) to 16-inch, mines, countermine systems, counter-fire systems, related ordnance material, related general equipment items designed for combat use, mortars, field artillery weapons, machine guns, and materiel. More than 10,000 rounds per year typically are fired for this testing. The primary test site for artillery and mortar weapons and munitions testing is KFR, which contains a 40-mile overland artillery range including fixed and temporary firing positions with conventional and specialized facilities and instrumentation. Most testing is from stationary guns at established GPs and firing points.

Over 400 established firing points are maintained on YPG that are used for testing artillery, tank, and mortar direct and indirect fire capabilities. When in use, GPs include the weapon to be tested and supporting utilities and facilities. There are 13 fixed GPs that are fully improved sites with permanent structures, including blast shields, and electricity/ telecommunications support. There also are seven semi-permanent GPs with permanent buildings that have electricity/telecommunications support. The remaining GPs are transient gun positions (TGPs), which are multiple use areas that may be used for firing, sensor or camera placement, or for observation of testing activities. TGPs are cleared areas (up to a 175-ft radius area [2.2 ac]) that may have telecommunications support. Electrical service may be provided or generators may be used to supply electricity during tests. Trailers and other support facilities or equipment are placed on the TGP for the duration of a test and then removed. Instrumentation at a TGP used to collect and analyze data from weapon systems and/or munitions during tests includes, but is not limited to, cameras, radars, microphones, lights, optical sensors, and pressure transducers. Other equipment that is typically brought in to support a firing test includes, but is not limited to: ³/₄-ton pick-up trucks, 2 ¹/₂-ton flatbed truck, 5-ton cargo truck (tactical or commercial), grader, crane, lowboy trailer, all-terrain fork lift, front-end loader, backhoe, bulldozer, dump truck, instrumentation van, and bomb-proof blast shields.

YPG is licensed through the NRC to conduct firing programs involving munitions that contain DU and beryllium. Although beryllium munitions are licensed, they have not been fired or tested at YPG. No additional use of these materials would occur under the Proposed Action. The NRC-licensed DU impact area is in the northwestern part of the Kofa Region and is regularly monitored to confirm that no adverse environmental impacts occur. After firing, the impact areas are searched by Ammunition Recovery personnel to recover spent DU rounds. Collected spent DU rounds are stored by YPG Radiation Protection until packaged and transported to a licensed disposal facility by the Army's Radioactive Waste Authority. The NRC-licensed DU impact area has a DU Catchment Structure and spent DU rounds are collected by Ammunition Recovery personnel and stored by YPG Radiation Protection until packaged and transported to a licensed disposal facility by the Army's Radioactive Waste Authority. There is an evaporative lagoon (catchment basin) that collects runoff from the DU Catchment Structure to minimize the potential for stormwater transport of DU off-post or to other areas on-post.

Range instrumentation that supports testing includes, but is not limited to, fuze chronographs, burst height monitors, muzzle velocity radars, tracking radars, high-speed cameras, video monitors, Kineto tracking mounts, telemetry antennas, optical theodolites,

wireless communication equipment, and versatile tracking mounts. Temperature conditioning boxes and environmental simulators, including rough handling, transportation vibration, drop towers, temperature/altitude, humidity, enveloping flame, and dust and salt fog chambers, are used to conduct munitions and weapons tests.

Support facilities in the Kofa Region prepare weapons and munitions that are tested, including assembly and storage of propellants, fuzes, and other sensitive explosives. Support facilities perform all maintenance for weapons assigned to YPG, including towed and self-propelled artillery and fire control systems. YPG also has dedicated mine and countermine facilities.

There are numerous radar sites throughout KFR that are primarily used to host and support deployment and operation of counterbattery radar systems and other sensors during testing. These sites are known as radar sites 1, 2, and 3, the Firefinder Compound, the Counterfire Compound, and the Counter Rocket Artillery and Mortar (CRAM) area (including Site 15, Tower 48, and the Land-Based Phalanx Weapon System [LPWS] GPs). These sites are established and improved areas with hard power, telecom infrastructure, vehicle parking areas, equipment storage containers, and personnel shelters that serve as the command center for test support personnel and test equipment during test operations. These sites are used to conduct tests involving geographically separated but networked sensors and weapon systems. These systems support testing by multiple testing groups and are not limited to munitions and weapons testing.

2.3.3.2 Air Delivery Systems and Air Movable Equipment

This work includes air cargo delivery, testing of precision guided and non-precision guided cargo and personnel parachute systems, airdrop certification of equipment and ammunition, certification of aircraft for airdrop operations, external transportability testing, and general Soldier systems testing. Testing is conducted using DZs and fixed facilities. Specific DZs are designated for explosives, general cargo, DU, and personnel. Restricted airspace over the DZs is controlled by YPG. Testing consists of airdrops of personnel, equipment, and ammunition. Most airdrop testing and training is done during the day, with occasional night operations.

Static drop testing determines the capability of military materiel to withstand ground impact forces resulting from accidental drop during transport. A crane is used to lift and drop loads to provide specific impact velocities. Fit checks and roll-on/roll-off testing are done using a C-130 fuselage.

The building, assembly, and rigging of loads for testing and training are done at YPG facilities. Parachute fabrication and maintenance activities include fabrication, inspection, repair, and modification of parachute assemblies and components required to support test programs. Parachutes are packed on YPG at facilities under controlled conditions. A shake-out/drying tower is used for large cargo parachutes prior to packing. Other support activities include load preparation, aircraft loading, recovery of airdrop and air transported equipment, and installation of data acquisition instrumentation systems for airdrop tests.

2.3.3.3 Aircraft Armament Systems

This testing includes development and performance testing of aircraft armament components and systems. Emphasis is on internal and external armament and fire control systems on rotary wing aircraft (helicopters), although fixed wing aircraft also are used. Developmental testing of Army aircraft armament components includes air-to-ground and air-to-air testing in various designated munitions impact areas with an emphasis on rotary wing aircraft. Aircraft use designated field sites located throughout YPG to take off and land and for re-arming and refueling operations. All components of aircraft armament systems are tested, including turreted guns, rockets, countermeasures, dispensers and launchers, guided missiles, laser systems and rangefinders, fire control systems, night vision devices, and aircraft integrations. Aircraft armament testing directly involves tests conducted on aircraft, and also includes firing ground-to-ground from specially constructed mounts and fixtures. Ground-to-ground firing of aircraft armament components and systems uses some of the same types of support facilities and instrumentation as artillery and combat vehicle weapons testing.

Testing of aircraft armament systems may include both ground and aerial firing. Munitions used may include small arms, ranging in sizes from 5.56mm to 203mm and consist of ball ammunition, incendiary, tracers, and other types of military rounds. They may also include ballistic rockets ranging in size from 57mm up to 240mm, guided missiles ranging in size from 70mm with warheads weighing less than 10 pounds, to warheads weighing in excess of 60 pounds. Specialized munitions such as flares, illumination, chaff, Tube-launched, Optically Tracked, Wire Command (TOW) missiles, AT-4 LAW, and all series of RPGs may also be fired or dispensed. Bombs (projectiles that require the acceleration due to gravity for propulsion) may be utilized for testing and could weigh up to 1,000 pounds. Target, instrumentation, and range facilities are in designated areas that can accommodate the safety fan of weapons being tested. Both passive and active targeting systems are tested using sensors in a number of regions of the EM spectrum, including infrared (IR), ultraviolet (UV), and visible lasers, millimeter wave radar, and magnetic signature detectors. Tests for these systems may include large, real threat target arrays moving in tactical scenarios. Both ground and aerial targets are used.

Rangefinders, lasers, and radar systems are used for tracking and recording data, for sighting and alignment, and for testing tracking and guidance systems. Laser systems tested on YPG include ground-mounted, vehicle-mounted, and airborne systems. Laser systems may have eye-hazard distances of several miles and include both continuous wave and pulsed lasers with output energies ranging from microwatts to megawatts. Turreted lasers require test areas large enough to transmit in azimuth sweeps of 240 degrees or more. Testing of these laser systems and rangefinders in conjunction with armament systems requires ranges and restricted airspace capable of accommodating sweeps of 240 degrees and at least an 18-mile radius. YPG has ranges and restricted airspace to accommodate these tests.

2.3.3.4 C5ISR Systems

C5ISR systems are integrated intelligence networks designed to collect and share data from multiple sources across the battlefield. Typical C5ISR systems comprise transport systems (personnel, aircraft, vehicles, etc.), computers, software, communications (wireless and wired), networks (classified and unclassified), data (archive, dissemination, and exploitation), sensors (radar, electro-optical, infrared, laser, seismic, acoustic, biometrics, hyperspectral, signal detection, etc.), and sensor platforms (aerostats, airships, aircraft, vehicles, towers, etc.). The emphasis of C5ISR testing is on component level, system level, and "systems of systems" interoperability. C5ISR systems are used for Force Protection, ISR

(intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance), RSTA (reconnaissance, surveillance, and target acquisition), and border security missions.

2.3.3.5 UAS

UASs include the GCS, UAV, launch/recovery systems, and other ancillary equipment. UAS testing includes rotary wing, fixed wing, high altitude long endurance, medium altitude long endurance, high speed jet, and transitional vertical take-off and landing airships. Testing addresses both ground-launched and air-launched systems. The size of UAS aircraft tested varies from under 1 pound (lb) to 15,000 lb. Energy sources include batteries, solar cells, heavy fuel, aviation gasoline, and combination systems.

UASs typically are tested for persistent surveillance, ISR, RSTA, sling load, over the hill resupply, communications relay, cargo transport, battle damage assessment, mannedunmanned teaming, change detection, and shipboard and ground operations. UASs typically carry a variety of sensors, including laser systems, and may include weapons. UAS weapons testing is conducted at designated munitions impact areas.

2.3.3.6 Combat and Automotive Systems

This includes the testing and evaluation of wheeled and tracked vehicles, direct fire programs, combat vehicle weapons systems and related munitions, target acquisition systems, vehicle components, communication systems, and related items including fire control systems, fuels, lubricants, and other automotive chemical products. Munitions, weapons, and other materiel tested on YPG include tank gun systems and associated ammunition from 5.56mm to 120mm and small arms. The demand for automotive testing is projected to increase into the future. Multiple tests are conducted in parallel, many of which are within a competitive bid process with multiple vendors, with the potential for several vehicles operating on multiple performance test facilities while other combat vehicle weapons system firing tests are conducted. Typically, automotive testing involves several hundred vehicles per year that, in total, are driven in excess of 2.5 million miles to evaluate performance, maintainability, and reliability. Automotive-type equipment tested on YPG includes combat vehicle weapons systems, tactical, special and general purpose vehicles, construction equipment, industrial and power generation equipment, missile ground support and fuel/water distribution system equipment, robotic (autonomous/unmanned) systems, automotive components and materials, and military fuels and lubricants. Typical automotive performance tests include tractive effort, full-load cooling, road load cooling, fuel consumption, speed, acceleration, braking, handling, field of vision/fire, transportability, towing, ride quality, toxic fumes, and fording/swimming capability. Fording capability is tested at the fording basin in the Laguna Region. Environmental tests evaluate starting ability at extreme high and low temperatures, effects of rain and humidity, operation at high altitudes, vapor lock tendencies, and the ability of air cleaners and other subsystems to function in severe sand and dust conditions. Additionally, transportation of military vehicles by rail and air is addressed by YTC.

The performance of military personnel who operate and maintain test vehicles and equipment under field conditions also is within the mission of automotive testing. Testing may use fixed or moving targets and may be done from stationary or moving vehicles. YPG is the DoD center for tire testing and has established dedicated tire test courses. Most vehicle test courses are within the YTC of the Laguna Region. Established vehicle test courses provide over 250 miles of courses that vary with respect to road, grade, and soil conditions. The valley, wash, and mountainous areas on YPG provide differing degrees of severity for endurance and reliability testing, as well as general desert environment testing. Firing facilities with moving targets, zigzag courses, bumps, and firing pads allow testing of weapons and fire control systems, which may be stationary or moving.

Automotive has a laboratory for analysis of carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), ammonia, and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) that may be generated from aircraft and ground vehicle weapon firings or engine operations in a stationary mode and can accumulate in cockpit/crew compartments. Non-routine analyses of other gases and fumes from weapon debris, explosives, and propellants also are conducted. Environmental chambers are used to expose vehicles and equipment to extreme temperatures and varying levels of humidity. Vehicle-mounted weapons up to 40mm can be fired from these chambers. Mobility absorption dynamometers support operations and are used for drawbar pull, fuel consumption, full-load cooling, and tractive resistance tests.

Automotive also conducts maintenance on all test vehicles as part of its mission. These activities are done in facilities in the Kofa cantonment in the eastern part of the Laguna Region. Buildings used for these activities are designed to contain any spills of petroleum, oils, and lubricants (POLs) that may occur during maintenance of test vehicles.

YPG is licensed through the NRC to conduct firing programs involving munitions that contain DU and beryllium. Although beryllium munitions are licensed, they have not been fired or tested at YPG. No additional use of these materials would occur under the Proposed Action. The NRC-licensed DU impact area is in the northwestern part of the Kofa Region and is regularly monitored to confirm that no adverse environmental impacts occur. After firing, the impact areas are searched by Ammunition Recovery personnel to recover spent DU rounds. Collected spent DU rounds are stored by YPG Radiation Protection until packaged and transported to a licensed disposal facility by the Army's Radioactive Waste Authority. The NRC-licensed DU impact area has a DU Catchment Structure and spent DU rounds are collected by Ammunition Recovery personnel and stored by YPG Radiation Protection until packaged and transported to a licensed disposal facility by the Army's Radioactive Waste Authority. There is an evaporative lagoon (catchment basin) that collects runoff from the DU Catchment Structure to minimize the potential for stormwater transport of DU off-post or to other areas on-post.

2.3.3.7 Counter-IED Activities

The EW Branch of the ASET Division tests counter-IED electronic systems primarily at the JERC sites in the northern Cibola Region, but also at other designated EW ranges on Cibola and Kofa. Counter-IED facilities include large complexes of buildings, roads, bridges and overpasses, and other infrastructure that replicate typical urban settings and overseas combat areas. The facilities include re-creation of the EM environment in those overseas areas. These facilities and the tests continually evolve to reflect changes in in-theater conditions. Counter-IED testing platforms include equipment varying in size from tiny sensors to tethered surveillance aerostats. Simulated IEDs include both inert and explosive devices and weapons.

EW test ranges support multiple test functions, including detection and defeat of IEDs, force protection, performance capabilities and limitations, theater support, interoperability/EM compatibility, blue force communications compatibility, platform integration, radio frequency safety measurements and system safety assessment test efforts, firing events, laser events, and blended test and training events. Blended test and training events include activities such as acceptance testing of the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) all-terrain vehicle.

EW ranges have an interconnected fiber communications system that extends throughout each EW range. These interconnected systems allow testing to occur in multiple locations simultaneously across test sites in support of a single test effort.

2.3.3.8 Training

YPG provides training and operational testing where troops use various weapons, munitions, vehicles, aircraft, and systems under tactical conditions and includes both vehicle-mounted training and dismounted training. In addition to the Army, other military units such as SOTACC, and visiting units also conduct training exercises on YPG. Visiting units include:

- Special Operations Command
- U.S. Marine Corps (includes support squads that train on water purification systems)
- U.S. Navy
- U.S. Air Force
- U.S. Customs and Border Protection (personnel and K-9 Units)
- U.S. Coast Guard
- U.S. Army Reserve
- Arizona National Guard
- Arizona Local Law Enforcement Agencies
- California Local Law Enforcement Agencies
- Other Federal and DoD Entities
- Foreign Nation Forces
- DoD Contractor Support

Training may include classroom or controlled environment exercises and field exercises. Additional operator training is conducted by DoD contractors.

Unless expressly designated for vehicle maneuvers, light maneuver training areas (LTAs) are for dismounted training with vehicle use restricted to existing improved roads and both maintained and unmaintained unimproved roads. Only incidental off-road vehicle operation related to troop/equipment drop-off or pick-up occurs. Training is conducted in designated areas in all three regions of YPG. In most areas, training is limited to company-level (approximately 120 troops) or smaller units. The Laguna Region Forward Operating Base (FOB) by LAAF, the Castle Dome FOB, and the Combat Systems Test Complex in the Kofa Region are capable of accommodating larger numbers of troops. Facilities, such as mock desert villages and simulated target areas, roadways, and trails provide troops with conditions similar to those encountered in the Middle East. Training activities in LTAs may include bivouacs, which would be located near roads to provide ease of access for troops and portable toilets. No digging or other ground intrusive activities occur during bivouacs and typically previously disturbed areas are selected. Trailer-mounted 60-kilowatt

generators may be used during training. These are operated within secondary containment to prevent fuel spills and generators are operated only near roads due to access requirements.

The training mission also includes military working dog training, combat skills, paratrooper training, night training, air operations, troop/equipment movement, land navigation, logistics exercises, intelligence training, field repair training, establishment of bivouacs and base camps, communications, military operations in urban terrain (MOUT), and military operations in open desert conditions. Field training is conducted with various weapons and combat systems, including small arms, shoulder-fired guided missiles, aircraft weapon systems, vehicles, artillery, and tanks. Training activities may use live ammunition or may include blank rounds, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, and riot control agents as identified by unit authorization or operational test plan.

Force on force training does not involve live fire. An eye-safe multiple integrated laser engagement system is used to determine weapons hits and casualties. Force on force training does use blanks, pyrotechnics, smoke, illumination, and grenade and IED simulators.

Training exercises may occur outside of designated LTAs and FOBs. When training is conducted outside of these designated areas, troops and equipment are limited to existing roads and trails and no off-road movement is allowed.

2.3.3.9 Base Support Operations

Many facilities are operated or maintained to support the activities of the six main functions listed above. These facilities include instrumentation, such as radar tracking and vectoring, real-time meteorological data, target arrays, telemetry capabilities, and video scoring. Other support operations include several vehicle and munitions maintenance facilities, ranges, heliports and airfields, various test facilities and laboratories, data collection and processing facilities, pest management, solid waste disposal, wastewater disposal, water distribution, storage facilities, and road and target maintenance. Support services are also provided for base personnel in the areas of administration, recreation, utilities, housing, health, education, and retail stores.

2.3.4 Status of the Analysis of the No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose and need for the project. The No Action Alternative would result in YPG continuing to operate with facilities and infrastructure in need of improvement or modification to meet future mission needs. The No Action Alternative, however, provides the baseline against which the potential impacts of the other considered alternatives can be evaluated. The No Action Alternative is carried forward for detailed analysis in this DPEIS.

2.4 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action includes all components identified in this DPEIS, including new construction and associated demolition, testing and training activities occurring on YPG, and new testing, and training proposed to meet anticipated testing or training needs. Current testing and training activities, which were discussed previously as part of the No Action Alternative, are identified in Appendix B and locations for these activities are shown

on Figures 2-4 through 2-12. No additional use of DU and beryllium materials would occur under the Proposed Action.

The construction, testing, and training activities planned to occur in the Laguna Region under the Proposed Action are identified in Table 2-1 and the locations are shown on Figure 2-13. The identifiers for each project in Table 2-1 correspond to the identifiers on Figure 2-13. These activities include infrastructure construction, expansion of test areas to accommodate additional testing and training, and planned changes in testing and training activities, including increases in testing of conventional and lighter-than-air UAS systems.

The construction, testing, and training activities planned to occur in the Cibola Region under the Proposed Action are identified in Table 2-2 and the locations are shown in Figure 2-14. The identifiers for each project in Table 2-2 correspond to the identifiers on Figure 2-14. These activities include infrastructure construction, expansion of test areas to accommodate additional testing and training, and planned changes in testing and training activities, and to provide appropriate supporting infrastructure for continued testing and training activities, such as appropriate POL storage at remote testing locations.

The construction, testing, and training activities planned to occur in the Kofa Region under the Proposed Action are identified in Table 2-3, with the locations shown in Figure 2-15. The identifiers for each project in Table 2-3 correspond to the identifiers on Figure 2-15. These activities include infrastructure construction, expansion of test areas to accommodate additional testing and training, and planned changes in testing and training activities.

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^a	Potential Principal Impacts ^b	
	Short-Term Activities		
L001	L001-a: Construct building, concrete pad, shade structure, and solar lights at K-9 Village. L001-b: Install hard power/fiber, communication service at K-9 Village.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at K-9 Village (building 900 square feet [ft ²], concrete pad 40,000 ft ² , shade structure 400 ft ²), and along associated utility lines (4,395 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.	
L002	L002-a: Construct Runway 18/36 extension, and realign Barranca Road at LAAF. L002-b: Install hard power at LAAF.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (2,000-ft runway extension 2.75 ac, realignment of Barranca Road 3.37 ac, and utilities 12,500 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Temporary disruption of on-post traffic. Increased impervious area.	
L003	Construct outdoor eating area at the Roadrunner Café.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance. Increased impervious area (eating area 840 ft ²).	
L004	Construct office building next to Building 2968.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (office building 4,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.	
L005	L005-a: Construct medium and large storage buildings.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (medium storage building 7,200 ft ² , large storage building	

TABLE 2-1 Proposed Action Activiti

Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^a	Potential Principal Impacts ^b
	L005-b: Construct 2 office buildings. L005-c: Construct Air Delivery Guided Test Facility next to Building 2970.	9,600 ft ² , 2 office buildings totaling 4,000 ft ² , and Air Delivery Guided Test Facility 35,900 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L006	L006-a: Construct Flight Detachment Maintenance Building. L006-b: Construct Wild Horse Café. L006-c: Construct antiterrorism/force protection (AT/FP) parking improvements.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (Flight Detachment Maintenance Building 18,000 ft ² , Wild Horse Café 3,200 ft ² , and parking improvements 101,560 ft ² in previously disturbed area). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L007	L007-a: Construct helicopter parking at CDH. L007-b: Construct UAS parking, UAS storage facility, and UAS maintenance hangar at CDH. L007-c: Construct privately owned vehicle (POV) parking at CDH. L007-d: Relocate C-130 CALA to CDH.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (helicopter and UAS parking 61,000 ft ² , POV parking 77,000 ft ² , UAS storage facility 14,400 ft ² , UAS maintenance hangar 43,500 ft ² , C-130 CALA relocation 240,200 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L008	L008-a: Construct access control point (ACP) at CDH. L008-b: Construct roadway drainage improvements at CDH.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (improved ACP 19,500 ft ² , roadway drainage improvements 370,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions.
L009	Construct warehouse at YTC.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (warehouse 7,750 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L010	Construct Instrumentation Development Facility at YTC.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (Instrumentation Development Facility 32,500 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L011	L011-a: Construct tracked vehicle trail at YTC. L011-b: Construct office at YTC.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (tracked vehicle trail 45,000 ft ² , office 400 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L012	L012-a: Construct hotel at the MAA. L012-b: Construct Emergency Operations Center (EOC) at MAA. L012-c: Construct addition to youth services center at MAA. L012-d: Construct ACP improvements at MAA. L012-e: Construct child development center for school- aged services at MAA. L012-f: Construct outdoor eating area at Covote Lanes bowling	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (hotel 15,000 ft ² , EOC 6,600 ft ² , youth services center 16,150 ft ² , and ACP improvements 19,500 ft ² , child development center 59,261 ft ² , outdoor eating area 3,169 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.

TABLE 2-1Proposed Action Activities – Laguna RegionYuma Proving Ground
TABLE 2-1
Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^a	Potential Principal Impacts ^b
	alley.	
L013	L013-a: Construct additional fencing and support facilities at the Threat Systems and Target Simulations Buildings 3572 and 3574. L013-b: Install hard power, fiber, and phone service to the Threat Systems and Target Simulations Buildings 3572 and 3574.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (fencing 1,420 ft ² , support facilities 50,000 ft ² , and install hard power 100 ft ²). Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
L014	L014-a: Construct aircraft shelter, command and control building, and clear a UAS launch/recovery area at Comanche Flats. L014-b: Construct multiple buildings, concrete pad, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking area at Comanche Flats. L014-c: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Comanche Flats.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (aircraft shelter 52,500 ft ² , command and control building 2,000 ft ² , UAS launch/recovery area - clearing vegetation 162 ac and adding 282,600 ft ² of aggregate base coat (ABC) in center of area, office building 600 ft ² , maintenance building 900 ft ² , pad 1,000 ft ² , water tank 30,000 gallons 1,000 ft ² , POL storage 900 ft ² , graded parking 7,500 ft ² , and utilities 7,560 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
L015	L015-a: Repair landing pad and construct building at K-9 Village. L015-b: Install hard power, fiber, and communication service at K-9 Village.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (repair landing pad 90,000 ft ² , building 2,500 ft ² , and utilities 2,962 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
L016	L016-a: Construct building, concrete or asphalt pad, shade structure, and install solar lights at Site 2. L016-b: Install hard power, fiber, and communication service at Site 2.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (building 900 ft ² , pad 40,000 ft ² , shade structure 400 ft ²) and along utility lines (250 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
L017	Construct GCSs for UAS operations at tracking mount (TM) Site 4.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (GCSs $2,500 \text{ ft}^2$).
L018	Construct concrete or asphalt pad and sensor tower east of existing sensor test building at Sidewinder Sensor Site.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (pad 900 ft ² and 65-ft to 130-ft sensor tower 100 ft ²). Increased impervious area.
L019	Expand and combine West LA LTA, K-9 Village LTA, Site 2 LTA, and Site 4 LTA.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (6,521 ac).
L020	Upgrade equipment at Tire X-Ray Facility (Building 2310).	None, impacts confined to interior of existing facility.

Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^a	Potential Principal Impacts ^b
L021	Construct solar chamber at Climatic Simulation Facilities (Building 3527).	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (solar chamber 15,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L022	Relocate dust chamber from Building 3352 to near Buildings 3357 and 3494 (Rough Handling).	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (dust chamber 15,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L023	L023-a: Improve ACP at the Kofa cantonment. L023-b: Construct joint wash rack for tracked and government owned vehicles (GOVs) at the Kofa cantonment. L023-c: Construct electric substation protection and electronics expansion at the Kofa cantonment. L023-d: Construct Howitzer Support\Acceptance Facility at the Kofa cantonment. L023-e: Construct open storage facility at the Kofa cantonment.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (ACP improvements 19,500 ft ² , joint wash rack 900 ft ² , open burn pad 43,500 ft ² , electronics expansion 10,500 ft ² , Howitzer Support\Acceptance Facility 22,500 ft ² , storage facility 70,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L024	Relocate Semi-trailer Delivery Safe Haven.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (11,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L025	L025-a: Construct Aberdeen Road flood upgrades. L025-b: Construct range road improvements.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (Aberdeen Road flood upgrades 0.5 mile, range road improvements 31.5 miles). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Improved traffic flow. Improved safety.
L026	Construct munitions treatment facility.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (60,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L027	Construct gun storage facility at the Kofa cantonment.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (22,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L028	Construct five ammunition magazines near the Kofa cantonment.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (4,000 ft ² each totaling approximately 22,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L029	Construct optical maintenance facility, graded parking area with power pole farm, and perimeter	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (building 7,500 ft ² , parking area 90,342 ft ² , fencing 2,400 ft ²). Construction-related emissions.

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^a	Potential Principal Impacts ^b
	fencing.	Increased impervious area.
L030	L030: Expand LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuvers at Muggins/Middle East: L030-a: 16,640 ac L030-b: 6,331 ac	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (up to 16,640 ac).
L031	L031: Construct MFFS Dining Facility (DFAC) (only one option to be selected): L031-a: at Location Option 1 L031-b: at Location Option 2 L031-c: at Location Option 3	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (building 48,979 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L032	Expand Bravo LTA.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (828 ac).
L033	Expand Hill 630 LTA.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (1,141 ac).
L034	L034: Construct MFFS Ready Room (only one option to be selected): L034-a: at Location Option 1 L034-b: at Location Option 2 L034-c: at Location Option 3	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (48,979 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L035	Construct Armament Test Operations and Analysis Facility.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (60,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L036	Construct Shower Facility at LAAF FOB area.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance. Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L037	Construct vehicle test course.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (up to 5,171 ac). Construction-related emissions.
L038	Construct vehicle test course.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (up to 1,550 ac). Construction-related emissions.
L039	Construct vehicle test course.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (up to 2,318 ac). Construction-related emissions.
L040	Construct DZ near LAAF (984 ft x 1,969 ft).	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (44.5 ac). Construction-related emissions.
L041	Construct air delivery storage and laboratory facility behind Building 2970.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (up to 14,851 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.

TABLE 2-1Proposed Action Activities – Laguna RegionYuma Proving Ground

Yuma Proving Ground				
Identifier	Proposed Activities ^a	Potential Principal Impacts ^b		
L042	Upgrade facility to an office and hangar in Building 3025.	None, all work confined to interior remodeling of existing facilities.		
	Long-Term Projects			
L100	L100-a: Construct addition to Building 3021. L100-b: Construct Future Combat Systems (FCS) Rotary Class IV hangars, and FCS. large Class IV hangar to the west of LAAF L100-c: Construct large transient UAS hangar with pad access west of LAAF. L100-d: Construct aviation growth hangar at LAAF. L100-e: Construct administrative support building to the west of LAAF. L100-f: Construct U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) Tactical Hangar at LAAF.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (addition to Building 3021 5,972 ft ² , FCS Rotary Class IV hangars totaling 17,600 ft ² ; FCS large Class IV hangar 5,972 ft ² ; UAS hangar 6,200 ft ² , aviation growth hangar 20,250 ft ² , administrative support building 38,500 ft ² , USASOC Tactical Hangar 67,774 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.		
L101	L101-a: Construct motor pool to the north of LAAF. L101-b: Construct addition to ammunition building rigging bay to the north of LAAF. L101-c: Construct access from Ocotillo Road and ammunition building access road improvements to the north of LAAF. L101-d: Construct storage yard improvements to the north of LAAF.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (motor pool 26,300 ft ² , addition to rigging bay 10,200 ft ² , access from Ocotillo Road 5,600 ft in length [180,000 ft ²], access road improvements 700 ft in length), storage yard improvements 60,500 ft ² . Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.		
L102	L102-a: Construct new MFFS Terminal at LAAF/MAA. L102-b: Construct consolidated rigger facility at LAAF/MAA. L102-c: Construct UAS airfield, hangars, taxiways, and UAS flight test area and other supporting infrastructure at LAAF/MAA. L102-d: Construct CASA Transport Aircraft Hangar at LAAF/MAA.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (MFFS Terminal 28,000 ft ² , consolidated rigger facility 15,500 ft ² , UAS taxiways 2,000 ft in length [120,000 ft ²], UAV airfield and hangars 403,250 ft ² , UAV flight test area and other supporting infrastructure 76,000 ft ²), CASA Transport Aircraft Hangar 153,858 ft ² . Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.		

TABLE 2-1 Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^a	Potential Principal Impacts ^b
L103	L103-a: Construct fire station at CDH. L103-b: Construct fuel point at CDH. L103-c: Construct C-130 parking at CDH. L103-d: Construct hot cargo refueling area at CDH. L103-e: Construct dining facility at CDH. L103-f: Construct airship hangar at CDH.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (Fire station, fuel point, and C-130 parking, totaling 410,000 ft ² , hot cargo refueling area 240,200 ft ² , dining facility 4,800 ft ² , and airship hangar 1,683,500 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Improved safety.
L104	Construct water and wastewater treatment facilities at CDH.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (77,100 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L105	Construct crosswind runway at CDH.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (6,000 ft in length [300,000 ft ²]). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L106	L106-a: Construct 4 administrative support buildings. L106-b: Construct Installation Logistics Complex.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (4 administrative support buildings totaling 44,465 ft ² , Installation Logistics Complex 76,833 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L107	Construct improvements to Cox Field, AT/FP, and Garrison headquarters, and convert Street D to pedestrian walkway.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (Cox Field 343,500 ft ² , AT/FP 12,000 ft ² , Garrison headquarters 17,200 ft ² , Street D 6,900 ft ²). Short-term on-post traffic disruption. Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L108	L108-a: Improve truck ACP at the Kofa cantonment. L108-b: Expand range communication at the Kofa cantonment. L108-c: Expand sand blasting at the Kofa cantonment. L108-d: Consolidate optics at the Kofa cantonment. L108-e: Construct second GOV and tracked vehicle maintenance facility at the Kofa cantonment.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (truck ACP 12,000 ft ² , range communication 20,000 ft ² , sand blasting 44,000 ft ² , optics 370,000 ft ² , second maintenance facility 122,230 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L109	Construct wax plant expansion at the Kofa cantonment.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (40,500 ft ²). Increased impervious area.

TABLE 2-1Proposed Action Activities – Laguna RegionYuma Proving Ground

Proposed Action Activities - Laguna Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^a	Potential Principal Impacts ^b
L110	Construct additional ammunition plant similar to Building 3482 and air-conditioned chamber near the Kofa cantonment.	Construction-related soil disturbance in previously disturbed area (ammunition plant 150,000 ft ² and air-conditioned chamber 40,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
L111	Upgrade equipment and electrical supply at Physical Test Facility (Buildings 3490 and 3130).	None, all work confined to interior remodeling of existing facilities.
L112	Upgrade equipment in vibration test facilities (Buildings 3496, 3495, and 3594).	None, all work confined to interior remodeling of existing facilities.
L113	Upgrade equipment at radiography facility (Building 3493).	None, all work confined to interior remodeling of existing facilities.

^a Work that would occur within existing buildings is not identified on maps because there would be no environmental impacts.

^b Measurements are approximate.

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Those that include a letter with the identifier are considered independent activities. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

TABLE 2-2 Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region ^a Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c	
Short-Term Projects			
C001	Construct vehicle test course.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (up to 4,644 ac). Construction-related emissions.	
C002	Construct new DZs: C002-a - South Urban DZ (1,640-ft radius) south of Urban DZ. C002-b - Tomahawk Circular DZ 769 (2,297-ft radius). C002-c - Tombstone DZ (984-ft radius). C002-d - Village Circular DZ (984-ft radius). C002-e - Abken DZ (1,640-ft radius). C002-f - Urban Circular Joint Precision Airdrop System (JPADS) DZ (984-ft radius).	Activity-related soil and vegetation disturbance (South Urban DZ 194 ac, Tomahawk Circular DZ 380 ac, Tombstone DZ 70 ac, Village Circular DZ 70 ac, Abken DZ 194 ac, and Urban Circular JPADS DZ 70 ac).	
C003	C003-a - Establish small arms impact areas for inert munitions at JERC I. C003-b - Establish small arms impact areas for inert munitions at JERC II. C003-c - Establish small arms impact areas for inert munitions at JERC III.	Inert fire weapons use at JERC I: impact areas 62 ac, 62 ac, and 15 ac; JERC II 62 ac; and JERC III 50 ac. These small arms impact areas would use collection boxes for fired ammunition and would be cleaned between tests. Potential air emissions from obscurants.	

Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region ^a *Yuma Proving Ground*

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c
C004	C004-a: Construct facilities at Gauna Peak. C004-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Gauna Peak.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (facilities 2,500 ft ²) and along utility lines (5,848 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C005	C005-a: Construct building at Site 18. C005-b: Install hard power, water, sewer, and communication service at Site 18.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (building 1,600 ft ²) and along utility lines (87,990 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C006	Establish Phoenix West Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (262 ac). Inert and explosive fire weapons use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C007	C007-a: Construct runway extension, aircraft shelter, and POL storage at Phoenix UAS site. C007-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Phoenix UAS site.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (runway extension 75,000 ft ² , aircraft shelter 8,000 ft ² , POL storage 900 ft ² , and utilities 26,870 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Reduced potential for POL spills. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C008	C008-a: Construct building at Site 16. C008-b: Install hard power, water, sewer, and communication service at Site 16.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (building 1,600 ft ²) and along utility lines (1,050 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C009	Establish North UAS Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (275 ac). Inert and explosive fire weapons use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C010	Construct aircraft shelter, POL storage, and graded parking lot at North UAV complex.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (aircraft shelter 43,500 ft ² , POL storage 900 ft ² , and parking lot 7,500 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Reduced potential for POL spills.
C011	Establish La Posa West Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (395 ac). Inert and explosive fire weapons use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c
C012	C012-a: Construct building and concrete pad at PSS Test Area (west of La Posa DZ). C012-b: Install hard power/fiber at PSS Test Area (west of La Posa DZ).	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (building 2,500 ft^2 , pad 5,000 ft^2) and along utility lines (31,090 ft^2). Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C013	Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Electronic Common Use Test (ECUT) area.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance along utility lines (47,970 ft ²). Construction-related emissions.
C014	C014-a: Install shade structure at Stinger Pole Target Area. C014-b: Install hard power to Stinger Pole Target Area.	Minimal soil and vegetation disturbance to place support poles (shade structure 400 ft ²) and along utility lines (2.68 ac). Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C015	Construct Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance/Electro-optical (ISR/EO) Ground Truth Reference Sites at: C015-a: Yuma Wash centered at (33.156, - 114.485) C015-b: Middle Mountain Road centered at (33.063, -114.358) C015-c: Mule Wash centered at (33.432, - 114.503) C015-d: Centered at (33.446, -114.471) C015-e: Centered at (33.477, -114.286) C015-f: Centered at (33.444, -114.325) C015-g: Centered at (33.448, -114.275) C015-h: Centered at (33.421, -114.279) C015-h: Centered at (33.49, -225.360) C015-j: Centered at (33.389, -114.303) C015-k: Centered at (33.387, -114.366) C015-l: Centered at (33.297, -114.395) C015-n: Centered at (33.165, -114.480) C015-o: Centered at (33.122, -114.299) C015-p: Centered at (33.090, -114.447) C015-q: Centered at (33.081, -114.353) C015-p: Centered at (33.081, -114.353)	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (each site - 2,000 ft ²).
C016	Rebuild target for long-range missile firing at Maverick Target.	None – existing target to be rebuilt.
C017	C017-a: Construct building, bomb-proof shelter, shade structure, concrete or asphalt pad, and sensor tower at camera mount (CM) 4. C017-b: Install phone service at CM 4.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (building 1,500 ft ² , bomb- proof shelter 2,000 ft ² , shade structure 400 ft ² , pad 40,000 ft ² , and 65-ft to 130-ft sensor tower 100 ft ²) and along utility lines (9,575 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c
C018	Construct landing pad at CM 1.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (pad 90,000 ft ²). Increased impervious area.
C019	Construct building and concrete pad at Z-12.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (building 2,000 ft ² and pad 90,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
C020	C020-a: Construct sensor tower, buildings, air- conditioning, and concrete pad at Site 9. C020-b: Install hard power and communication service at Site 9.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (sensor tower 65-ft to 130-ft tall 100 ft ² , buildings 2,000 ft ² , air- conditioned facility 1,000 ft ² , pad 40,000 ft ²), and along utility lines (7,880 ft ²). Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C021	C021-a: Construct secure building with reinforced concrete floors and ramp to building centered at (-114.356, 33.077). C021-b: Construct multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking centered at (-114.356, 33.077). C021-c: Construct aircraft shelter centered at (-114.356, 33.077). C021-d: Clear launch/recovery area centered at (-114.356, 33.077). C021-e: Install hard power/fiber and communication service centered at (-114.356, 33.077).	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance [total area for C021-a through C021-d: 193,284 ft ²) and along utility lines (1,810 ft ²)]. Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power. Reduced potential for POL spills.
C022	 C022-a: Construct building, concrete slab, walkways, and fencing centered at (-114.36, 33.074). C022-b: Construct aircraft shelter centered at (-114.36, 33.074). C022-c: Construct POL storage centered at (-114.36, 33.074). C022-d: Relocate meteorological tower centered at (-114.36, 33.074). C022-e: Construct runway expansion and taxiway centered at (-114.36, 33.074). 	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (command and control room 2,000 ft ² , walkways 1,800 ft ² , 10,000 ft ² concrete slab, aircraft shelter 12,000 ft ² , POL storage area 900 ft ² , meteorological tower 100 ft ² , runway expansion 725,000 ft ² , and taxiway 400,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Reduced potential for POL spills.
C023	C023-a: Construct multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking centered at (-114.363, 33.051). C023-b: Construct aircraft shelter centered at (-114.363, 33.051). C023-c: Clear a launch/recovery area centered at (-114.363, 33.051). C023-d: Install hard power/fiber and communication service centered at (-114.363, 33.051).	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (multiple buildings 2,500 ft ² each, 30,000 gal water tank 1,000 ft ² , POL storage area 900 ft ² , graded parking area 7,500 ft ² , aircraft shelter 43,500 ft ² , and launch/recovery area 22.8 ac) and along utility lines (216 ft ²)]. Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.

TABL	E 2-2
------	-------

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c
		Reduced potential for POL spills.
C024	C024-a: construct aircraft shelter, concrete pad, graded parking area near Inverted Range Control Center (IRCC) Tank Maintenance and Storage Ramada. C024-b: fence and install solar lights, around IRCC Tank Maintenance and Storage Ramada compound.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (shelter 1,600 ft ² , pad 90,000 ft ² , graded parking area 250,000 ft ² , and fence 4,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Reduced long-term use of fossil fuels by using solar lights.
C025	C025-a: Construct runway, taxiway, aircraft shelter, and building at IRCC. C025-b: Install hard power/fiber adjacent to existing helicopter pad at IRCC.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (runway 27.5 ac, taxiway 14 ac, aircraft shelter 12,000 ft ² , and building 2,000 ft ²) and along utility lines (1,245 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C026	C026-a: Construct ramp to existing building, and rollup door to existing building, and install solar lights at Site 10 Missile Test Facility. C026-b: Construct concrete landing pad C026-c: Install hard power/fiber at Site 10 Missile Test Facility.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (ramp 500 ft ² and landing pad 90,000 ft ²) and along utility lines (1,670 ft ²). Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power. Reduced long-term use of fossil fuels by using solar lights.
C027	C027-a: Expand flat area on top of hill, and construct facility, concrete pad, and sensor tower at Site 12. C027-b: Construct road leading from the sensor building on the top of the hill at Site 12A down to the Persistent Threat Detection System (PTDS) Site.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (total area for C027-a: 10.2 ac and for road 34,850 ft ²). Increased impervious area.
C029	C029-a: Construct buildings and concrete pad at Aerostat Mooring Site. C029-b: Install generators and hard power/fiber at Aerostat Mooring Site.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (buildings 2,000 ft ² , pad 10,000 ft ²) and along utility lines (12,220 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C030	C030-a: Construct aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking area, and clear a launch/recovery area east of Rocket Alley. C030-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service east of Rocket Alley.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (aircraft shelter 52,500 ft, command and control building 2,000 ft ² , office building 600 ft ² , maintenance building 900 ft ² , water tank 30,000 gallons 1,000 ft ² , POL storage area 900 ft ² , graded parking area 7,500 ft ² , and UAS launch/recovery area clearing vegetation of 162 ac and adding 282,600 ft ² of ABC in center of area)

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c
		and along utility lines (13,500 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power. Reduced potential for POL spills.
C031	Utilize Site 6 as a meteorological station.	None, existing disturbed area.
C032	Renovate Large Multi-Purpose Environmental Chamber (Building 6015).	None, action limited to renovation within existing building footprint.
C033	C033-a: Construct aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, concrete pad, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking area, and clear a launch/recovery area at C-17 C033-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at C-17.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (aircraft shelter 52,500 ft ² , command and control building 2,000 ft ² , office building 600 ft ² , maintenance building 900 ft ² , pad 5,000 ft ² , 30,000-gallon water tank 1,000 ft ² , POL storage 900 ft ² , graded parking area 7,500 ft ² , and UAS launch/recovery area clearing vegetation of 162 ac and adding 282,600 ft ² of ABC in center of area) and along utility lines (1,418 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power. Reduced potential for POL spills.
C034	C034-a: Expand size of Graze Range Impact Areas by consolidating 7 individual impact areas into a single larger area. C034-b: Install hard power to Graze Range.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (527 ac). Inert and explosive fire weapons use. Potential air emissions from obscurants. Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance along utility lines (10,123 ft ²). Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C035	Expand Combined Live Fire Exercise Range at OP-9 by consolidating 2 designated impact areas and Prospect Square.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (200 ac). Inert and explosive fire weapons use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C036	Increase use of Prospect Square for bombing or aircraft gunnery.	None, inert and explosive fire weapons use is authorized for this area.
C037	Install hard power to 40-ft drop tower.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance along utility lines (3,444 ft ²). Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C038	Construct medical evacuation (MEDEVAC) pad.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (MEDEVAC pad 1,000 ft ²). Increased impervious area.

TABLE 2-2Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region aYuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c
C039	Construct air-conditioned storage facility at Castle Dome Annex (CDA).	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (8,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
C040	Install hard power to the Cibola Region North Range.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance along utility lines (3.59 ac). Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C041	Expand LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at Middle Mountain.	Long-term soils disturbance from dismounted maneuver activities (11,230 ac).
C042	C042-a -Install relocatable instrumentation sites along all JERC I roads. Instrumentation sites would be moved to accommodate specific testing requirements. Each 20-ft instrumentation trailer requires a staging area with a 20-ft radius. C042-b -Install relocatable instrumentation sites along all JERC II roads. Instrumentation sites would be moved to accommodate specific testing requirements. Each 20-ft instrumentation trailer requires a staging area with a 20-ft radius. C042-c -Install relocatable instrumentation sites along all JERC III roads. Instrumentation sites along all JERC III roads. Instrumentation sites along all JERC III roads. Instrumentation sites would be moved to accommodate specific testing requirements. Each 20-ft instrumentation trailer requires a staging area with a 20-ft radius.	Soil and vegetation disturbance (less than 0.5 ac per site).
C043	Temporarily bury simulated missiles, explosives, etc. off roads for sensor testing. Locations for temporary burials would vary and be determined by specific testing requirements. Locations include: C043-a - All JERC I roads. C043-b - All JERC II roads. C043-c – All JERC III roads.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance.
C044	C044-a -Clear MEDEVAC helicopter landing pad at JERC I for evacuations. C044-b -Clear MEDEVAC helicopter landing pad at JERC II for evacuations. C044-c -Clear MEDEVAC helicopter landing pad at JERC III for evacuations.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (2,500 ft ² each).
C045	Construct MFFS Forward Staging Area.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (50 ac). Increased impervious area.
C046	Expand North UAV Compound C046-a: Construct concrete pad. C046-b: Grade project area and install fencing. C046-c: Construct asphalt taxiway.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance for pad (23,808 ft ²), project area and fencing (25,704 ft ²), and taxiway (62,500 ft ²). Increased impervious area.

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c
C047	Create 23 TGPs at: C047-a: Rocket Alley C047-b: CM9 East C047-c: Cibola Target Boundary GP C047-d: Site 16 C047-e: CM9 West C047-f: C17 (North and South) C047-g: Mound C Archer GP C047-h: Mound C GP C047-i: CM1 West C047-j: La Posa DZ C047-k: Site 8 GP C047-k: Site 8 GP C047-k: Site 8 GP C047-n: Excalibur SW GP C047-n: Excalibur SW GP C047-o: LADZ GP C047-p: Site 18 GP C047-g: 2.75 Rocket GP C047-r: Ehrenberg GP C047-r: Ehrenberg GP C047-t: La Posa South DZ C047-u: Water Tank GP C047-w: C17 North M777LWH GP.	Soil and vegetation disturbance (up to 2.2 ac at each site). Any weapons fire would be directed into existing authorized impact areas.
C048	Install hard power to Detection and Recognition Target Array (DET/REC) target in the Cibola Range.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance along utility lines (163,310 ft ²). Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C049	Install acoustic and seismic sensor at Horizontal Impact Area.	Very minor construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance.
C050	C050-a: Construct building at Simulated Minefield Site to support UAS operations. C050-b: Install hard power, water, sewer, and communication service at Simulated Minefield Site.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (building 1,600 ft ² and UAS launch/recovery site - vegetation clearing 162 ac and adding 282,600 ft ² of ABC in center of area) and along utility lines (5,619 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
C051	Install shade structure at Lightweight Shock Facility.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (400 ft ²).
C052	Establish CM 7 Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (1,270 ac). Inert and explosive weapons fire use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C053	Establish CM 4 North Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (1,510 ac).

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c
		Inert and explosive weapons fire use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C054	Construct Yuma Wash ECUT expansion.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (78,400 ft ²).
C055	Establish Multi-Purpose North Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (567 ac). Inert and explosive weapons fire use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C056	Establish Multi-Purpose South Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (3,823 ac). Inert and explosive weapons fire use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C057	Expand Rocket Alley Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (2,127 ac). Inert and explosive weapons fire use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C058	Establish Aerial Weapons Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (2,452 ac). Inert and explosive weapons fire use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C059	Establish East Target Road Impact Area.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (2,531 ac). Inert and explosive weapons fire use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C060	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at TOW Town.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (29,010 ac).
C061	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at JERC I/ Saderville.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (8,437 ac).
C062	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at JERC II.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (3,503 ac).
C063	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at JERC III.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (4,312 ac).
C064	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at Yuma Wash.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (9,907 ac).
C065	C065: Create LRA Impact Areas: C065-a: LRA Impact Area 1 C065-b: LRA Impact Area 2	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from testing and training activities (9.9 ac for each site).

TABLE 2-2 Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region ^a Yuma Proving Ground

TABLE 2-2Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region aYuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities ^b	Potential Principal Impacts ^c
	C065-c: LRA Impact Area 3 C065-d: LRA Impact Area 4	Inert and explosive weapons fire use. Potential air emissions from obscurants.
C066	C066-a: Construct aerial cable drop site for drop testing in mountains north of Prospect Square. Activity includes two cables suspended between mountain peaks, winches and pulleys for each cable, 328-ft target area. C066-b: Construct an approximately 2.5-mile access trail to the target area in mountains north of Prospect Square.	Vegetation and soil disturbance to create a passable access path to the proposed location. Terrain at this location would require cost-prohibitive road work to create a passable access path. In addition, this location has airspace conflicts with Aviation and Air Delivery test missions. Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (2 cable sites [each 11,065 ft ²], target area [87,855 ft ²], and access trail [3 ac]).

^a The project originally proposed as C028 has been removed from direct analysis in this document. Due to a time critical need for implementation, this activity was analyzed through a separate and specific NEPA document. This activity is considered in the analysis of cumulative impacts in this document.

^b Work that would occur within existing buildings is not identified on maps because there would be no environmental impacts.

^c Measurements are approximate.

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Those that include a letter with the identifier are considered independent activities. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

TABLE 2-3

Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Potential Principal Impacts ^a	
	Short-Term Projects		
K001	Construct a 1,640-ft radius DZ for personnel and cargo drops in southern portion of East Arm.	Activity-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (194 ac) and associated utility lines (0.92 ac).	
K002	Construct 1,250-ft radius DZ for personnel and cargo drops northeast of East Smart Weapons Test Range (SWTR) Impact Area.	Activity-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (113 ac) and associated utility lines (0.37 ac).	
K003	Expand munitions impact area from north boundary of Echo and Foxtrot to north boundary of contaminated area (Advanced Munitions Range).	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from inert and explosive munitions impact (24,309 ac).	
K004	K004-a: Construct aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking area, and clear a launch/recovery area at SWTR. K004-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at SWTR.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (aircraft shelter 52,500 ft ² , command and control building 2,000 ft ² , office building 600 ft ² , maintenance building 900 ft ² , 30,000-gallon water tank 1,000 ft ² , POL storage area 900 ft ² , graded parking area 7,500 ft ² , and UAS launch/recovery area - vegetation clearing of 162 ac and adding 282,600 ft ² of ABC in center of area) and along utility lines (3,883 ft ²).	

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Potential Principal Impacts ^a
		Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
K005	Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Tower L.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site and associated utility lines (450 ft ²). Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
K006	Install launch/recovery systems and a GCS trailer at Tower 48.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance $(1,200 \text{ ft}^2)$.
K007	K007-a: Construct runway west of S-15 Command and Control Shelter K007-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service west of S-15 Command and Control Shelter.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (runway 302,800 ft ²) and along utility lines (7,658 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area. Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power.
K008	Expand munitions impact area to encompass area between Impact Areas Delta and Echo.	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance from inert and explosive munitions impact (4,467 ac).
K009	Install fiber and permanent Improved Vehicle Tracking System (IVTS) and telemetry relays at Windy Hill.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site and associated utility lines (3,950 ft ²).
K010	Expand munitions impact area north of North Boundary Road between GP 21A and Impact Area Alpha (Advanced Munitions Range).	Long-term soil and vegetation disturbance (980 ac) from inert and explosive munitions impact.
K011	Renovate site and construct new control room and firing chamber at GP 5.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (1,500 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K012	K012-a: Construct two permanent reinforced concrete buildings to house personnel, equipment, and ammunition, and new access road at GP 18. K012-b: Install hard power and communication services at GP 18.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (7,190 ft ²) and utilities (530 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K013	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building and additional building to house weapons at GP 21.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (buildings 3,600 ft ² each). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K014	Construct ISR/EO Ground Truth Reference Sites at: K014-a: centered at (32.846, -114.336) K014-b: centered at (32.967, -114.239) K014-c: centered at (32.932, -114.151) K014-d: centered at (32.822, -114.196) K014-e: centered at (32.990, -113.955) K014-f: centered at (32.930, -113.926)	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (each: 2,500 ft ²).

Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region Yuma Proving Ground

Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Potential Principal Impacts ^a
	K014-g: centered at (32.836, -114.016) K014-h: centered at (32.867, -113.922) K014-i: centered at (32.841, -113.866) K014-j: centered at (32.986, -113.812) K014-k: centered at (32.904, -113.791) K014-l: centered at (32.020, -113.758) K014-m: centered at (32.957, -113.666)	
K015	Construct permanent building at GP 21A.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at previously disturbed site (3,600 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K016	Construct permanent building at GP 17A.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at previously disturbed site (3,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K017	Construct permanent building at GP on Growl Road in southeast corner of Echo Munitions Impact Area.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at previously disturbed site (3,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K018	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building at GP Splinter.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (3,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K019	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building at GP 19.1.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (3,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K020	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building at GP 11.1.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance. (3,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K021	Create LTA to support operational training and dismounted maneuver training at East Arm.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (28,233 ac).
K022	Establish up to 12 TGPs within Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, Delta, Echo, or Foxtrot munitions impact areas on KFR annually.	Soil and vegetation disturbance on up to 2.2 ac at each site. Any weapons fire directed into existing authorized impact areas.
K023	Install hard power and communication services to Hazard Classification Deflagration test area.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance utility lines 11,230 ft ²). Long-term reduction in fossil fuel use and air emissions from replacement of generators with hard power. Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area

Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Potential Principal Impacts ^a
K024	K024-a: Construct aerial cable drop site for drop testing in mountains south of Pole Line Road. Activity includes two cables suspended between mountain peaks, winches and pulleys for each cable, 328-ft target area. K024-b: Construct an approximately 0.6-mile access trail to the target area in mountains south of Pole Line Road.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (2 cable sites [each 11,065 ft ²], target area [87,855 ft ²], and access trail [0.75 ac]).
K025	K025-a: Construct East Kofa Operations Center, including a small building complex, perimeter fencing, vehicle maintenance area, storage areas, tactical vehicle wash rack, and 40-ton crane. K025-b: Install hard power, communication, water well, and septic system at East Kofa Operations Center.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (10 ac) and 1,370 ft ² for utilities.
K026	Expand LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at SWTR.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (8,840 ac).
K027	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at Tower 71.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (3,446 ac).
K028	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at SCAM Flats.	Vegetation and soil disturbance from dismounted maneuvers and bivouacs (12,660 ac).
K029	Extend water line from Countermine Test and Training Range to Bldg 3970 and Bldg 3971. Install fire suppression system in Bldg 3971.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance (33,010 ft ²).
K030	Construct runway, taxiway, aircraft shelter, command and control room, simulator training room, classroom, maintenance area, POL storage area, graded area for parking, concrete or asphalt pad, clear area for GCSs, and clear area for UAS launch/recovery at East Arm.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (runway 800,000 ft ² , taxiway, aircraft shelter 12,000 ft ² , command and control room 2,000 ft ² , simulator training room 1,600 ft ² , classroom 2,000 ft ² , maintenance area 2,000 ft ² , POL storage area 900 ft ² , graded area for parking 7,500 ft ² , pad 250,000 ft ² , clear area for GCSs 30,000 ft ² and clear area for UAS launch/recovery 30,000 ft ²). Construction-related emissions. Increased impervious area.
K031	Construct lagoon for Kofa Sewage Lagoon Expansion.	Construction-related soil and vegetation disturbance at site (sewage lagoon 146,545 ft ²). Construction-related emissions.

^a Measurements are approximate.

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Those that include a letter with the identifier are considered independent activities. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

For the Proposed Action, the analysis is structured to allow the Army to exercise discretion and to select a subset of the proposed activities or, for certain activities, to select from among a range of magnitude, frequency, or duration. It also is possible that only a subset of the proposed activities described in Tables 2-1 through 2-3 would be selected for implementation. The alternatives considered for implementation of the Proposed Action are discussed in Section 2.5.

2.5 Alternatives for Activities of the Proposed Action

In addition to the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative, other alternatives were considered. For each component project, this section identifies whether one or more reasonable alternatives exist and provides descriptions of reasonable alternatives considered. In addition, for proposed projects with no reasonable alternatives, the justification for not retaining other alternatives is provided.

Specific short-term proposed projects included in the Proposed Action that are subjected to detailed analysis are discussed in Tables 2-4 through 2-6 by region. It is possible that not all of the activities subjected to detailed analysis will be selected for implementation and it is possible that some selected projects would not be implemented due to changes in mission needs or technology.

There are three cantonment-type areas on YPG: YTC, MAA, and the Kofa cantonment area in the eastern part of the Laguna Region. These areas are already largely developed and contain limited additional developable land. Concentrating new buildings and facilities in these areas, which are somewhat disturbed from previous development, would result in less environmental impact than placing new buildings and facilities on undeveloped land outside of cantonment areas. There is no appreciable difference in direct environmental impacts based on location within these cantonment areas, unless a given location would require construction of additional parking areas. The planning process maximized the use of developable land near existing parking to minimize the need for additional land disturbance. The planning process also evaluated operational efficiency to determine where facilities and structures would be placed. By grouping like activities and placing facilities in proximity to existing supporting infrastructure (such as tracked vehicle routes or the airfield) the environmental impacts of operation would be minimized.

TABLE 2-4

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
L001	L001-a: Construct building, concrete pad, shade structure, and solar lights at K-9 Village.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L001-a because expansion of the existing K-9 Village facility, which provides a simulated urban environment for troop and K-9 unit training, would have less impact than construction of a new urban simulation facility elsewhere.
	L001-b: Install hard power/ fiber, and communication service at K-9 Village.	The location of proposed hard power infrastructure is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
L002	L002-a: Construct Runway 18/36 extension, and realign Barranca Road at LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L002-a because extension of the runway must be either to the north or south, along its long axis. Martinez Lake Road is a public road that crosses YPG to the north of the runway. Barranca Road is entirely within YPG to the south of the runway. Extension of the runway would require relocation of one of these roads. While

Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
		there would be no difference in environmental impacts regardless of which direction the runway is extended, extension to the south would not affect public traffic or existing perimeter AT/FP setbacks.
	L002-b: Install hard power at LAAF.	The location for hard power installation is constrained by existing utility infrastructure and airfield requirements.
L003	Construct outdoor eating area at the Roadrunner Café.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location of an outside eating area is constrained by the location of the existing facility.
L004	Construct office building next to Building 2968.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because potential locations are constrained by existing infrastructure, proximity to available parking, and other proposed construction.
L005	L005-a: Construct medium and large storage buildings next to Building 2970.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L005-a because locations are constrained by existing infrastructure, proximity to users, and other proposed construction.
	L005-b: Construct 2 office buildings next to Building 2970.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L005-b because locations are constrained by existing infrastructure, proximity to available parking, and other proposed construction.
	L005-c: Construct Air Delivery Guided Test Facility next to Building 2970.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L005-c because locations are constrained by existing infrastructure, proximity to related test facilities, and other proposed construction.
L006	L006-a: Construct Flight Detachment Maintenance Building.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L006-a because the location is constrained by size requirements, existing infrastructure near the airfield, and other proposed construction.
	L006-b: Construct Wild Horse Café.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L006-b because potential locations are constrained by existing infrastructure and other proposed construction.
	L006-c: Construct AT/FP parking improvements.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L006-c because there are no choices for the location of the AT/FP parking improvements.
L007	L007-a: Construct helicopter parking at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L007-a because locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway alignment.
	L007-b: Construct UAS parking, UAS storage facility, and UAS maintenance hangar at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities for L007-b because locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway alignment. Impacts associated with construction of a new heliport and runway would be greater than those associated with upgrading facilities at CDH.

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
	L007-c: Construct privately owned vehicle (POV) parking at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities for L007-c because locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway alignment. Impacts associated with construction of a new heliport and runway would be greater than those associated with upgrading facilities at CDH.
	L007-d: Relocate C-130 CALA to CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L007-d because locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway alignment.
L008	L008-a: Construct ACP at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities for L008-a because there are no choices for the location of the security upgrades.
	L008-b: Construct roadway drainage improvements at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L008-b because there are no choices for the location of the proposed improvements and because the site drainage improvements would have less environmental impact than building a new access road to CDH.
L009	Construct warehouse at YTC.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L009 because the location is constrained by existing infrastructure and proximity to related users.
L010	Construct Instrumentation Development Facility.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L010 because the location is constrained by existing infrastructure, proximity to related test users, and other proposed construction.
L011	L011-a: Construct tracked vehicle trail at YTC.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L011-a because potential routes from existing tracked vehicle trails to storage and maintenance areas are constrained by existing infrastructure and roadways and other proposed construction.
	L011-b: Construct office at YTC.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L011-b because locations are constrained by existing infrastructure, other proposed construction, and proximity to existing parking.
L012	L012-a: Construct hotel at MAA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L012-a because sites within the MAA are constrained by existing infrastructure, proposed construction, and parcel size. No other available sites have sufficient size to accommodate the hotel.
	L012-b: Construct EOC at MAA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L012-b because sites within the MAA are constrained by existing infrastructure, proposed construction, and adjacency to roadways.
	L012-c: Construct addition to youth services center at MAA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L012-c because there are no choices for the

TABLE 2-4
Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities - Laguna Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
		location of the addition and because there would be less impact from expansion of the existing facility than from construction of a new youth services center.
	L012-d: Construct ACP improvements at MAA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L012-d because there are no choices for the location of the AT/FP improvements.
	L012-e: Construct child development center for school-aged services at MAA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L012-e because sites within the MAA are constrained by existing infrastructure, proposed construction, and adjacency to roadways.
	L012-f: Construct outdoor eating area at Coyote Lanes bowling alley.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location of an outside eating area is constrained by the location of the existing facility.
L013	L013-a: Construct additional fencing and support facilities at the Threat Systems and Target Simulations Buildings 3572 and 3574.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L013-a because there are no choices for the location of security fencing and support facilities are constrained by existing infrastructure, other proposed construction, and parcel size.
	L013-b: Install hard power, fiber, and phone service to the Threat Systems and Target Simulations Buildings 3572 and 3574.	The location of proposed hard power, fiber, and phone service infrastructure is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
L014	L014-a: Construct aircraft shelter, command and control building, and clear a UAS launch/recovery area at Comanche Flats.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L014-a because the temporary construction- related impacts of expanding the testing and training capabilities at Comanche Flats would be less than those associated with establishing a new UAS testing/training area elsewhere on YPG. Relocation of the current and planned future activities from Comanche Flats to other existing UAS areas is not possible because other UAS areas are heavily utilized and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at Comanche Flats.
	L014-b: Construct multiple buildings, concrete pad, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking area at Comanche Flats.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L014-b because the temporary construction- related impacts of expanding the testing and training capabilities at Comanche Flats would be less than those associated with establishing a new UAS testing/training area elsewhere on YPG. Relocation of the current and planned future activities from Comanche Flats to other existing UAS areas is not possible because other UAS areas are heavily utilized and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at Comanche flats.
	L014-c: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Comanche Flats.	The location of proposed hard power/fiber and communication service infrastructure is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.

Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region *Yuma Proving Ground*

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
L015	L015-a: Repair landing pad and construct building at K-9 Village.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L015-a because the temporary construction- related impacts of expanding the testing and training capabilities at K-9 Village would be less than those associated with establishing a new UAS testing/training area elsewhere on YPG. Relocation of the current and planned future activities from K-9 Village to other existing UAS areas is not possible because other UAS areas are heavily utilized and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at K-9 Village.
	L015-b: Install hard power, fiber, and communication service at K-9 Village.	The location of proposed hard power, fiber, and communication service infrastructure is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
L016	L016-a: Construct building, concrete or asphalt pad, and shade structure, and install solar lights at Site 2.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because expansion of the existing Site 2 training area, which provides a simulated urban environment for troop and K-9 unit training, would have less impact than construction of a new urban simulation facility elsewhere.
	L016-b: Install hard power, fiber, and communication service at Site 2.	The location of proposed hard power, fiber, and communication service infrastructure is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
L017	Construct GCSs for UAS operations at TM Site 4.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because enhancing this existing location to accommodate modified testing would have less impacts than constructing a new test site at a different location. Relocation of the current and planned future activities from TM Site 4 to other existing UAS areas is not possible because other UAS areas are heavily utilized and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at TM Site 4.
L018	Construct concrete or asphalt pad and sensor tower east of existing sensor test building at Sidewinder Sensor Site.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because expansion of testing capabilities at the Sidewinder Sensor Site would have less impacts than constructing a new sensor site elsewhere. Relocation of testing activities conducted at the Sidewinder Sensor Site is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support testing at the Sidewinder Sensor Site and other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at the Sidewinder Sensor Site.
L019	Expand and combine West LA LTA, K-9 Village LTA, Site 2 LTA, and Site 4 LTA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because this expansion would connect 4 MOUT areas (West LA, K-9 Village, Site 4, and Site 2) to allow overland navigation by troops to reach urban targets at different locations. No other locations on YPG are available that would allow use of existing urban simulation areas and the impacts associated with expanding these 4 existing LTAs would be less than establishing a new LTA and constructing multiple MOUT areas.

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
L020	Upgrade equipment at Tire X- Ray Facility (Building 2310).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the upgrade of equipment is technically and economically feasible and there would be no environmental impacts from the equipment upgrade.
L021	Construct solar chamber at Climatic Simulation Facilities (Building 3527).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the size of the parcel required, other proposed construction, and proximity to related test facilities. Other locations of sufficient size would result in increased time, cost, and energy use to conduct climatic testing.
L022	Relocate dust chamber from Building 3352 to near Buildings 3357 and 3494 (Rough Handling).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the size of the parcel required, other proposed construction, and proximity to related test facilities.
L023	L023-a: Improve ACP at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L023-a because there are no choices for the location of the ACP security upgrades.
	L023-b: Construct joint wash rack for tracked and GOVs at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L023-b because the locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
	L023-c: Construct electric substation protection and electronics expansion at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L023-c because the locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
	L023-d: Construct Howitzer Support/Acceptance Facility at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the size of the parcel required, other proposed construction, and proximity to KFR. Other locations of sufficient size would result in increased time, cost, and energy use to move from storage to firing positions.
	L023-e: Construct open storage facility at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L023-e because the locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and the need to have proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
L024	Relocate Semi-trailer Delivery Safe Haven.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the need for access to US 95 and by the need to meet safety/security requirements.
L025	L025-a: Construct Aberdeen Road flood upgrades.	There are no reasonable alternatives for L025-a because there are no choices for the location of the improvements. Construction of a new road, with an associated new crossing of Castle Dome Wash, would have greater impacts than upgrading the existing crossing of the wash.

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
	L025-b: Construct range road improvements.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L025-b because construction of new roads would have greater impacts than upgrading existing roads and there are no alternate choices for locations where problems with roads occur and where upgrades would be implemented.
L026	Construct munitions treatment facility.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirements of the YPG Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Part B Permit.
L027	Construct gun storage facility at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the size of the parcel required, other proposed construction, and proximity to KFR. Other locations of sufficient size would result in increased time, cost, and energy use to move from storage to firing positions.
L028	Construct 5 ammunition magazines near the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations are constrained by the need to have proximity to delivery access points, other construction, and requirements for explosive quantity safety distance (EQSD) arcs.
L029	Construct optical maintenance facility, graded parking area, and fencing.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because potential locations are constrained by existing infrastructure, the need to have proximity to related test users and available parking, and other proposed construction.
L030	L030: Expand LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuvers at Muggins/Middle East : L030-a: 16,640 ac L030-b: 6,331 ac	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected. Expansion of an existing LTA would have less impact than creation of a new LTA elsewhere.
L031	L031: Construct MFFS DFAC (only one option to be selected): L031-a: at Location Option 1 L031-b: at Location Option 2 L031-c: at Location Option 3	Three reasonable alternative locations for this activity are under consideration (L031-a, L031-b, L031-c) and only one would be selected if the activity is implemented. Other potential locations for the DFAC are constrained by other existing and proposed uses at YPG.
L032	Expand Bravo LTA.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected. Expansion of an existing LTA would have less impact than creation of a new LTA elsewhere.

TABLE 2-4
Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
L033	Expand Hill 630 LTA.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected. Expansion of an existing LTA would have less impact than creation of a new LTA elsewhere.
L034	L034: Construct MFFS Ready Room (only one option to be selected): L034-a: at Location Option 1 L034-b: at Location Option 2 L034-b: at Location Option 3	Three reasonable alternative locations for this activity are under consideration (L034-a, L034-b, L034-c) and only one would be selected if the activity is implemented. Other potential locations for the Ready Room are constrained by other existing and proposed uses.
L035	Construct Armament Test Operations and Analysis Facility.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because potential locations for this facility are constrained by existing infrastructure, the need for proximity to related test users and available parking, and other proposed construction.
L036	Construct Shower Facility at LAAF FOB area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because showers are needed to support training exercises at the LAAF FOB and because existing temporary facilities have exceeded their functional life and replacement with other temporary facilities is not cost-effective.
L037	Construct vehicle test course.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because other locations are constrained by existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for vehicle access.
L038	Construct vehicle test course.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because other locations are constrained by existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for vehicle access.
L039	Construct vehicle test course.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because other locations are constrained by existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for vehicle access.
L040	Construct DZ near LAAF (984- ft x 1,969-ft).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because other locations are constrained by airspace restrictions, the presence of unexploded ordnance (UXO), and the need to have road accessibility by transport/recovery vehicles.
L041	Construct air delivery storage and laboratory facility behind Building 2970.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because other locations are constrained by existing infrastructure, the need to have proximity to related test users and available parking, and other proposed construction.
L042	Upgrade facility to an office and	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because upgrade of an existing facility is less

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
	hangar in Building 3025.	intrusive than development of a new facility and because of the proximity to related test facilities.
L100	L100-a: Construct addition to Building 3021.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L100-a because the locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
	L100-b: Construct FCS Rotary Class IV hangars, and FCS large Class IV hangar to the west of LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L100-b because other locations at LAAF are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed runway extension and roadway realignment.
	L100-c: Construct large transient UAS hangar with pad access at LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L100-c because other locations at LAAF are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed runway extension and roadway realignment.
	L100-d: Construct aviation growth hangar at LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L100-d because other locations at LAAF are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed runway extension and roadway realignment.
	L100-e: Construct administrative support building at LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L100-e because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and proximity to related facilities.
	L100-f: Construct USASOC Tactical Hangar at LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L100-f because other locations at LAAF are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed runway extension and roadway realignment.
L101	L101-a: Construct motor pool to the north of LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L101-a because other locations at LAAF are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed runway extension.
	L101-b: Construct addition to ammunition building rigging bay to the north of LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L101-b because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
	L101-c: Construct access from Ocotillo Road and ammunition building access road. improvements to the north of LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L101-c because other locations at LAAF are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed runway extension.
	L101-d: Construct storage yard improvements to the north of LAAF.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L101-d because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
L102	L102-a: Construct new MFFS	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed

TABLE 2-4
Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities - Laguna Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
	Terminal at LAAF/MAA.	activity for L102-a because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
	L102-b: Construct consolidated rigger facility at LAAF/MAA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L102-b because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and the need to have proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
	L102-c: Construct UAS airfield, hangars, taxiways, and UAS flight test area and other supporting infrastructure at LAAF/MAA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L102-c because the temporary construction- related impacts of expanding the testing and training capabilities at LAAF/MAA would be less than those associated with establishing a new UAS testing/training area elsewhere on YPG. Relocation of the current and planned future activities from LAAF/MAA to other existing UAS areas is not possible because other UAS areas are heavily utilized and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at LAAF/MAA.
	L102-d: Construct CASA Transport Aircraft Hangar at LAAF/MAA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L102-d because other locations at LAAF are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed runway extension.
L103	L103-a: Construct fire station at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L103-a because other locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway.
	L103-b: Construct fuel point at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L103-b because other locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway.
	L103-c: Construct C-130 parking at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L103-c because other locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway.
	L103-d: Construct hot cargo refueling area at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L103-d because other locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway.
	L103-e: Construct dining facility at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L103-e because a dining facility is needed to support training exercises at CDH. Locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway.
	L103-f: Construct airship hangar at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L103-f because locations at CDH are constrained by existing infrastructure, security setback requirements, and the proposed crosswind runway.
L104	Construct water and wastewater treatment facilities	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L104 because treatment facilities are needed

Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region *Yuma Proving Ground*

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
	at CDH.	to support operations at CDH. The locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
L105	Construct crosswind runway at CDH.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L105 because potential locations are constrained by other proposed construction and proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
L106	L106-a: Construct 4 administrative support buildings at YTC.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L106-a because potential locations are constrained by existing infrastructure, proximity to related users and available parking, and other proposed construction.
	L106-b: Replace 5 existing warehouses at YTC.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L106-b because it is not technically or economically feasible to upgrade the existing warehouses, as potential locations are constrained by existing infrastructure, proximity to users, and other proposed construction.
L107	Construct improvements to Cox Field, AT/FP, and Garrison headquarters, and convert Street D to pedestrian walkway.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L017 because there are no choices for the location of the AT/FP improvements. Additionally, sites within the MAA are constrained by existing infrastructure, proposed construction, and adjacency to roadways.
L108	L108-a: Improve truck ACP security at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L108-a because there are no choices for the location of the ACP security upgrades.
	L108-b: Expand range communication at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L108-b because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and the need to have proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
	L108-c: Expand sand blasting at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L108-c because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and the need to have proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
	L108-d: Consolidate optics at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L108-d because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and the need to have proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
	L108-e: Construct second GOV and tracked vehicle. maintenance facility at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L108-e because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and the need to have proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
L109	Construct wax plant expansion at the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L109 because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and the

TABLE 2-4Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Laguna RegionYuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
		need to have proximity to related facilities.
L110	Construct additional ammunition plant similar to Building 3482 and air- conditioned chamber near the Kofa cantonment.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity for L110 because other locations are constrained by parcel sizes, other proposed construction, and the need to have proximity to related test or maintenance facilities.
L111	Upgrade equipment and electrical supply at Physical Test Facility (Buildings 3490 and 3130).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the upgrade of equipment is technically and economically feasible and there would be no environmental impacts from the equipment upgrade
L112	Upgrade equipment in vibration test facilities (Buildings 3496, 3495, and 3594).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the upgrade of equipment is technically and economically feasible and there would be no environmental impacts from the equipment upgrade.
L113	Upgrade equipment at radiography facility (Building 3493).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the upgrade of equipment is technically and economically feasible and there would be no environmental impacts from the equipment upgrade.

Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Laguna Region Yuma Proving Ground

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

TABLE 2-5

Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities - Cibola Region	n
Yuma Proving Ground	

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
C001	Construct vehicle test course.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because other locations for the vehicle test course are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for vehicle access.
C002	C002-a: Construct South Urban DZ (1,640-ft radius) south of Urban DZ.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because other locations are constrained by airspace restrictions, the presence of UXO, and the need to have road accessibility by transport/recovery vehicles (Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).
	C002-b: Construct Tomahawk Circular DZ 769 (2,297-ft radius).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because other locations are constrained by airspace restrictions, the presence of UXO, and the need to have road accessibility by transport/recovery vehicles (Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). The location for C002-b is further constrained by a requirement to be in mountainous terrain to meet testing requirements.
	C002-c: Construct Tombstone DZ (984-ft radius).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because other locations are constrained by airspace restrictions, the presence of UXO, and the need to have road accessibility by transport/recovery

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
		vehicles (Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).
	C002-d: Construct Village Circular DZ (984-ft radius).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because locations are constrained by airspace restrictions, the presence of UXO, and the need to have road accessibility by transport/recovery vehicles (Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).
	C002-e: Construct Abken DZ (1,640-ft radius).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because locations are constrained by airspace restrictions, the presence of UXO, and the need to have road accessibility by transport/recovery vehicles (Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).
	C002-f: Construct Urban Circular JPADS DZ (984-ft radius).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because locations are constrained by airspace restrictions, the presence of UXO, and the need to have road accessibility by transport/recovery vehicles (Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).
C003	C003-a: Establish small arms impact areas for inert munitions at JERC I. Small arms impact areas would use collection boxes for fired ammunition and would be cleaned between tests.	There are no reasonable alternatives C003-a because the location is constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing at JERC I. Construction of a new facility to provide the testing conducted at JERC I at an existing small arms impact areas would have greater impacts than establishing a small arms impact area at JERC I. Relocation of testing and training activities conducted at JERC I is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at these sites and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at JERC I.
	C003-b: Establish small arms impact areas for inert munitions at JERC II. Small arms impact areas would use collection boxes for fired ammunition and would be cleaned between tests.	There are no reasonable alternatives C003-b because the location is constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing at JERC II. Construction of a new facility to provide the testing conducted at JERC II at an existing small arms impact area would have greater impacts than establishing a small arms impact area at JERC II. Relocation of testing and training activities conducted at JERC II is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at these sites and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at JERC II.
	C003-c: Establish small arms impact areas for inert munitions at JERC III. Small arms impact areas would use collection boxes for fired ammunition and would be cleaned between tests.	There are no reasonable alternatives C003-c because the location is constrained by requirement to support ongoing testing at JERC III. Construction of a new facility to provide the testing conducted at JERC III at an existing small arms impact area would have greater impacts than establishing a small arms impact area at JERC III. Relocation of testing and training activities conducted at JERC III is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at these sites and because other sites are beavily used and cannot accommodate the additional

 TABLE 2-5

 Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region

 Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
		testing and training conducted at JERC III.
C004	C004-a: Construct facilities at Gauna Peak.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing and training at Gauna Peak. Relocation of testing and training activities conducted at Gauna Peak is not possible because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at Gauna Peak.
	C004-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Gauna Peak.	The locations for hard power and fiber are constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C005	C005-a: Construct building at Site 18.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing and training at Site 18. Relocation of testing and training activities conducted at Site 18 is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at Site 18 and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at Site 18.
	C005-b: Install hard power, water, sewer, and communication service at Site 18.	The locations for hard power and fiber are constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C006	Establish Phoenix West Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by airspace restrictions, the need to have accessibility by transport/recovery vehicles, and minimum separation distance requirements from areas where strong EM signals are used.
C007	C007-a: Construct runway extension, aircraft shelter, and POL storage at Phoenix UAS site.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing and training at Phoenix UAS site. Relocation of testing and training activities conducted at the Phoenix UAS site is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at the Phoenix UAS site and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at the Phoenix UAS site.
	C007-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Phoenix UAS site.	The locations for hard power and fiber/communication are constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C008	C008-a: Construct building at Site 16.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing and training at Site 16. Relocation of testing and training activities conducted at Site 16 is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
		conducted at Site 16 and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at Site 16.
	C008-b: Install hard power, water, sewer, and communication service at Site 16.	The locations for hard power and fiber/communication are constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C009	Establish North UAS Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for impact areas associated with UAS testing are constrained by airspace restrictions, the need to have accessibility by transport/recovery vehicles, and minimum separation distances from other test areas where strong EM signals are used.
C010	Construct aircraft shelter, POL storage, and graded parking lot at North UAV complex.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at the North UAV complex. Relocation of testing and training activities conducted at the North UAV complex is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at the North UAV complex and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at the North UAV complex.
C011	Establish La Posa West Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for impact areas associated with UAS testing are constrained by airspace restrictions, the need to have accessibility by transport/recovery vehicles, and minimum separation distances from other test areas where strong EM signals are used.
C012	C012-a: Construct building and concrete pad at PSS Test Area (west of La Posa DZ).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at the PSS Test Area. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at the PSS Test Area is not possible due to requirements for minimal EM interference and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at the PSS Test Area.
	C012-b: Install hard power/fiber at PSS Test Area (west of La Posa DZ).	The locations for hard power and fiber/communication are constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C013	Install hard power/fiber, and communication service at ECUT area.	The locations for hard power and fiber/communication are constrained by the location of the existing infrastructure and roadways.
C014	C014-a: Install shade structure at Stinger Pole Target Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at the Stinger Pole Target Area. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at the

TABLE 2-5Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola RegionYuma Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
		Stinger Pole Target Area is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at the Stinger Pole Target Area and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at the Stinger Pole Target Area.
	C014-b: Install hard power at Stinger Pole Target Area.	The location for hard power is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C015	Construct ISR/EO Ground Truth Reference Sites at: C015-a: Yuma Wash centered at (33.156, -114.485) C015-b: Middle Mountain Road centered at (33.063, -114.358) C015-c: Mule Wash centered at (33.432, -114.503) C015-d: Centered at (33.446, - 114.471) C015-e: Centered at (33.4477, - 114.286) C015-f: Centered at (33.444, - 114.325) C015-g: Centered at (33.448, - 114.275) C015-h: Centered at (33.408, - 225.360) C015-j: Centered at (33.389, - 114.303) C015-k: Centered at (33.387, - 114.366) C015-l: Centered at (33.347, - 114.286) C015-m: Centered at (33.347, - 114.386) C015-n: Centered at (33.165, - 114.480) C015-o: Centered at (33.122, - 114.499) C015-p: Centered at (33.090, - 114.447) C015-q: Centered at (33.081, - 114.353) C015-r: Centered at (33.081, - 114.420)	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because these sites are consolidated sensor arrays deployed to optimally provide ground truth verification for aerial activities and the ability of airborne sensors to perceive the ground truth sites. These arrays are deployed in locations with other compatible land uses.
C016	Rebuild target for long-range missile firing at Maverick Target.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because this specific target in an existing impact area needs to be rebuilt.
C017	C017-a: Construct building, bomb-proof shelter, shade structure, concrete or asphalt pad, and sensor tower at CM 4.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at CM 4. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at CM 4 is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
		conducted at CM 4 and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at CM 4.
	C017-b: Install phone service at CM 4.	The location for phone service is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C018	Construct landing pad at CM 1.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location for the landing pad is constrained by existing roadways, infrastructure, and site topography at CM 1.
C019	Construct building and concrete pad at Z-12.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at Z-12. The locations for the building and pad are constrained by roadways, infrastructure, and site topography.
C020	C020-a: Construct sensor tower, buildings, and concrete pad at Site 9.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at Site 9 and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at Site 9 is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at Site 9 and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at Site 9.
	C020-b: Install hard power, communication service, and air conditioning at Site 9.	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C021	C021-a: Construct secure building with reinforced concrete floors and ramp to building centered at (-114.356, 33.077).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location. The location for the building is constrained by the locations of infrastructure, roadways, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C021-b: Construct multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area and graded parking area centered at (- 114.356, 33.077).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography.
		Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C021-c: Construct aircraft	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed

TABLE 2-5Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola RegionYuma Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
	shelter centered at (-114.356, 33.077).	activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C021-d: Clear a launch/recovery area centered at (-114.356, 33.077).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C021-e: Install hard power/fiber and communication service to (- 114.356, 33.077).	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C022	C022-a: Construct building, concrete slab, walkways, and fencing centered at (-114.36, 33.074).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C022-b: Construct aircraft shelter centered at (-114.36, 33.074).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C022-c: Construct POL storage centered at (-114.36, 33.074).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training

TABLE 2-5 Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region Yuma Proving Ground Proving Ground
Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
		conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C022-d: Relocate meteorological tower centered at (-114.36, 33.074).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C022-e: Construct runway expansion and taxiway centered at (-114.36, 33.074).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
C023	C023-a: Construct multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking centered at (-114.363, 33.051).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C023-b: Construct aircraft shelter centered at (-114.363, 33.051).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C023-c: Clear a launch/recovery area centered at (-114.363, 33.051).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at this location and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography.
		Relocation of the testing and training conducted at this location is not possible because other sites lack the

 TABLE 2-5

 Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region

 Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
		specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at this location.
	C023-d: Install hard power/fiber and communication service to (- 114.363, 33.051).	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C024	C024-a: Construct aircraft shelter, concrete pad, graded parking area near IRCC Tank Maintenance and Storage Ramada.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities for C024-a because the location is constrained by the locations of existing munitions impact areas, DZs, and infrastructure and is further constrained by proximity to roadways for access/recovery.
	C024-b: Fence and install solar lights, around IRCC Tank Maintenance and Storage Ramada compound.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities for C024-b because there are no choices for the location of these security features.
C025	C025-a: Construct runway, taxiway, aircraft shelter, and building at IRCC.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the location of the helipad, other infrastructure, and existing roadways.
	C025-b: Install hard power/fiber adjacent to existing helicopter pad at IRCC.	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C026	C026-a: Construct ramp to existing building and rollup door to existing building and install solar lights at Site 10 Missile Test Facility.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at the Site 10 Missile Test Facility and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at the Site 10 Missile Test Facility is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at Site 10 Missile Test Facility.
	C026-b: Construct concrete landing pad at Site 10 Missile Test Facility.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at the Site 10 Missile Test Facility and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at Site 10 Missile Test Facility is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at the Site 10 Missile Test Facility.
	C026-c: Install hard power/fiber at Site 10 Missile Test Facility.	The location for hard power is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C027	C027-a: Expand flat area on top of hill, and construct facility, concrete pad, and sensor tower	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at Site 12

TABLE 2-5 Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
	at Site 12.	and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. The location for hard power is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
		Relocation of the testing and training conducted at Site 12 is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at Site 12.
	C027-b: Construct road leading from the sensor building on the top of the hill at Site 12A down to the PTDS Site.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location of the road is constrained by the location of infrastructure and site topography.
C029	C029-a; Construct buildings, concrete pad, and install generators at Aerostat Mooring Site.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support ongoing activities at the Aerostat Mooring Site and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography.
	C029-b: Install hard power/fiber at Aerostat Mooring Site.	The location for hard power is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C030	C030-a: Construct aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage, graded parking, and clear launch/recovery area east of Rocket Alley.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support UAS testing and training near and adjacent to Rocket Alley and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography.
	C030-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Aerostat Mooring Site.	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C031	Utilize Site 6 as a meteorological station.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because there would be no environmental impacts associated with the reuse of a previously disturbed site in this non-intrusive manner.
C032	Renovate Large Multi-Purpose Environmental Chamber (Building 6015).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because renovation of the existing building is technically and economically feasible and no environmental impacts would be associated with this activity.
C033	C033-a: Construct aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, concrete pad, water tank, POL storage area, graded parking area, and clear a	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at C-17 and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography.
	launch/recovery area at C-17.	Relocation of the testing and training conducted at C-17 is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at C-17 and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at C-17.
	C033-b: Install hard power/fiber,	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of

TABLE 2-5 Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
	and communication service at C-17.	existing infrastructure and roadways.
C034	C034-a: Expand size of Graze Range Impact Areas by consolidating 7 individual impact areas into a single larger area	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because expansion of the Graze Range Impact Areas by consolidation of smaller individual impact areas would have less impact than establishment of a new firing range of this size in another location.
	C034-b: Install hard power to Graze Range.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the locations of existing electrical power infrastructure and roadways.
C035	Expand Combined Live Fire Exercise Range at OP-9 by consolidating 2 designated impact areas and Prospect Square.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because expansion of the existing Live Fire Exercise Range impact areas by consolidation across the existing space between the ranges and connecting with Prospect Square would have less impact than establishment of a new firing range of this size in another location.
C036	Increase use of Prospect Square for bombing or aircraft gunnery.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because Prospect Square is already committed to this use and can accommodate additional bombing and gunnery activities. Additional use of this area would have less environmental impact than constructing a new bombing/aircraft gunnery area elsewhere.
C037	Install hard power and cameras to 40-ft drop tower.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by existing infrastructure and roadways.
C038	Construct MEDEVAC pad at CDA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for MEDEVAC helicopter landing pads are constrained by locations of testing and training sites in remote areas, which lack roadways capable of accommodating emergency medical vehicles for rapid response and/or evacuation.
C039	Construct air-conditioned storage facility at CDA.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by proximity to occupied buildings and existing testing/training activities.
C040	Install hard power to the Cibola Region North Range.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the locations of existing electrical power infrastructure and roadways.
C041	Expand LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at Middle Mountain.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K0-27, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected. Expansion of an existing LTA would have less impact than creation of a new LTA elsewhere.

TABLE 2-5 Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region Yuma Proving Ground Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
C042	C042-a: Install relocatable instrumentation sites along JERC I roads. Instrumentation sites would be moved to accommodate specific testing requirements. Each 20-ft instrumentation trailer requires a staging area with a 20-ft radius.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations are constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing at JERC I. Locations are further constrained by the locations of the existing road system and infrastructure in the JERC sites.
	C042-b: Install relocatable instrumentation sites along JERC II roads. Instrumentation sites would be moved to accommodate specific testing requirements. Each 20-ft instrumentation trailer requires a staging area with a 20-ft radius.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations are constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing at JERC II. Locations are further constrained by the locations of the existing road system and infrastructure in the JERC sites.
	C042-c: Install relocatable instrumentation sites along JERC III roads. Instrumentation sites would be moved to accommodate specific testing requirements. Each 20-ft instrumentation trailer requires a staging area with a 20-ft radius.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations are constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing at JERC III. Locations are further constrained by the locations of the existing road system and infrastructure in the JERC sites.
C043	C043-a: Temporarily bury simulated missiles, explosives, etc. off JERC I roads for sensor testing. Locations for temporary burials would vary and be determined by specific testing requirements.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations are constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing at JERC I. Locations are further constrained by the locations of the existing road system and infrastructure in the JERC sites.
	C043-b: Temporarily bury simulated missiles, explosives, etc. off JERC II roads for sensor testing. Locations for temporary burials would vary and be determined by specific testing requirements.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations are constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing at JERC II. Locations are further constrained by the locations of the existing road system and infrastructure in the JERC sites.
	C043-c: Temporarily bury simulated missiles, explosives, etc. off JERC III roads for sensor testing. Locations for temporary burials would vary and be determined by specific testing requirements.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations are constrained by the requirement to support ongoing testing at JERC III. Locations are further constrained by the locations of the existing road system and infrastructure in the JERC sites.
C044	C044-a: Clear MEDEVAC helicopter landing pads at JERC I for evacuations.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because locations for MEDEVAC helicopter landing pads are constrained by locations of testing and training sites in remote areas that lack roadways capable of accommodating emergency medical vehicles for rapid response and/or evacuation.
	C044-b: Clear MEDEVAC helicopter landing pads at JERC	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because locations for MEDEVAC helicopter

TABLE 2-5	
Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region	
Yuma Proving Ground	

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
	Il for evacuations.	landing pads are constrained by locations of testing and training sites in remote areas that lack roadways capable of accommodating emergency medical vehicles for rapid response and/or evacuation.
	C044-c: Clear MEDEVAC helicopter landing pads at JERC III for evacuations.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because locations for MEDEVAC helicopter landing pads are constrained by locations of testing and training sites in remote areas that lack roadways capable of accommodating emergency medical vehicles for rapid response and/or evacuation.
C045	Construct MFFS Forward Staging Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by proximity to an airstrip and accessibility from US 95.
C046	North UAV Compound Expansion: C046-a: Construct concrete pad.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the locations of existing infrastructure, roadways, and existing training/testing activities.
	C046-b: Grade project area and install fencing.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the locations of existing infrastructure, roadways, and existing training/testing activities.
	C046-c: Construct asphalt taxiway.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the locations of existing infrastructure, roadways, and existing training/testing activities.
C047	Create 23 TGPs at: C047-a: Rocket Alley C047-b: CM9 East C047-c: Cibola Target Boundary GP C047-d: Site 16 C047-e: CM9 West C047-f: C17 (North and South) C047-g: Mound C Archer GP C047-h: Mound C GP C047-h: Mound C GP C047-i: CM1 West C047-j: La Posa DZ C047-k: Site 8 GP C047-k: Site 8 GP C047-k: Site 8 GP C047-r: Excalibur SW GP C047-n: Excalibur SW GP C047-o: LADZ GP C047-gi 2.75 Rocket GP C047-r: Ehrenberg GP C047-r: La Posa South DZ C047-u: Water Tank GP C047-v: LA DZ East C047-w: C17 North M777LWH GP.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities. Locations for proposed TGPs were selected based on the requirement to support testing and training activities in nearby munitions impact areas. Locations were further constrained by proximity to existing roads and existing topography that would allow firing into existing munitions impact areas.
C048	Install hard power to DET/REC target in the Cibola Range.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because there are no choices for the locations

TABLE 2-5

Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
		of existing DET/REC targets. The location for hard power is constrained by the locations of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C049	Install acoustic and seismic sensor at the Horizontal Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by existing testing requirements.
C050	C050-a: Construct building at the Simulated Minefield Site to support UAS operations.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support UAS testing and training at the Simulated Minefield Site and by the locations of existing roadways, other infrastructure, and site topography. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at the Simulated Minefield Site is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at the Simulated Minefield Site.
	C050-b: Install hard power, water, sewer, and communication service at Simulated Minefield Site to support UAS operations	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
C051	Install shade structure at Lightweight Shock Facility.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by existing testing requirements and there would be no environmental impacts associated with this activity.
C052	Establish CM 7 Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for new munitions impact areas are constrained by airspace restrictions and land use by other testing activities.
C053	Establish CM 4 North Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for new munitions impact areas are constrained by airspace restrictions and land use by other testing activities.
C054	Construct Yuma Wash ECUT expansion.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support ECUT testing and training at the Yuma Wash ECUT Site. Relocation of the testing and training conducted at the Yuma Wash ECUT Site is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at this location and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at the Yuma Wash ECUT Site.
C055	Establish Multi-Purpose North Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for new munitions impact areas are constrained by airspace restrictions and land use by other testing activities.
C056	Establish Multi-Purpose South Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for new munitions impact

TABLE 2-5Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola RegionYuma Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
		areas are constrained by airspace restrictions and land use by other testing activities.
C057	Expand Rocket Alley Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for new munitions impact areas are constrained by airspace restrictions and land use by other testing activities.
C058	Establish Aerial Weapons Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for new munitions impact areas are constrained by airspace restrictions and land use by other testing activities.
C059	Establish East Target Road Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because locations for new munitions impact areas are constrained by airspace restrictions and land use by other testing activities.
C060	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at TOW Town.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected.
C061	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at JERC I/Saderville.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected.
C062	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at JERC II.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected.
C063	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at JERC III.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected.
C064	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at Yuma Wash.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected.
C065	C065: Create LRA Impact	Potential locations for LRAs are constrained by other

TABLE 2-5 Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier ^a	Proposed Activity	Alternatives
	Areas: C065-a: LRA Impact Area 1	existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. Four potential sites for new LRAs are evaluated. All, some, or none these potential sites may be selected.
	C065-b: LRA Impact Area 2	Potential locations for LRAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. Four potential sites for new LRAs are evaluated. All, some, or none of these potential sites may be selected.
	C065-c: LRA Impact Area 3	Potential locations for LRAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. Four potential sites for new LRAs are evaluated. All, some, or none of these potential sites may be selected.
	C065-d: LRA Impact Area 4	Potential locations for LRAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. Four potential sites for new LRAs are evaluated. All, some, or none of these potential sites may be selected.
C066	C066-a: Construct aerial cable drop site for drop testing in mountains north of Prospect Square. Activity includes two cables suspended between mountain peaks, winches and pulleys for each cable, and 328- ft target area.	Potential locations for aerial cable drop sites are constrained by the need for topography that allows construction of a cable of sufficient height to conduct the needed tests. There is a reasonable alternative to project C066 that is considered as project K024. If an aerial cable drop site is developed, a selection between the two proposed sites would be made.
	C066-b: Construct an approximately 2.5-mile access trail to the target area	The location of the road is constrained by potential locations for aerial cable drop sites and existing infrastructure and roadways. There is a reasonable alternative to project C066 that is considered as project K024. If an aerial cable drop site is developed, a selection between the two proposed sites would be made.

TABLE 2-5 Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Cibola Region Yuma Proving Ground Yuma Proving Ground

^a The project originally proposed as C028 has been removed from direct analysis in this document. Due to a time critical need for implementation, this activity was analyzed through a separate and specific NEPA document. This activity is considered in the analysis of cumulative impacts in this document.

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

TABLE 2-6

Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region *Yuma Proving Ground*

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
K001	Construct 1,640-ft radius DZ for personnel and cargo drops in the southern portion of East Arm.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because DZ locations on YPG are constrained by airspace restrictions, the presence of UXO, and road access (Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
K002	Construct a 1,250-ft radius DZ for personnel and cargo drops northeast of East SWTR Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because DZ locations on YPG are constrained by airspace restrictions, the presence of UXO, and road access (Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).
K003	Expand munitions impact area from north boundary of Echo and Foxtrot to north boundary of contaminated area (Advanced Munitions Range).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed location because the expansion must occur at this location. The analysis will consider variations in the size of the expanded munitions impact area: a minimum area expansion alternative, a maximum area expansion alternative to include all of the available space, and an intermediate area expansion alternative.
K004	K004-a: Construct aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, water tank, POL storage area, and graded parking area, and clear a launch/recovery area at SWTR	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at SWTR and is further constrained by topography and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
		Relocation of the testing and training conducted at SWTR is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at SWTR and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at SWTR.
	K004-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service at SWTR.	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
K005	Install hard power/fiber and communication service at Tower L.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by existing infrastructure and roadways.
K006	Install launch/recovery systems and a GCS trailer at Tower 48.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at Tower 48 and is further constrained by topography and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure. The location for hard power is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
		Relocation of the testing and training conducted at Tower 48 is not possible because other sites lack the specific infrastructure to support the testing and training conducted at Tower 48 and because other sites are heavily used and cannot accommodate the additional testing and training conducted at Tower 48.
K007	K007-a: Construct runway west of S-15 Command and Control Shelter.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at the S- 15 Command and Control Shelter, topography, the proximity to live-fire ranges, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
	K007-b: Install hard power/fiber and communication service to	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.

TABLE 2-6Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Kofa RegionYuma Proving Ground

TABLE 2-6

Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
	west of S-15 Command and Control Shelter.	
K008	Expand munitions impact area to encompass area between Impact Areas Delta and Echo.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed location because the expansion must occur at this location. The analysis will consider variations in the size of the expanded munitions impact area: a minimum area expansion alternative (4,500 ac) and a maximum area expansion alternative to include all of the available space (16,000 ac).
K009	Install fiber and permanent IVTS and telemetry relays at Windy Hill.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by topography, which necessitates placing IVTS and telemetry relays on the summit of Windy Hill. The location of fiber is constrained by the location of roadways to the top of Windy Hill.
K010	Expand munitions impact area north of North Boundary Road between GP 21A and Impact Area Alpha (Advanced Munitions Range).	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed location because locations for munitions impact areas are constrained by airspace restrictions and land use by other testing activities. The impacts associated with expanding this existing munitions impact area would be less than those of establishing a new munitions impact area.
K011	Renovate site and construct new control room and firing chamber at GP 5.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at GP 5, by safety requirements, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
K012	K012-a: Construct two permanent reinforced concrete buildings to house personnel, equipment, and ammunition, and new access road at GP 18.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at GP 18, by safety requirements, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
	K012-b: Install hard power and communication services at GP 18.	The location for utilities is constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
K013	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building and additional building to house weapons at GP 21.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at GP 21, by safety requirements, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
K014	Construct ISR/EO Ground Truth Reference Sites at: K014-a: centered at (32.846, - 114.336) K014-b: centered at (32.967, - 114.239) K014-c: centered at (32.932, - 114.151) K014-d: centered at (32.822, - 114.196) K014-e: centered at (32.990, - 113.955) K014-f: centered at (32.930, - 113.926) K014-g: centered at (32.836, -	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because these sites are consolidated sensor arrays deployed to optimally provide ground truth verification for aerial activities and the ability of airborne sensors to perceive the ground truth sites. These arrays are deployed in locations with other compatible land uses.

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
	114.016) K014-h: centered at (32.867, - 113.922) K014-i: centered at (32.841, - 113.866) K014-j: centered at (32.986, - 113.812) K014-k: centered at (32.904, - 113.791) K014-l: centered at (32.020, - 113.758) K014-m: centered at (32.957, - 113.666)	
K015	Construct permanent building at North Boundary GP.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at North Boundary GP, by safety requirements, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
K016	Construct permanent building at GP 17A.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at GP 17A, by safety requirements, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
K017	Construct permanent building at GP on Growl Road in southeast corner of Echo Munitions Impact Area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at GP QQ, by safety requirements, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
K018	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building at GP Splinter.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at GP Splinter, by safety requirements, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
K019	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building at GP 19.1.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at GP 19.1, by safety requirements, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
K020	Construct permanent reinforced concrete building at GP 11.1.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support testing and training at GP 11.1, by safety requirements, and by the locations of existing roadways and other infrastructure.
K021	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at East Arm.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, C041,

TABLE 2-6 Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
		C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected.
K022	Establish up to 12 TGPs within Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, Delta Echo, or Foxtrot munitions impact areas on KFR annually.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activities. TGP sites would be dependent upon specific testing needs and would be constrained by proximity to existing roads and topography.
K023	Install hard power and communication services to Hazard Classification Deflagration test area.	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by existing electric power infrastructure and roadways.
K024	K024-a: Construct aerial cable drop site for drop testing in mountains south of Pole Line Road. Activity includes two cables suspended between mountain peaks, winches and pulleys for each cable, and 328-ft target area.	Potential locations for aerial cable drop sites are constrained by topography that allows construction of a cable of sufficient height to conduct the needed tests. There is a reasonable alternative to project K024 that is considered as project C066. If an aerial cable drop site is developed, a selection between the two proposed sites would be made.
	K024-b: Construct an approximately 0.6-mile access trail to the target area	The location of the road is constrained by potential locations for aerial cable drop sites and existing infrastructure and roadways. There is a reasonable alternative to project K024 that is considered as project C066. If an aerial cable drop site is developed, a selection between the two proposed sites would be made.
K025	K025-a: Construct East Kofa Operations Center, including a small building complex, perimeter fencing, vehicle maintenance area, storage areas, tactical vehicle wash rack, and 40-ton crane.	There are no alternatives for the proposed activity. Potential locations for the East Kofa Operations Center are constrained by proximity to roads and utilities, existing munitions impact areas and other areas with potential UXO contamination, and other planned activities.
	K025-b: Install hard power, communication, water well, and septic system at East Kofa Operations Center.	Potential locations for utilities are constrained by the location of existing infrastructure and roadways.
K026	Expand LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at SWTR.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected. The impacts associated with expansion of an existing LTA would be less those of creating a new LTA elsewhere
K027	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at Tower 71.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061,

TABLE 2-6Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Kofa RegionYuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activities	Alternatives
		C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected.
K028	Create LTA to support operational testing and dismounted maneuver training at SCAM Flats.	Potential locations for LTAs are constrained by other existing and proposed uses and by the need to have proximity to roads for troop access. All potential sites for new or expanded LTAs are evaluated (includes projects L021, L030, L032, L033, C041, C060, C061, C062, C063, C064, K021, K026, K027, K028). Some, all, or none of these proposed LTAs may be selected.
K029	Extend water line from Countermine Test and Training Range to Bldg 3970 and Bldg 3971. Install fire suppression system in Bldg 3971.	There are no reasonable alternatives for the proposed activities. Extension from the Countermine Test and Training Range would have the minimum length of pipe and minimum disturbance.
K030	Construct runway, taxiway, aircraft shelter, command and control room, simulator training room, classroom, maintenance area, POL storage area, graded area for parking, concrete or asphalt pad, clear area for GCSs, and clear area for UAS launch/recovery at East Arm.	Potential locations for this activity are constrained by site topography requirements for establishment of the runway and UAS launch/recovery area. A location in the northern portion of the Kofa East Arm is needed to provide an area for sensor testing that is remote from potential interfering electrical/communications signal transmissions. Multiple sites or layouts within the identified area in the upper portion of the Kofa East Arm may be suitable, but the activity is not yet designed sufficiently to allow site-specific analysis. Should this activity be selected, additional NEPA analysis, including other reasonable alternatives, would be required prior to its implementation.
K031	Construct lagoon for Kofa Sewage Lagoon Expansion	There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed activity because the location is constrained by the requirement to support expansion of sewer infrastructure at the existing sewage treatment facility.

TABLE 2-6

Alternatives for Short-term Proposed Action Activities – Kofa Region Yuma Proving Ground

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

In addition to the specific projects described in Tables 2-4 through 2-6, less well-defined activities were considered from a programmatic standpoint. Proposed activities that were subjected to programmatic analysis are identified in Table 2-7. This includes long-term and short-term projects without defined locations that are likely to be implemented following further design and analysis or implemented on an as-needed basis for specific testing needs. No alternatives, other than the Proposed Action, were carried forward for analysis for projects subjected to programmatic analysis. The programmatic analysis documented in later sections was based on analysis of the likely maximum potential impacts of the considered activities on a broad scale. Because detailed analysis was not possible, due to the generally undefined nature of these activities, these projects would be analyzed in detail, including reasonable alternatives, in future follow-on, site-specific NEPA analysis that would tier from this programmatic analysis.

TABLE 2-7
Project Components Subjected to Programmatic Analysis
Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Project
L100	Construct addition to Building 3021, FCS Rotary Class IV hangars, large transient UAS hangar with pad access, FCS large Class IV hangar, aviation growth hangar, and administrative support building to the west of LAAF.
L101	Construct motor pool, addition to ammunition building rigging bay, access from Ocotillo Road, storage yard improvements, and ammunition building access road improvements to the north of LAAF.
L102	Construct new MFFS Terminal, consolidated rigger facility, fire station, UAV airfield and hangars, taxiways, UAS flight test area, and other supporting infrastructure at LAAF/MAA.
L103	Construct C-130 parking, fire station and fuel point, hot cargo refueling area, dining facility, and airship hangar at CDH.
L104	Construct water and wastewater treatment facilities at CDH.
L105	Construct crosswind runway at CDH.
L106	Construct outdoor park/stormwater detention pond and an additional 4 administrative support buildings, and replace 5 existing warehouses at YTC.
L107	Construct improvements to Cox Field, AT/FP, and Garrison headquarters, and convert Street D to pedestrian walkway.
L108	Improve truck ACP, realign tank trail to new fuel point, expand range communication and sand blasting, consolidate optics, add to administrative area, and construct second GOV and tracked vehicle maintenance facility at the Kofa cantonment.
L109	Construct wax plant expansion at the Kofa cantonment.
L110	Construct additional ammunition plant similar to Building 3482 and air-conditioned chamber near the Kofa cantonment.
L111	Upgrade equipment and electrical supply at Physical Test Facility (Buildings 3490 and 3130).
L112	Upgrade equipment in vibration test facilities (Buildings 3496, 3495, and 3594).
L113	Upgrade equipment at radiography facility (Building 3493).
L114	Relocate SOTACC from CDA to MAA.
C100	Relocate Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDTE) facility from CDH to CDA.

Note: Some project identifiers in maps represent unrelated activities that are grouped due to geographical proximity. Graphic representation on maps may be larger or smaller than the project area.

2.6 Alternative to Implement a Subset of the Proposed Action

The U.S. Army has the option of selecting only certain of the proposed construction, testing, and training activities for implementation, and to re-evaluate options at a future time. Should a subset of Proposed Action components be selected for implementation, the subset would be clearly identified in the ROD, and the impacts of that subset of activities would be discussed relative to the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

2.7 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

This section provides a brief description of other alternatives that were not carried forward for detailed analysis in this DPEIS. The rationale for each alternative being eliminated from consideration is provided.

2.7.1 Discontinue Use of Yuma Proving Ground as a Military Proving Ground

YPG has not been identified for closure under any of the Base Closure and Realignment Acts, and closure would require congressional authorization. Closure of YPG also would not meet the need for the Proposed Action. Closure of YPG was not retained as an alternative for analysis in this DPEIS; however, should closure of YPG be recommended by the Army in the future, a separate and specific NEPA analysis would be prepared prior to any such action being undertaken.

2.7.2 Expand the Size of Yuma Proving Ground

There are no plans to expand the size of YPG and this action is not considered in this DPEIS. There is room within YPG to expand existing testing and training areas to meet anticipated needs.

2.7.3 Increase the Military Testing Mission to Encompass Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Activities

Nuclear, biological, and chemical activities testing is not within the scope of the military mission of YPG and the addition of these types of testing was not considered in this DPEIS. Missions to address these activities are conducted at other DoD facilities.

2.7.4 Proceed with New Construction with No Increase in Testing and Training

The activities described under the No Action Alternative would continue to be implemented, as identified in Appendix B. In addition, the construction and demolition proposed in this DPEIS would be done, as described in Tables 2-1 through 2-3. Under this alternative, no increases or changes in testing and training would be conducted. Testing and training would remain at current levels, the same as under the No Action Alternative.

Many existing facilities on YPG are undersized for their current uses or are being used for purposes other than those for which the structures were designed. The construction and demolition proposed would result in more efficient operations and enable YPG better to meet its mission requirements. This alternative would not allow the current programs on YPG to evolve to meet future needs that are beyond current testing and training levels.

This alternative was eliminated from further consideration because it would not allow the Army to test new technologies, which would result in an inability to adapt to new conditions and technologies encountered in the theater of combat. This alternative also would not fulfill the purpose of the project, as YPG would be unable to test military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, ammunition, sensors, and guidance systems that are developed in the future. In addition, this alternative would not meet the need for the project to ensure the readiness of U.S. forces and materiel to meet the demands of hot, arid environment theaters around the world, as new challenges could not be met.

2.7.5 Proceed with Increased Testing and Training with No New Construction or Demolition

Under this alternative, the current activities described under the No Action Alternative would continue to be implemented, as identified in Appendix B. Testing and training also would be increased as described under the Proposed Action and in Tables 2-1 through 2-3. The construction and demolition proposed in this DPEIS, as described in Tables 2-1 through 2-3, would not be conducted. All future training and testing would be done within existing facilities and munitions impact areas.

Under this alternative, YPG would be able to increase testing and training to address changing conditions and technologies, but this would require continued use of facilities that are undersized, that are over-utilized, or that lack appropriate support infrastructure to efficiently meet testing or training requirements.

This alternative was eliminated from further consideration because the inefficiencies that would result from increased testing and training under conditions that are already inadequate would impair the military mission. This alternative would not fulfill the purpose of the project, as YPG would be inadequate for proper testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, ammunition, sensors, and guidance systems. This alternative also would not meet the need for the project to ensure the readiness of U.S. forces and materiel to meet the demands of hot, arid environment theaters around the world, as new challenges could not be met.

2.7.6 Relocate Certain Activities to Other Installations

Under this alternative, some of the proposed activities would be relocated to other military installations, while others would be implemented on YPG. The current activities described under the No Action Alternative would continue to be implemented, as identified in Appendix B. Some of the proposed changes to testing and training described under the Proposed Action and in Tables 2-1 through 2-3 would be implemented at YPG, while other activities would be implemented on other installations. Under this alternative, YPG would be able to increase testing and training to address some of the changing conditions and technologies, but certain aspects of the installation mission would be relocated to other military installations.

This alternative was eliminated from further consideration because relocation of certain mission components to other installations would require a greater commitment of resources to establish new testing or training facilities at the gaining installation, or would relocate some testing and training activities to installations less suited for providing realistic hot and arid conditions. This alternative would result in mission changes at YPG and at any receiving installations, which have not been authorized. Changing the mission of YPG to relocate certain testing and training activities would not fulfill the purpose of the project. This alternative also would not meet the need for the project to ensure the readiness of U.S. forces and materiel to meet the demands of hot, arid environment theaters around the world.

2.8 Comparison of Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

Impacts of the alternatives considered in this DPEIS are summarized in Table 2-8.

TABLE 2-8 Impacts by Resource Area Yuma Proving Ground		
Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
Air Quality	No change from existing conditions. Benefits from reduced use of portable generators would not occur.	Minor impacts from increased emissions due to operation of minor permanent sources of air emissions created by proposed construction activities, operation of new facilities, vehicle operation to travel to new facilities, and testing and training activities that would be conducted.
		Temporary negative impacts due to fugitive dust from construction. Negligible short-term impacts to local air quality as a result of emissions from construction equipment.
		Minor beneficial impacts from installation of hard power and telecommunications lines with associated reduction in the use of portable generators for testing and training.
Airspace Management	No change from existing conditions.	No change from existing conditions.
Cultural Resources	Potential impact from inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during testing or training activities at current approved locations and levels. Potential for damage to cultural resources from vandalism. As appropriate, surveys, SHPO consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and mitigation would be implemented	Potential impacts to cultural resources in areas not previously surveyed. As appropriate, surveys, SHPO consultation under the NHPA, and mitigation would be implemented.
		Potential for minor to moderate impacts from construction and training activities and from increased potential for inadvertent discovery due to increase in area where activities would be implemented.
		Potential for damage to cultural resources from vandalism.
Energy/Utilities	Portable generators would continue to be used at current levels and locations.	Energy/Electricity
		Beneficial impacts from construction of more energy-efficient buildings.
	Continued use of utilities at current levels.	Increase in energy demand would result in minor to moderate impacts to energy use in the region.
	Continued use of bottled water and individual reverse osmosis systems outside of MAA.	Minor beneficial impacts from use of solar- powered lights. Moderate long-term beneficial impacts to regional energy consumption from
	Satellite uplinks powered by portable generators would continue to be used for telecommunications.	installing hard power to locations currently using portable generators.
		reduced emissions and to hazardous materials
	Benefits from reduced use of portable generators would not occur.	management from reduced transport and handling of fuels following installation of hard power to testing and training locations with associated
	No change from existing	reduction in generator use.

TABLE 2-8Impacts by Resource AreaYuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
	conditions for solid waste. No significant increase in non- hazardous waste is anticipated to occur. No significant impacts to the non-hazardous waste landfill capacity would be anticipated.	Water Minor impacts to groundwater from anticipated increased usage. Minor beneficial impact from water plant at CDH, reducing reliance on bottled and bulk water.
	Potential for conflicts in scheduling multiple users with needs to conduct testing in areas free of electromagnetic interference from cellular/radio towers.	New wastewater treatment system at CDH and new sewage lagoon at Kofa cantonment area would have minor beneficial impacts on wastewater utilities.
		Telecommunications Minor beneficial impacts to air quality from reduced emissions and to hazardous materials management from reduced transport and handling of fuels following installation of hard power to testing and training locations with associated reduction in use of generators and satellite uplinks. Greater flexibility in scheduling users needing test areas free of electromagnetic interference.
		Solid Waste No significant increase in non-hazardous waste is anticipated to occur. No significant impacts to the non-hazardous waste landfill capacity or regional construction and demolition landfills are anticipated.
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	No change from existing conditions.	No changes from existing conditions and no impacts.
Fire Management	No change from existing conditions. The potential for wildfires would continue and fire management activities would continue	Minor increase in potential for wildfires due to increased testing and training.
		Minor to moderate potential for increased fuel load from growth of exotic invasive plant species.
	Fire management from new EOC in the Laguna Region would not occur.	New EOC in the Laguna Region would benefit fire management.
Geological Resources	No change from existing conditions.	No change from existing conditions and no impacts.
Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste	No change from existing conditions. No changes in volumes of hazardous materials used or hazardous wastes generated. Potential for leaks from on-road and off-road vehicle use and maintenance, POL spills, and chemical decomposition of munitions constituents of concern (MCOCs) would remain.	Impacts described for the No Action Alternative would occur, plus additional potential for minor impacts from leaks associated with vehicle use and maintenance, POL spills, and chemical decomposition of MCOCs as a result of increased testing and training.
		Minor short-term increase in hazardous waste generation due to demolition of buildings containing asbestos-containing materials (ACMs).
		Potential for minor impacts from increased use and disposal of certain hazardous materials during

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
		testing and training activities.
		Potential for impacts from installation of air conditioning components.
		Minor beneficial effects from construction of appropriate down-range facilities to store and contain POLs and reduce the potential for spills.
		Minor beneficial effects from installation of hard power and telecommunications to testing and training sites that would reduce use of portable generators and also reduce the transport of fuel.
Land Use	No change from existing conditions.	Minor changes from conversion of open space to other uses, but consistent with military land uses.
		The slight changes in the noise zones associated with large artillery would not require any changes to the land uses designated in the Yuma County 2020 Comprehensive Plan.
Noise	No change from existing conditions. Continued sporadic impacts to wildlife from noise during testing and training	The slight changes in the noise zones associated with large artillery would not adversely affect use of surround lands outside the installation boundary.
	activities. Continued potential for complaints from the Martinez Lake area.	Minor long-term impact on wildlife from disturbance from sporadic noise from increased testing and training.
		Minor temporary impact to wildlife from noise due to construction activities.
		Potential for minor disturbance of outdoor conversations due to construction noise. No permanent sensitive human receptors in proximity to construction areas.
Recreation	No change from existing	No impacts to off-post recreational opportunities.
	conditions. No new recreation facilities would be constructed.	Potential for minor to moderate impacts to recreational hunting in the Cibola Hunting Area, Martinez Hunting Area, and the East Arm Hunting Area due to increased testing and training.
		Beneficial impacts to other on-post recreation from construction of new park, youth center addition, and improvements to other passive recreational opportunities.
		Loss of greenspace in MAA that is used by residents for passive recreation from Cox Field improvements.
		Potential disruption of some on-post recreation during construction.
Safety	No change from existing conditions. Safety benefits that would result from the Proposed Action would	Potential for minor increase in safety incidents due to increase in testing and training, but the rate of incidents (expressed per worker hour) would not be expected to change.
	not occur.	Minor potential increase in frequency of wildfire

TABLE 2-8 Impacts by Resource Area *Yuma Proving Ground*

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
		ignition due to increase in testing and training.
		Potential for minor short-term impacts to construction worker safety.
		Potential minor temporary impacts to traffic safety due to construction-related traffic.
		Moderate benefits to operational safety due to AT/FP improvements, MEDEVAC helicopter pads, flood upgrades on Aberdeen Road, pedestrian safety from D Street conversion to walkway, and installation of shading at multiple locations.
		Minor benefit to personnel safety from installation of hard power and telecommunications in the Cibola and Kofa Regions due to decreased transportation of fuel and portable generators.
		Moderate benefit from relocating safe haven away from YPG personnel.
Socioeconomics	No change from existing conditions. Short-term benefits to local economy from construction would	Minor short-term beneficial impacts to local economy from purchase of building materials, short-term construction jobs, and secondary spending by construction workers.
	not occur.	Potential for negligible to minor impacts on local fuel and water retailers from reduction in demand for these services on YPG.
Soils	No change from existing conditions. Continued impacts to soils from testing and training activities at authorized locations and levels.	Impacts described for the No Action Alternative would continue, but with increased potential for impacts due to increase in testing and training activities and expansion or creation of testing and training areas.
		Increase in disturbed area and disturbance to soils used for dismounted maneuver training, munitions impact areas, DZs, and UAS launch/recovery areas resulting in negligible to minor impacts to soils that are not susceptible to erosion to moderately erodible and moderate impacts to highly erodible soils that are disturbed.
		Minor impact from establishment of TGPs in the Cibola and Kofa Regions.
		Long-term indirect impact from degradation of munitions into soils in munitions impact areas.
		Disturbance due to construction resulting in negligible to minor impacts to soils that are not highly erodible to moderately erodible and moderate impacts to highly erodible soils.
		Minor impacts from disturbances to soils during installation of utilities.
Threatened and Endangered Species and Species of Concern	No change from existing conditions. Potential for minor impacts to threatened, endangered, or sensitive (TES) species, as testing and training	Transient or Incidental Species Negligible to minor impacts likely from displacement during construction, testing, or training activities.

TABLE 2-8Impacts by Resource AreaYuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
	activities continue at existing locations and levels.	Sonoran Desert Tortoise Long-term moderate impacts from loss of habitat and potential for incidental mortality.
		Sonoran Pronghorn Long-term minor impacts to the experimental population due to loss of habitat and disturbances from testing and training activities.
		Banded Gila Monster Minor long-term impacts from loss of habitat and disturbances from construction, testing, and training activities.
		TES Bat Species Negligible to minor long-term impacts due to loss of foraging habitat.
		Loggerhead Shrike Moderate long-term impacts from loss of habitat and disturbances caused by construction, testing, and training activities.
		Western Burrowing Owl Moderate long-term impacts due to loss of habitat and disturbances from construction, testing, and training activities.
		Parish Onion Negligible to minor long-term impacts from incidental mortality and due to the slow growth rate of these species.
		Other TES Plants Minor long-term impacts from clearing of vegetation for construction, testing, and training purposes.
		Wild Horses and Burros Minor temporary impacts due to construction activities. Minor long-term impacts due to displacement and loss of habitat from increased testing and training areas.
		No impacts to other species.
Traffic/Transportation	No change from existing conditions. No new impacts would occur.	Potential increase in temporary road closures and construction-related traffic. Minor short-term impact.
		Long-term beneficial impacts from improved traffic safety due to flood upgrades, intersection improvements, and range road improvements.
		Long-term benefits from increased air transportation efficiency due to new infrastructure.
Vegetation	No change from existing conditions. Continued impacts to vegetation from testing and training activities at current locations and levels.	Minor to moderate impacts due to removal of vegetation for construction, increases in testing and training, and use of new impact areas.

TABLE 2-8
Impacts by Resource Area
Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
Visual Resources	No change from existing conditions. Current testing and	Temporary minor impacts from construction- related airborne dust.
	training activities would continue to have negligible to minor	Recurring temporary minor impacts from dust and other obscurants caused by testing and training.
	impacts to visual resources.	Potential long-term minor impacts from increased use of lighter-than-air UASs.
		Potential minor long-term impacts from appearance of new buildings.
Water Resources	Continued impacts from contaminants and water consumption due to testing and training activities at current locations and levels.	Potential temporary minor adverse impacts to water quality resulting from sediment runoff during construction and an increase in impervious surfaces following construction, reduced with use of appropriate BMPs
		Minor to moderate increased potential for impacts to groundwater from degradation of munitions.
		Minor potential for offsite impacts due to transport of contaminants and sediments generated from testing and training activities by stormwater runoff.
		Potential negligible reduction in groundwater recharge rates due to new impervious area.
Wildlife and Fisheries	No change from existing conditions. Minor impacts to wildlife would continue under	Minor short-term impact from incidental mortality, displacement, and disturbance due to construction.
	current levels of testing and training activities at current locations.	Potential for minor to moderate long-term impacts from incidental mortality, displacement, and disturbance due to increased testing and training.
		Minor to moderate long-term indirect impacts from loss of habitat due to construction, UAS launch/recovery areas, utilities, and TGPs and only minor impacts from disturbance of habitat due to use of DZs.

2.9 Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Procedures

Table 2-9 summarizes the proposed mitigation measures for resource areas with the potential for significant impacts from the Proposed Action. Avoidance of resources would be considered as the primary mitigation measure, but it would not be practicable to avoid all resources for all proposed activities. The table shows potential mitigation measures, including implementation of BMPs, in the event avoidance is not practicable.

TABLE 2-9

Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures for Each Resource Area Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Mitigation Measures	Document Section
Air Quality	Yes, for activities in non-attainment area	Implement BMPs during construction to reduce fugitive dust emissions. Yuma would revise the Title V permit as needed to align with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) regulations and Title V permit monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements.	3.2.2.4
Airspace Management	No	Continue coordination with MCAS Yuma and private/commercial air traffic controllers.	3.3.2.3
Cultural Resources	Yes	Implement Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) procedures; avoid or protect significant sites; monitor protection measures; implement data recovery; coordinate/consult with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Native American tribes, as appropriate, and implement any required mitigation from SHPO consultation. Environmental Awareness Training for persons working in areas where paleobotanical resources occur.	3.4.8
Energy/Utilities	No	Incorporate energy-efficient design into new buildings. Use solar lights where practicable. Recycle/reuse to the extent practicable.	3.5.2.4
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	No	None	3.6.2.3
Fire Management	Yes	Develop and implement a program to monitor invasive plants; continue to implement ITAM; coordinate with BLM, Kofa NWR, and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) on fire management; develop and interpret wildfire data with other agencies.	3.7.2.4
Geological Resources	No	None	3.8.2.3
Hazardous Materials/ Hazardous Waste	Yes	Continue management of hazardous materials; consult with state and federal agencies; manage and dispose of hazardous materials and wastes in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance; follow standard protective measures and procedures. Update, as necessary and implement SPCCP. Require non-ozone-depleting chemicals as refrigerants in new air conditioning systems.	3.9.2.4
Land Use	Yes	Continue coordination with local plans to	3.10.2.4

TABLE 2-9
Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures for Each Resource Area
Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Mitigation Measures	Document Section
		avoid incompatibilities, as appropriate.	
Noise	Yes	Require construction workers to use appropriate hearing protection. Maintain aircraft operations in compliance with established Installation Compatible Use Zones (ICUZs). Locate noise-generating activities away from sensitive noise receptors and use natural barriers where practicable. Conduct noise-intensive activities during favorable weather conditions where practicable. Use lower noise products where practicable. Continue noise complaint management procedure and implement fly-neighborly programs. Adjust timing of disruptive activities and inform the public of unusual increases in intensity of testing and training.	3.11.2.4
Recreation	No	None	3.12.2.4
Safety	Yes	Minimize potential risks and exposure; require contractors to follow Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards; comply with YPG safety program and specific safety protocols for testing and training activities.	3.13.2.4
Socioeconomics	No	None	3.14.2.4
Soils	Yes	Avoid highly erodible soils; minimize soil disturbance to the extent practicable; implement construction BMPs and stormwater controls; continue to implement ITAM program and Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP).	3.15.2.5
Threatened or Endangered Species and Species of Concern	Yes	Avoid known sensitive habitats during siting process. Avoid impacts to water sources; schedule construction projects to avoid or minimize conflicts with reproduction; avoid implementing activities in areas where sensitive species occur to the extent practicable; relocate or deter species to minimize impacts if necessary; implement INRMP procedures. Limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable. Avoid vegetation where feasible. Should the Sonoran desert tortoise be listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), then activities proposed in areas where the tortoise may occur on YPG would be re- evaluated with regard to potential impacts.	3.16.2.4

Resource Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Mitigation Measures	Document Section
		and appropriate consultation with the USFWS would be conducted prior to any land-disturbing activities.	
		Should the experimental Sonoran pronghorn population in the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge be reclassified under the ESA, then activities proposed in areas where the pronghorn may occur on YPG would be re- evaluated with regard to potential impacts and appropriate consultation with the USFWS would be conducted prior to any land-disturbing activities.	
Traffic/Transportation	Yes	Implement traffic control procedures as appropriate; minimize construction activities during peak traffic periods on YPG.	3.17.2.3
Vegetation	Yes	Develop and implement a program to monitor invasive plants; continue to implement ITAM and INRMP; implement appropriate construction BMPs and stormwater controls. Limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable. Avoid vegetation where feasible.	3.18.2.4
Visual Resources	Yes	Apply appropriate dust suppression practices; design buildings to blend with existing structures; continue implementation of the Environmental Awareness program.	3.19.2.4
Water Resources	Yes	Develop and implement Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) to reduce potential for environmental exposure to pollutants in stormwater. Implement appropriate construction BMPs and stormwater controls; design to maximize use of pervious and semi-pervious surfaces; continue to implement INRMP; implement any mitigation required in Section 404 permits obtained.	3.20.2.4
Wildlife and Fisheries	Yes	Avoid wildlife concentration areas and sensitive habitats (e.g. water sources); schedule construction projects to avoid or minimize conflicts with reproduction; continue to implement INRMP. Limit surface- disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable. Avoid vegetation where feasible.	3.21.2.4

TABLE 2-9Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures for Each Resource AreaYuma Proving Ground

Notes: Information provided is summarized from the analysis for each resource area in Section 3. Mitigation measures identified would be implemented, as appropriate, for each specific activity undertaken. Only those measures appropriate for a given action would be implemented.

2.10 Preferred Alternative

The U.S. Army has not identified a Preferred Alternative at this time. As the analysis continues, the Army will receive additional input from government agencies, tribal organizations, and the public that will be considered in determining a Preferred Alternative. A Preferred Alternative will be identified in the FPEIS.

This page intentionally left blank.

Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

3.1 Introduction

This section provides descriptions of the affected environment for the valued environmental components (VECs) analyzed in this DPEIS and presents the environmental consequences of the actions carried forward for detailed analysis. The description of each VEC addresses its baseline, or current, condition and identifies the factors that resulted in this condition. This DPEIS identifies important past human actions and natural events that have contributed to the condition of each VEC analyzed in detail.

3.1.1 Presentation of VECs

VECs are the resources, ecosystems, and human communities of concern that could be affected by the Proposed Action. The Army reviewed the VECs and ranked them based on their relative potential to be affected by the Proposed Action (see Section 1.3.3). Based on this ranking, VECs were grouped into one of three categories:

- Primary VEC (high potential for impact)
- Secondary VEC (moderate potential for impact)
- Low VEC (low potential for impact)

Table 3-1 identifies the category to which each VEC was assigned and the EIS section where each is discussed.

TABLE 3-1

Characterization of Valued Environmental Components Yuma Proving Ground

VEC	Described In		
Primary VECs (High Potential for Impact)			
Air Quality	Section 3.2		
Cultural Resources	Section 3.4		
Energy/Utilities	Section 3.5		
Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste	Section 3.9		
Land Use	Section 3.10		
Noise	Section 3.11		
Safety	Section 3.13		
Soils	Section 3.15		
Threatened and Endangered Species and Species of Concern	Section 3.16		
Vegetation	Section 3.18		

VEC	Described In
Primary VECs (High Potential for Impact)	
Visual Resources	Section 3.19
Wildlife and Fisheries	Section 3.21
Secondary VECs (Moderate Potential for Imp	act)
Recreation	Section 3.12
Socioeconomics	Section 3.14
Traffic/Transportation	Section 3.17
Water Resources	Section 3.20
Low VECs (Low Potential for Impact)	
Airspace Management	Section 3.3
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	Section 3.6
Fire Management	Section 3.7
Geological Resources	Section 3.8

TABLE 3-1

Characterization of Valued Environmental Components Yuma Proving Ground

Subsistence resources are not considered a VEC at YPG. No persons use YPG for subsistence resources; therefore, subsistence resources are not discussed in this DPEIS.

3.1.2 Framework for Impact Analysis

This section describes the approach to impact assessment and the determination of environmental consequences for the No Action Alternative and the Action Alternatives. As appropriate, the analysis of impacts builds on existing environmental documentation supporting testing and training activities on YPG (see Section 2.3.2).

3.1.2.1 Alternatives

For each resource area, qualitative and/or quantitative analysis of the environmental and socioeconomic consequences of implementing the No Action Alternative or the considered alternatives to the Proposed Action are presented. The alternatives analyzed in this DPEIS were described in Section 2 and are summarized below.

No Action Alternative. The testing and training activities of the No Action Alternative are current and ongoing activities on YPG. Under the No Action Alternative, testing and training would continue at the current levels. No test areas, training areas, munitions impact areas, or DZs would be created or expanded and no construction or demolition would occur. See Tables B-1 through B-3 in Appendix B for a listing of the No Action activities in each region.

Proposed Action. The Proposed Action includes all the components of the No Action Alternative plus the new construction and associated demolition, new or expanded testing, and expanded training proposed in this DPEIS, all components occurring on YPG, and new

testing and training proposed to meet anticipated testing or training needs. Where there are feasible alternatives for activities under the Proposed Action, the impacts of each alternative are addressed. See Tables 2-1 through 2-3 in Section 2 for a listing of activities included in the Proposed Action and Tables 2-4 through 2-6 for a discussion of reasonable alternatives to considered activities.

3.1.2.2 Context and Intensity

Context and intensity were considered in determining the significance of potential impacts (40 CFR Section 1508.27). Context is the location of the action and the areal extent of potential impacts. For site-specific infrastructure improvement projects, the locations for routine test and training types and support activities may be more general or may be at a specific site or sites (for example, large-caliber weapons can be fired from multiple firing points throughout KFR). The areal extents of potential impacts for each resource typically vary.

The intensity of a potential impact refers to its severity and takes into account beneficial and adverse impacts, the level of controversy associated with impacts on human health, whether the action establishes a precedent for further actions with significant effects, the level of uncertainty about projected impacts, and the extent to which the action threatens to violate Federal, state, or local environmental protection laws or constrain future activities. Intensities that are classified as "none" to "moderate" are considered less than significant in this analysis. Significant adverse impacts are those categorized as "severe." Potential beneficial impacts are discussed separately from potential adverse impacts. The following categories were used to classify impacts to resources:

- None: No measurable impacts are expected to occur.
- Minor: Short-term but measurable adverse impacts are expected. Impacts may have slight impact on the resource.
- Moderate: Noticeable adverse impacts would have a measurable effect on a resource and are not short-term.
- Severe: Adverse impacts would be obvious, both short-term and long-term, and would have serious consequences on a resource. These impacts would be considered significant.
- Beneficial: Impacts would benefit the resource/issue.

3.1.2.3 Presentation of Analysis

For each resource, the significance criteria are presented, followed by a discussion of the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts for the No Action Alternative and the considered alternatives for the Proposed Action. Section 3.1.3 provides the basis for the cumulative effects analysis. Measures to avoid or minimize the potential for impacts to a resource area are identified. Section 3.22 provides a summary of impacts and mitigation.

The level of analysis provided for each VEC is commensurate with the potential for significant adverse impacts, with primary VECs receiving the greatest level of detail in the analysis.

Quick Look Questions prepared to support cumulative effects analysis for the VECs also were used to support the relative VEC ranking presented in Table 3-1. An explanation of

how to use the Quick Look Questions is found in Section 3.1.3.2. The answers to the Quick Look Questions for each VEC are provided in Appendix C. The Army would implement procedures and management practices to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to VECs, as appropriate, and these measures are discussed as they apply to each resource area.

3.1.3 Cumulative Effects Analysis

This section describes the approach used to analyze potential cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Action in the context of potential interactions with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions in the region. The CEQ regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1508.7) define a "cumulative impact" for purposes of NEPA as follows:

Cumulative impact is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

Cumulative impacts would occur if incremental impacts of the Proposed Action, added to the environmental impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable similar actions, would result in an adverse effect to resources in the region. Actions that have the potential to combine with incremental effects of the Proposed Action to result in cumulative impacts are those that are similar to the Proposed Action or could affect environmental resources similar to those affected by the alternatives considered, are located in geographic proximity to YPG, and have occurred, are ongoing, or are reasonably foreseeable. Reasonably foreseeable actions include those that have an application for operations pending before an agency with permit authority and would occur in the same timeframe as the Proposed Action and alternatives.

The analysis of cumulative impacts in this DPEIS follows CEQ and Army guidance (CEQ, 1997; USAEC, 2007), and provides a systematic approach for assessing cumulative impacts.

3.1.3.1 Other Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions

Because off-post testing is independent of on-post testing, creates only minor impacts of limited extent, and is spatially separated from YPG, no interaction effects with testing or training activities on YPG beyond incremental additions to regional air emissions would result. The off-post locations are not considered in the cumulative impacts except for air quality.

The potential for other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions to interact with the Proposed Action to create cumulative effects varies among the different resource areas. Considered projects are discussed for each resource area with a potential for cumulative impacts. Resource areas that would not be impacted by the Proposed Action and would have no potential for cumulative effects are identified as such and no project list is provided for these resource areas.

YPG has begun analyzing the development of a solar renewable energy resource on the installation to increase YPG's energy security and meet federal mandates and legislative requirements to increase production and consumption of renewable energy resources. This development would be through an EUL with a private company. Solar technologies under consideration by the Army include solar PV, dish-engine system based on the Dish Stirling, and dry-cooled concentrating solar thermal technologies. Two proposed locations have been identified: a Northeast Cibola Site and a West Kofa Site (see Figure 3-3). The Northeast

Cibola Site would support a facility capable of producing up to 200 megawatts (MW) and the West Kofa Site would support a facility capable of producing up to 60 MW. Total solar development on YPG lands would not exceed 1,000 acres (ac) at these locations (USAEC, 2012). An EUL for solar power generation is not a component of the Proposed Action and an EA is being prepared for this project. The potential for cumulative impacts from development and operation of such a facility was considered in the assessment of potential cumulative impacts in this analysis, based on what was known at the time this document was prepared. Should design specifications become better defined prior to the decision on this action being made and if those design changes would result in changes to the analysis of cumulative impacts provided herein, this document will be revised prior to the decision document being signed.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project is a commercial development proposed approximately 10 miles north of Quartzite, Arizona in LaPaz County. The preferred alternative is to construct, operate, maintain, and decommission a 100-MW solar thermal generation power plant using dry-cooling technology with a 1.5-mile generator tie-line, switchyard, and access road. An EIS was prepared and a Record of Decision for this project was signed in May 2013. This solar energy project is not a component of the Proposed Action, but the potential for cumulative impacts from development of this project was considered in the assessment of potential cumulative impacts in this analysis.

There are four proposed solar projects within approximately 10 miles of YPG. These solar projects are associated with BLM. The Palomas project is proposed to be a concentrated solar power trough and would be located east of YPG adjacent to the Aqua-Caliente solar project. The LaPosa Solar Terminal and Quartzite project are proposed to be a concentrated solar power trough and would be located along I-95 between Cibola and the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. The Windcat Quartzite project is proposed as concentrated solar power tower and would be located along I-95 between Cibola and the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. These solar projects are not a component of the Proposed Action, but the potential for cumulative impacts from development of this project was considered in the assessment of potential cumulative impacts in this analysis.

3.1.3.2 Approach for Assessing Cumulative Effects

To determine whether specific VECs would have the potential for cumulative effects with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions and be included in the cumulative impact assessment, the DPEIS analysis followed the CEQ/Army 11-step process to assess potential cumulative effects:

- Step 1. Identify significant cumulative issues associated with the Proposed Action
- Step 2. Establish geographic scope for analysis for each VEC
- Step 3. Establish a timeframe for the analysis for each VEC
- Step 4. Identify other actions affecting VECs
- Step 5. Characterize the sensitivity of VECs
- Step 6. Characterize the stresses on the VECs
- Step 7. Define a baseline condition for the VECs
- Step 8. Identify cause-effect relationships between included activities and VECs
- Step 9. Determine magnitude and significance of cumulative effects for each VEC
- Step 10. Modify actions to minimize significant cumulative effects

• Step 11. Monitor cumulative effects during project implementation

The Army uses three levels of analysis to accomplish these steps and evaluate VECs for cumulative impacts. The foundation of this methodology is the Quick Look Questions (USAEC, 2007). Quick Look Questions, which were adapted to suit the environment of the Colorado Desert subregion of the Sonoran Desert, were used to determine the need to address the direct and indirect effects of the Proposed Action on each VEC, as well as to assess the potential for cumulative impacts. The Quick Look Questions help screen VECs by answering resource-specific questions identified through the NEPA process related to scoping concerns raised, affected environment, and environmental consequences. Depending on the outcome of the Quick Look analysis, each VEC is assigned to one of three levels of cumulative impact analysis:

- No further analysis is needed if the answers to the Quick Look Questions show significant impacts are not likely.
- Analysis and discussion are required if the Quick Look Questions cannot be easily answered.
- Detailed analysis is required if potentially significant impacts could occur.

The Quick Look Questions and answers are provided in Appendix C.

3.1.4 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

Irreversible or irretrievable resource commitments are related to the use of nonrenewable resources and the effects that use of those resources would have on future generations. These effects primarily result from the use or destruction of a specific resource (e.g. energy from hydrocarbons) that cannot be replaced within a reasonable timeframe. Irretrievable resource commitments involve the loss in value of an affected resource that cannot be restored after implementing a Proposed Action (e.g. extinction of a species).

Construction, demolition, paving, vegetation clearing, and increased testing and training activities would consume electricity, hydrocarbon fuels, and water. Construction and paving would use construction materials, such as concrete and steel. Construction and paving, materials would be recycled to the extent practicable; however, some irretrievable resource loss would result. The hydrocarbon-based energy required to conduct these activities or to procure the finished materials would be permanently lost.

Land and natural resources (e.g. flora and fauna) would be used by the Army for construction, testing and training activities. The loss of desert vegetation and wildlife habitat from proposed activities could be reversed, but the time required would be great for some species and habitats. Mature saguaro cactus, for example, could not be replaced for three to four generations of visitors. Clearing of desert vegetation would result in an irretrievable commitment for near-term future generations, but not an irretrievable commitment when considered from a long-term perspective. These areas could be revegetated and restored once military use of the land is no longer needed.

Creation of new or expanded munitions impact areas could result in an irretrievable commitment of these areas for use as test areas. Without the removal of potential UXO, these areas would be precluded from future use.

Loss of cultural resources would represent an irretrievable action, but no such loss would be expected to occur under the Proposed Action.

3.1.5 Short-term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-term Productivity

Short-term uses associated with the Proposed Action would result in minor adverse impacts to certain resources. Increased soil erosion could result from soil disturbance from construction and paving activities. Washes and off-post waterways could experience increased scour and sedimentation from stormwater runoff. Air quality could be affected by increased dust and vehicle emissions from construction activities and increased testing and training. Construction and testing/training could also generate increased noise. There would be a short-term beneficial socioeconomic impact associated with jobs and purchase of materials during the construction period. During testing and training, wildlife could be displaced on a short-term basis until the activity, such as drop testing in a DZ, is completed.

Sustainability of the YPG mission would be promoted through measures that would be incorporated into the Proposed Action:

- Implementation of design features, BMPs, and standard construction practices
- Adherence to existing management plans and programs
- Compliance with federal, State, and local regulations

With increased UAS activity, short-term uses of YPG airspace would become more frequent and intensive, but coordination with MCAS Yuma and other users would ensure that airspace remains productive for all users. The long-term productivity of YPG land and airspace would not be affected by the Proposed Action.

3.2 Air Quality

3.2.1 Existing Conditions

3.2.1.1 Ambient Air Quality

Air quality is determined by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment. USEPA has established NAAQS for six criteria pollutants: SO₂, NO_x, particulate matter (which includes inhalable particulate matter less than or equal to 10 micrometers in diameter [PM₁₀] and inhalable particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 micrometers in diameter [PM_{2.5}]), CO, ozone (O₃), and lead (Pb). Primary NAAQS are intended to protect public health, while secondary NAAQS are intended to protect public health, while secondary NAAQS are intended to protect the environment (crops, wildlife, and buildings). Individual states may establish more stringent standards. The State of Arizona has adopted the Federal NAAQS. The Primary and Secondary NAAQS for the six criteria pollutants are presented in Table 3-2.

Areas where ambient concentrations of a given pollutant are below the levels established in the NAAQS are designated as being in attainment for that pollutant. Areas that do not comply with the NAAQS for a given pollutant are classified as a non-attainment area for that pollutant. Non-attainment areas are regulated in an effort to lower pollutant ambient concentrations to regulatory standards.

A portion of Yuma County is currently in non-attainment (moderate) for the 24-hour NAAQS for PM₁₀. This non-attainment area includes the southwestern corner of the Laguna Region (Figure 3-1). Data from 2008 through 2010 show that no exceedances of the PM₁₀

Pollutant	Primary Standards ^a	Averaging Times	Secondary Standards
Carbon Monoxide	9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	8-hour ^b	None
	35 ppm (40 mg/m ³)	1-hour ^b	None
Lead	0.15 μg/m ³	Rolling 3-Month Average	Same as Primary
Nitrogen Dioxide	0.053 ppm (100 μg/m ³)	Annual (Arithmetic Average)	Same as Primary
	100 ppb	1-hour ^c	None
PM ₁₀	150 µg/m ³	24-hour ^d	Same as Primary
PM _{2.5}	12.0 μg/m ³	Annual ^e (Arithmetic Average)	15.0 μg/m ³
	35 ug/m ³	24-hour ^f	Same as Primary
Ozone	0.075 ppm	8-hour ^g	Same as Primary
Sulfur Oxides	0.03 ppm	Annual (Arithmetic Mean)	
	0.14 ppm	24-hour ^b	
		3-hour ^b	0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m ³)
	75 ppb	1-hour	None

TABLE 3-2 NAAQS for Criteria Pollutants Yuma Proving Ground

^a ppm = parts per million, $\mu g/m^3$ = micrograms per cubic meter, ppb = parts per billion

^b Not to be exceeded more than once per year.

^c 3-year average of the 98th percentile of daily maximum 1-hour average at each monitor within an area must not exceed 100 ppb

^d Not to be exceeded more than once per year over 3 years.

^e 3-year average weighted annual mean PM_{2.5} concentration from single or multiple community-oriented monitors must not exceed 15.0 μg/m³.

^f 3-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hour concentration at each population-oriented monitor must not exceed 35 µg/m³.

^g 3-year average of the fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentration measured at each monitor within an area over each year must not exceed 0.0075 ppm.

^h 3-year average of the 99th percentile of daily maximum 1-hour average at each monitor within an area must not exceed 75 ppb. Source: USEPA, 2012

standard occurred that were not the result of exceptional natural events. These data indicate that the entire county has moved into attainment with the 24-hour PM₁₀ standard (ADEQ, 2011a). At this time, the USEPA has not approved the ADEQ Yuma PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan (ADEQ, 2006) and the area remains classified as non-attainment. The Arizona State Implementation Plan includes statewide Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACMs), as specified in Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) Title 18 Chapter 2, Sections R18-2-604 through R18-2-607 and R18-2-804. RACMs are applicable across all of YPG, not just in the non-attainment area. The RACMs specified at R18-2-804 apply to construction equipment operated at YPG.

3.2.1.2 Affected Environment

The proposed activities discussed in Section 2.4 would be implemented in Yuma County. With the exception of twelve proposed activities in the southwestern corner of the Laguna
Region, all of the proposed activities would be implemented in an attainment area for all criteria pollutants. All or portions of twelve proposed activities in the southwestern corner of the Laguna Region would be within the Yuma County moderate PM_{10} non-attainment area. The area is currently in attainment for the other criteria pollutants.

The potential emissions from the twelve proposed activities that would be implemented in the PM₁₀ non-attainment area and other proposed activities that would be enacted near the non-attainment area were analyzed and results indicate that the proposed activities in the non-attainment area would not exceed the conformity threshold for PM₁₀ (Table 3-3, see Appendix D for the detailed analysis). A Record of Non-Applicability has been prepared certifying that "All activities associated with the Proposed Action in the non-attainment area would be below the conformity threshold value for PM₁₀" (Appendix D).

TABLE 3-3

Proposed Activities in the Yuma County PM10 Non-attainment Area Yuma Proving Ground

Identifier	Proposed Activity
L002	Construct Runway 18/36 extension, realign Barranca Road, and install hard power at LAAF.
L009	Construct warehouse at YTC
L010	Construct Instrumentation Development Facility at YTC.
L011	Construct tracked vehicle trail and office at YTC.
L029	Construct optical maintenance facility, graded parking area with power pole farm, and perimeter fencing centered at YTC
L031	Construct MFFS DFAC
L032	Expand Bravo LTA
L034	Construct MFFS Ready Room
L037	Construct vehicle test course
L040 ^a	Construct DZ near LAAF (984-foot [ft] x 1,969-ft)
L102 ^a	Construct new MFFS Terminal, consolidated rigger facility, CASA Transport aircraft hangar, UAV airfield and hangars, taxiways, UAS flight test area, and other supporting infrastructure at LAAF/MAA.
L106	Construct 4 administrative support buildings and Installations Logistics Complex at YTC.
^a LAAF is not with	in the non-attainment area, activities are included due to uncertainty regarding the specific locations.

Regulations for the implementation of construction permitting programs are mandated under Title I of the CAA and regulations for the implementation of operating permit programs are mandated under Title V of the CAA. ADEQ has combined these programs and requires that a facility with emissions obtain a construction/operating permit for all existing stationary sources of air emissions and any future stationary sources of air emissions. YPG currently has a Title V permit (Permit # 43492) dated June 17, 2010. YPG is classified as a major source with potential emissions of NO_{x} , CO, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs), each exceeding 100 tons per year (tpy). PM₁₀ emissions are less than 100 tpy. Additionally, YPG is an area source of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) with emissions of a single HAP and facility-wide totals less than 10 tpy and 25 tpy, respectively.

Air emissions tracked on the installation consist of criteria air pollutants, VOCs, HAPs, and ozonedepleting chemicals (ODCs), (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). YPG is required to submit an annual air emissions inventory to ADEQ. Data from the YPG 2012 air emissions inventory are provided in Table 3-4 and are compared to Yuma County's total emissions for 2008 (the most recent year for which county data are available). YPG's point source emissions account for a very small fraction of Yuma County's total emissions.

Turna Proving Cround	Yuma County ^b	Yuma Proving Ground		
Pollutant	Total (tpy)	Point Source (tpy) ^c	% of Total	
PM ₁₀	12,661	19.50	0.15	
СО	34,765	5.73	0.02	
VOC	8,203	17.57	0.21	
NO _X	6,782	13.06	0.19	
SO ₂	184	0.03	0.02	

TABLE 3-4

Comparison of Yuma Proving Ground Air Emissions to Yuma County Air Emissions^a Yuma Proving Ground

^a Data in this table is from the most current available data (2008 and 2012).

^b Source: USEPA, 2013. (The data are from 2008, which is the most recent data available).

^c Source: Yuma Proving Ground 2012 Annual Air Emission Inventory. (Obregon, 2013a, personal communication)

3.2.1.3 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases

Climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate (such as temperature, precipitation, or wind) lasting for an extended period of decades or longer. Climate change may result from any of the following conditions (USEPA, 2010):

- Natural factors, such as changes in the sun's intensity or slow changes in the Earth's orbit around the sun
- Natural processes within the climate system (e.g. changes in ocean circulation)
- Natural processes within the climate system (e.g. changes in ocean circulation)
- Human activities that change atmospheric composition (such as through burning fossil fuels [natural gas, oil products, and coal]) and that change the land surface (such as deforestation, reforestation, urbanization, and desertification)

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are referred to as greenhouse gases (GHGs). Some GHGs, such as carbon dioxide (CO₂) occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes and human activities. Other GHGs (such as fluorinated gases) are derived exclusively from human activities. GHGs may contribute to accelerated climate change by altering the thermodynamic properties of the Earth's atmosphere.

Water vapor (H_2O) is the most abundant and dominant GHG. H_2O varies from 0 to 2 percent in the atmosphere with great spatial variability at any given time because it has a

short life-span. H₂O and other short-lived GHGs, such as CO, tropospheric O₃, and O₃ precursors, are not quantified for their climate change potential (USEPA, 2011a).

GHGs with long life-spans are quantified for their climate change potential, expressed as CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e). These long-lived GHGs include the following pollutants (USEPA, 2010, 2011b):

- CO₂ is a naturally occurring gas produced by natural fires, geothermal events, and aerobic respiration. CO₂ also is a by-product of fossil fuel and biomass combustion and other industrial processes. It is the principal anthropogenic GHG that affects the Earth's radiative balance. CO₂ also may be removed from the atmosphere as part of the biological carbon cycle when it is converted into plant tissue through photosynthesis.
- Methane (CH₄) is a naturally occurring gas with a climate change potential approximately 20 times that of CO₂ with regard to climatic warming. CH₄ is produced through anaerobic (without oxygen) decomposition of waste in landfills, animal digestion, decomposition of animal wastes, production and distribution of natural gas and petroleum, coal production, and incomplete fossil fuel combustion.
- Nitrous oxide (N₂O) is a naturally occurring gas with a climate change potential approximately 300 times that of CO₂ with regard to climatic warming. Major sources of N₂O include soil cultivation practices, especially the use of commercial and organic fertilizers, fossil fuel combustion, nitric acid production, and biomass burning.
- Fluorinated gases (hydrofluorocarbons [HFCs], perfluorocarbons [PFCs], and sulfur hexafluoride [SF₆]) are man-made compounds containing a mix of hydrogen, fluorine, chlorine, and carbon (HFCs) or just fluorine and carbon (PFCs). HFCs were introduced as a replacement for chlorofluorocarbons, which had been identified as ODCs. The climate change potential of HFCs ranges from approximately 100 to 10,000 times that of CO₂. PFCs also are used as replacements for chlorofluorocarbons in addition to use in manufacturing facilities, where they may be emitted as by-products of processes. PFCs are powerful GHGs, with a climate change potential approximately 5,000 to 10,000 times that of CO₂. SF₆ is a colorless gas and a very powerful GHG, with a climate change potential more than 20,000 times that of CO₂. SF₆ is used primarily in electrical transmission and distribution systems, as well as in dielectrics in electronics. Fluorinated gases typically are emitted in smaller quantities than other GHGs.

The USEPA Mandatory Reporting Rule became effective on December 29, 2009. Suppliers of fossil fuels or industrial GHGs, manufacturers of vehicles and engines, and facilities that emit 25,000 metric tons or more per year of CO₂e must submit annual reports to USEPA. The Supreme Court decision in *Massachusetts et al. v. Environmental Protection Agency et al.* (Supreme Court Case 05-1120) found that USEPA has the authority to list GHGs as pollutants and to regulate emissions of GHGs under the CAA. On April 17, 2009, USEPA found that CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆ may contribute to air pollution and may endanger public health and welfare. YPG's GHG emissions are currently below the mandatory reporting threshold of 25,000 metric tons per year (Obregon, 2013a, personal communication).

Electricity use and transportation are the principal GHG emissions sources in AZ, accounting for nearly 80 percent of the annual gross GHG emissions through combustion of fossil fuels. The remaining use of fossil fuels in the residential, commercial, and industrial

sectors contributes 11 percent of annual GHG emissions. Agricultural activities result in CH₄ and nitrogen dioxide (NO2) emissions that account for another 5 percent of annual GHG emissions, as do industrial process emissions. Industrial process emissions are increasing rapidly due to the increasing use of HFCs as substitutes for ozone-depleting chlorofluorocarbons and the use of PFCs in semiconductor manufacture, as well as from CO₂ released during cement and lime production, and CH₄ released by natural gas and coal mine production. Landfills and wastewater management facilities produce CH₄ and NO₂ emissions that account for 2 percent of annual GHG emissions. GHG emissions from landfills have declined in recent years as landfill gas is increasingly captured for energy purposes. Executive Order (EO) 2010-06, the Governor's Policy on Climate Change, recognizes the importance of reducing GHG emissions while maintaining economic growth and competitiveness in the State of Arizona. EO 2010-06 supports Arizona's continued collaboration in regional and national endeavors to advance clean energy and implement cost-effective solutions to climate change (Climate Change Advisory Group, 2006). Additionally, EO 13514 (Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance dated 8 October 2009), establishes an integrated strategy toward sustainability in the Federal Government and makes reduction of GHG a priority for federal agencies.

3.2.2 Environmental Consequences

This section discusses direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to air quality that could result from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. The types of impacts considered in this air quality impact analysis include the following:

- Fugitive dust can result from disturbed soils during construction activities and from testing and training activities, particularly driving on unpaved roads or driving off-road.
- Temporary combustion emissions result from temporary sources of air pollution and GHG emissions during construction of infrastructure improvement projects or use of portable generators to supply electrical power to test and training sites.
- Vehicle emissions are sources of air pollution from incomplete combustion of fossil fuels and also contribute GHGs to the atmosphere.
- Non-vehicle emissions include air pollution and GHGs that derive from combustion of fossil fuels for heating, power generation, or any other non-vehicle sources.
- Beneficial impacts from the Proposed Action. Proposed Action would include a decrease in fossil fuel consumption or a decrease in human-caused fugitive dust.

3.2.2.1 Significance Criteria

The significance criteria that were used to determine potential impacts to air quality were:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) –Activities that would result in measurable changes to local or regional air quality that are below regulatory thresholds.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would result in increased fossil fuel consumption.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would result in an exceedance of stationary source emissions greater than major permit modification thresholds for new sources or in exceedance of other regulatory thresholds.

• Beneficial – Activities that would result in a reduction of fossil fuel consumption.

3.2.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

No emissions due to construction or construction-related traffic would occur. There would be no change in emissions generated on YPG. No impacts to air quality would occur.

There would be no benefit from reduction of emissions from reduced use of portable generators as no hard power would be installed to testing and training locations.

3.2.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

The proposed activities would cause minor, short-term adverse impacts on air quality due to construction. These impacts would not be expected to occur past the construction phase. All construction emissions would likely be local, limited to the duration of the construction, and would not have a lasting impact on ambient air quality.

During construction, air quality impacts could occur from dust carried offsite and combustion emissions from construction equipment. The primary risks from blowing dust particles are to human health and human nuisance values. Fugitive dust can contribute to respiratory health problems and create an uncomfortable work environment. Deposition on surfaces can be a nuisance to those living or working nearby. YPG would implement RACMs to minimize fugitive dust generation.

Many of the soils at YPG are susceptible to wind erosion and could produce fugitive dust and particulates when disturbed. Disturbance could occur during construction and testing or training activities.

The twelve proposed activities in the PM_{10} non-attainment are addressed in Appendix D. It should be noted that the proposed activities in the non-attainment area would be below the conformity threshold value for PM_{10} during both the construction and operating phases.

YPG would require use of BMPs during construction to reduce or eliminate fugitive dust emissions. In areas with disturbed and unstable highly erodible soils, BMPs would also be applied during military operations. BMPs that could be implemented include the following:

- *Application of Dust Suppressants.* Where appropriate, dust suppressants or liquid surfactants would be applied to areas where dust could be disturbed by construction or traffic.
- *Sprinkling/Irrigation*. Sprinkling the ground surface with water until it is moist can be used to control dust on haul roads and other traffic routes. This practice can be applied to almost any site. When suppression methods involving water are used, care would be exercised to minimize over-watering that could cause the transport of mud onto adjoining roadways, which ultimately could increase the dust problem. Mechanical removal of mud from tires would be implemented if necessary
- *Vegetative Cover*. In areas not expected to accommodate vehicle traffic, vegetative stabilization of disturbed soil is often desirable. Vegetation provides coverage to surface soils and decreases wind velocity at the ground surface, thus reducing the potential for dust to become airborne.
- *Mulch*. Mulching can be a quick and effective means of dust control for recently disturbed areas.

No substantial changes to air quality from baseline conditions would be likely with implementation of the Proposed Action. Fugitive dust would increase in the immediate area during construction, but impacts would be temporary and minor. Dust abatement measures discussed above would limit the direct and secondary creation of dust.

Emissions would be generated by engine exhaust from construction workers' personal vehicles and off-road construction equipment, including earth-moving equipment, cranes, and trucks. The emissions would primarily consist of NO_X, SO₂, PM, CO, and VOCs, which are typical of the emissions commonly observed at construction sites, and would not extend past the construction period. The construction associated with the proposed activities would be spread through time and the emissions associated with each individual proposed activity would similar in magnitude to the construction of a small shopping area. Because of the separation in time, any short-term impacts to local air quality would be negligible.

Land clearing to establish new DZs and expand/create runways could increase the potential for generation of dust. Construction BMPs would be implemented to minimize the potential for dust generation and sites would be stabilized (disturbed areas typically covered with ABC).

Aircraft operations may increase under the Proposed Action and there would likely be a trend to use larger UAS. Either of these could result in an increase of aircraft emissions during testing and training. Any such increases would be minor to moderate and would not contribute to the status of the non-attainment area or cause other regulatory exceedances.

Existing use of the sandblasting facility is authorized in the Title V permit, but increased use of the facility would require modification of the YPG Title V air permit. In addition, the Title V permit requires monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting for the sandblast facility expansion, for the new POL storage facilities, and for construction activities.

Construction and operation of an East Kofa Operations Center (K025a and b) would include a small building complex, perimeter fencing, vehicle maintenance area, storage areas, tactical vehicle wash rack, 40-ton crane, and utility infrastructure. Construction-related fugitive dust would be generated. During operations, engine emissions associated with personnel traveling to and from work and operation of facilities would result in minor increases in vehicle emissions across the lower portion of the Kofa Region. The amount of emissions would be small and any impacts to air quality in the Kofa Region would be negligible to minor.

Construction of Project K030 in the northern portion of the East Arm would include approximately 26 ac of land disturbance. Construction-related fugitive dust would be generated. During operations, engine emissions associated with personnel traveling to and from work and operation of facilities would produce minor emissions in an area that currently has no source of exhaust emissions. The amount of emissions would be small and any impacts to air quality in the northern portion of the Kofa Region would be negligible to minor.

Minor permanent sources of air emissions would be created by the proposed activities, including building heating units and water heaters; however, these small sources would result in no more than a *de minimis* impact on air quality. If necessary, YPG would revise its permit to include the new emission sources. Yuma would continue to procure materials and services consistent with the policies outlined in EO 13423, *Strengthening Federal*

Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management, EO 13514, Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance, and EO 2010-06, the Arizona Governor's Policy on Climate Change.

GHG emissions are more than 3,000 metric tons below the annual reporting threshold and are expected to remain below this threshold following implementation of the Proposed Action.

Most air quality impacts would be minor and temporary. There would be long-term incremental additions of dust from new or expanded testing and training as a result of increased vehicle operation, munitions firing, and other activities. The BMPs described above would be implemented to minimize dust generation, as appropriate. There would be slight increases to the current levels of dust generated by testing and training activities. There also would be minor long-term increases in combustion engine emissions from increased vehicle use, but, as noted above, these would not be expected to result in exceedances of air quality standards. Any contribution to cumulative impacts would be expected to be minor.

YPG is considering development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility in either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site through use of an EUL with private business. Fugitive dust generated by construction of such a facility could interact with other projects to produce temporary localized negative cumulative impacts to air quality. It is likely that any such project would result in long-term beneficial impacts to air quality through reduced fossil fuel emissions associated with other electrical generation methods; however, the use of fossil fuels to produce demineralized water to wash mirrors and to transport that water to the facility would partially offset any benefits.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would remain below all major source thresholds and any contribution to cumulative impacts would be expected to be minor.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to air quality during construction as a result of emissions from operation of construction equipment and personal vehicles and from the generation of fugitive dust. It is expected that BLM will require that construction contractors implement appropriate BMPs and equipment maintenance procedures to minimize this potential. Once operational, these facilities could contribute to beneficial impacts to regional air quality through a reduction in use of fossil fuels to generate electricity.

3.2.2.4 Mitigation

In addition to the BMPs listed above, YPG would implement the following measures during construction to reduce or eliminate fugitive dust emissions:

- Cover haul trucks to prevent materials from becoming airborne.
- Sweep Paved Areas on a regular basis during construction activities.

3.3 Airspace Management

3.3.1 Existing Conditions

There is restricted military airspace over most of YPG. This restricted military airspace also extends over most of the Kofa NWR (Figure 2-3; Table 3-5). The majority of YPG restricted airspace is used for test missions; however, the U.S. Department of Justice operates a Special Use Airspace (R-2309), which restricts military mission access as well as commercial use. Outside of the Department of Justice Special Use Airspace, the restricted airspace on YPG is prioritized for testing and training conducted at the installation. YPG restricted airspace allows testing of UASs and weapons systems, such as mortars and rockets, without risk to non-military aircraft. Secondary priority for use of this restricted airspace is for other military users.

TABLE 3-5 Restricted Airspace Yuma Proving Ground Airspace Area^a Description R-2306A Covers the southern part of the Cibola Region from the surface to 80,000 ft R-2306B North of R-2306A in the Cibola Region, from the surface to 80,000 ft R-2306C West of R-3206B in the Cibola Region, from the surface to 17,000 ft R-2306D North of R-2306B in the Cibola Region, from the surface to 23,000 ft R-2306E South of R-2306A in the Cibola and Laguna Regions, from the surface to 80,000 ft Laguna and Kofa Regions west of US 95 and north of Pole Line Road, from the surface to R2307 unlimited. Also includes the southern portion of the Kofa NWR R2308A Kofa NWR from 1,500 ft above ground level (AGL) to 80,000 ft R2308B West of R-2308A in East Arm, from the surface to 80,000 ft R2308C North of R-2308A in Kofa NWR from 1,500 ft AGL to 23,000 ft Department of Justice Special Use Airspace. 1.5-mile radius from the surface to 15,000 ft, R-2309 north of CDH R-2311 Eastern Kofa Region south of Pole Line Road from the surface to 3,500 ft R-2306-F Proposed at Laguna Airfield from the surface to 3,500 ft

Airspace areas are shown on Figure 2-3

MCAS Yuma schedules airspace in the greater Yuma region and manages the restricted airspace over YPG at its Yuma Range, upon release of the airspace by YPG. This arrangement allows flight training opportunities for all services in Arizona, California, and elsewhere. Private or commercial flights may use YPG restricted airspace during periods of non-use by YPG or other military users, with proper clearance.

YPG is working with the Federal Aviation Administration to add a restricted airspace over LAAF. This action was analyzed in a previous NEPA document (Jason Associates Corporation, 2008a) and found to have no significant impacts.

3.3.2 Environmental Consequences

Because there would be no potential for impacts to this resource area, the discussion of impacts is abbreviated and significance criteria and proposed mitigation are not provided.

3.3.2.1 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no change to airspace management, beyond those previously analyzed under NEPA. As a result, there would be no potential for direct or indirect negative impacts to airspace management. Non-military use would be coordinated through MCAS Yuma to avoid conflicts with the priority remaining military use. No significant cumulative impacts would be expected.

3.3.2.2 Impacts of the Proposed Action

No changes to airspace management, beyond those previously analyzed under NEPA, would occur under the Proposed Action. There would be no potential for direct or indirect impacts to airspace management. Non-military use would be coordinated through MCAS Yuma to avoid conflicts with the priority remaining military use. No significant cumulative impacts would be expected.

3.3.2.3 Mitigation

Because no impacts to airspace management would occur, no mitigation measures are proposed for this resource.

3.4 Cultural Resources

Activities that would be implemented under the Proposed Action that could impact cultural resources include construction and demolition of facilities and infrastructure, as well as changes to current types, levels, and locations of testing and training. This DPEIS addresses the following categories of activities: near-term, well-defined activities at known locations; near-term, well-defined activities at non-specific locations; and less well-defined activities that would occur later in time. Due to the large size of YPG and the possible volume of activities, the Army is adopting a programmatic approach to this analysis to comply with NEPA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and is establishing the framework for future analysis, if required.

3.4.1 Regulatory Setting

YPG manages cultural resources through its ICRMP (YPG, 2012a). The ICRMP sets forth the specific goals, policies, and procedures to identify potential historic properties, assess them for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), nominate them for listing in the NRHP as appropriate, and manage them. Information on the identification and evaluation of historic properties at YPG in this section comes from the ICRMP. Cultural resources on Federal property are regulated by several laws, regulations, and EOs that require consideration of cultural resources in Federal planning, decision-making, and project execution. These include:

- NHPA, as amended
- Protection of Historic Properties; 36 CFR Part 800, as amended
- NRHP; 36 CFR Part 60
- National Historic Landmarks Program; 36 CFR Part 65
- National Natural Landmarks Program; 36 CFR Part 62
- NEPA

- Historic Sites Act of 1935
- Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act, as amended
- Protection of Archaeological Resources; 43 CFR Part 7
- Curation of Federally Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections; 36 CFR Part 79
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act
- Eagle Permits, Permits for Indian Religious Purposes; 50 CFR Part 22.22
- EO 11593, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment
- EO 13007, Indian Sacred Sites
- Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, 29 April 1994: Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments
- Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, 29 April 1994: Policy Concerning Distribution of Eagle Feathers for Native American Religious Purposes
- AR 200-1, Environmental Protection and Enhancement, 13 December 2007
- AR 210-20, Real Property Master Planning for Army Installations, 16 June 2005
- AR 405-80, Management of Title and Granting Use of Real Property, 10 October 1997
- AR 405-90, Disposal of Real Estate, 10 May 1985
- AR 415-15, Army Military Construction and Nonappropriated-Funded Construction Program Development and Execution, 12 June 2006

In addition, there are Program Comments issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) that apply to YPG. Due to the large number of DoD buildings that are 50 years of age or will soon reach that threshold, the ACHP issued several Program Comments that address NHPA compliance for World War II and Cold War Era properties. These Program Comments address Cold War Era (1946-1974) Unaccompanied Personnel Housing, World War II and Cold War (1939-1974) Ammunition Storage Facilities, and World War II and Cold War (1939-1974) Army Ammunition Production Facilities and Plants. Actions covered by the Program Comments include ongoing operations, maintenance, and repair; rehabilitation; renovation; mothballing; cessation of maintenance, new construction or demolition; deconstruction and salvage; remediation activities; and transfer, sale, lease, and closure of such facilities. Installations have no further requirements to identify, evaluate, treat, mitigate, or consult with the SHPO regarding these facilities, and installations may proceed with actions affecting these properties without further NHPA Section 106 compliance.

Additional ACHP Program Comments that apply to YPG are the Program Comments for all Capehart and Wherry Era (1949-62) Housing, Associated Structures, and Landscape Features. The Program Comments provide NHPA compliance for maintenance and repair;

rehabilitation; layaway and mothballing; renovation; demolition; and transfer, sale, or lease from Federal ownership for all Capehart and Wherry Era housing. The only responsibility that installations with this housing, such as YPG, have is to consider the Neighborhood Design Guidelines that are part of the Program Comments when conducting actions that will affect Capehart-Wherry housing and to document that consideration appropriately.

3.4.2 NHPA Section 106 Consultation

YPG is consulting with the Arizona SHPO, the ACHP, and interested tribes to develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA), see Appendix E, to address cultural resource issues that arise during normal operations at YPG, as well as those from proposed projects. This agreement defines the process for evaluating potential historic properties that could be affected by activities, including establishing areas that require no additional cultural resource surveys and methods for surveys in those areas that do require survey; provides a list of project types that have been determined to have no effects or no adverse effect to historic properties and thus require no or limited consultation to implement; and describes the consultation process necessary for those projects that may have adverse effects.

A Section 106 consultation meeting to present the PEIS concept to interested tribal governments was held on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14, 2011, with initial public scoping meetings held later.

Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the projects and locations for the Proposed Actions and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements. Once the Proposed Actions reached the draft development stage, Section 106 consultation continued. Letters were sent to the tribes, ACHP, and SHPO on April 24, 2012, to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings. On June 27, 2012, letters inviting participation in the Section 106 process and notifying them of an upcoming consultation meeting were sent to the SHPO, ACHP, and tribes. The tribal letters also specifically sought input regarding their knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the activities under the Proposed Action.

A Section 106 consultation meeting was held August 21-23, 2012. Sixteen representatives from 10 tribes attended in person, and the SHPO, ACHP, and USACE attended via teleconference. The proposed projects and possible PA stipulations were discussed, as well as tribal interest in specific areas of YPG, overarching tribal concerns, and general timelines for the PEIS and PA. In the fall of 2012, YPG prepared the first draft of the PA, based on the previous consultation meetings and input from the ACHP, SHPO, and tribes. The first draft of the PA was distributed to ACHP, SHPO, USACE, and the tribes in early 2013, and comments were received on this draft over the next few months. The draft PA was revised to incorporate and address these comments, as appropriate.

Another consultation meeting was held on April 17, 2013, attended by thirteen representatives from four tribes, and the ACHP and USACE attended via teleconference. The primary focus of this meeting was to review the important points of the PA, including some of the comments that had been received, and to discuss slight revisions to the proposed project list. Additional comments from the tribes were solicited on both the PA and the proposed projects. The draft PA is being revised to address additional comments received. Consultation is ongoing to finalize the PA that will allow YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes.

Copies of correspondence with the SHPO, ACHP, and tribal governments are provided in Section 8.

3.4.3 Existing Conditions

3.4.3.1 Prehistoric and Historic Setting

YPG is at the edge of an archaeological and historical region known as the North American Southwest Culture Area. This region is marked by contrasting and diverse landscapes and divergent cultural adaptations. Many of the historic and prehistoric groups inhabiting the Southwest Culture Area were largely dependent on farming. The use of agriculture was not uniform across the Southwest, and was often supplemented by hunting and gathering of wild resources (YPG, 2012a).

Archaeological evidence on YPG indicates that the area has experienced occupation by native peoples for the past 12,000 years and suggests that occupation consisted mostly of small family groups. Many of the archaeological sites are trails from the nearby Colorado and Gila Rivers to hunting areas in the mountains and other areas. While native peoples may have inhabited some of the lands, the scarcity of water, the harsh climate, and the rugged landscape likely prevented more intensive occupation (YPG, 2012a). The local tribes had a robust relationship with the landscape, which also has native religious significance (Trafzer, in preparation).

Spanish explorers and missionaries traveled through or near the area beginning in the 1500s, but settlement and occupation did not begin in the area until 1850. Mining-related activities began at that time and intensified in the 1880s. Scattered gold and silver mining took place in the highlands, and farming was concentrated in the Gila and Colorado river valleys. Remnants of abandoned mines, placers, and prospects have been identified within the Dome Rock Mountains, Trigo Peaks, Chocolate Mountains, Middle Mountains, Laguna Mountains, Muggins Mountains, and Castle Dome Mountains (YPG, 2012a).

In 1942, the Army began to use the YPG area as part of a larger Desert Training Center and in 1943, the Yuma Test Branch began to operate along the banks of the Colorado River. Initially, the Army leased buildings in Yuma and conducted test work on bridge designs, boats, and well-drilling equipment near Laguna Dam. The Yuma Test Branch was officially closed in 1950 and all of the facilities were taken over by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Most of the buildings and trailers associated with the Yuma Test Branch were dismantled and sold at public auction. In 1951, the installation was reactivated as the Yuma Test Station and was used for desert environment testing. In 1963, the installation was placed under the command of the Army Material Command (AMC) and re-designated as YPG (YPG, 2012a).

3.4.3.2 Cultural Resources

For the purposes of NEPA, cultural resources include historic properties as defined under Section 106 of the NHPA as well as other culturally significant properties. Cultural resources on YPG include prehistoric sites, historic mining sites, and historic military sites and structures. Previous surveys conducted on YPG are summarized in the ICRMP (YPG, 2012a). Historic building evaluations were conducted in 1983, 1999, 2009, and 2011. As a result of these inventories, no buildings or structures on YPG are considered eligible for listing in the NRHP. There are historic mining sites within YPG but no known town sites or other notable historic settlements from this period are within the YPG boundary. The potential historic significance and NRHP eligibility of historical mining locations within the YPG boundary has not been assessed (YPG, 2012a).

3.4.3.3 Archaeology

There are 1,924 identified archaeological sites at YPG (James, 2011, personal communication). Most identified archaeological sites occur on terraces and ridges, followed by a number of sites at water sources and within wash areas (YPG, 2012a). Archaeological sites typically contain scatters of artifacts indicating use by Native Americans, or features such as rock rings or trail segments. Approximately 170,190 ac, which represent approximately 19 percent of YPG, have been surveyed for cultural resources (James, 2011, personal communication). Areas on YPG within the Kofa, Cibola, and Laguna regions that have been surveyed for cultural resources include:

- Kofa Region southern portion and just below the East Arm and specific locations within the East Arm
- Cibola Region east of the Chocolate Mountains
- Laguna Region most of the area except portions of the southeast and southwest corners

Large areas of YPG that are not used for physically intrusive activities have not been surveyed for cultural resources. Due to the large size of YPG, a predictive model for probability of prehistoric archaeological resources was prepared (Bullard et al., 2011). This model can be used to prioritize survey efforts not associated with a specific project so that locations with a higher probability of containing cultural resources have a higher priority for being surveyed.

Based on previous cultural resource surveys, several potential historic districts and thematically related areas at YPG are eligible for listing in the NRHP. These include:

- White Tanks Management Area in the northern part of the East Arm of the Kofa Region consists of 46 archaeological sites within a 2,069-ac area. All of the sites contribute to the archaeological district which has been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP.
- Camp Laguna in the Laguna Region consists of the remains of General Patton's IV Armored camp along Imperial Dam Road west of US 95. Remains of the camp are found in 21 separate components. Although a formal determination has not been made, YPG and SHPO consider Camp Laguna to be eligible for the NRHP as a district.
- The Direct Fire Range in the Kofa Region near the Muggins Mountains contains 54 sites in 5 distinct locations within a 5,652-ac area. Each of the five locations is considered an eligible historic district, although formal determinations have not been made. The five historic districts are the Red Bluff Pediment District, Red Bluff Basin District, Muggins Basin District, Upper Basin District, and Gila Watershed District.
- The Ammunition Storage, Handling, and Testing Facilities contain 20 sites in 4 distinct patterns within a 2,223-ac area. Each of the four locations is considered an eligible historic district, although formal determinations have not been made. The four historic

districts are the Castle Dome Plain District, Castle Dome Wash District, 9-Alpha North District, and 9-Alpha East District.

- The Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area contains 161 sites within a 9,902-ac area in the south-central portion of YPG. All 161 sites were determined eligible for the NRHP as thematically-related property types under a multiple property designation.
- The Red Bluff Range Combat Systems Maneuver Area contains 96 sites within a 5,434-ac area in the south-central portion of YPG. All 96 sites were determined eligible for the NRHP as thematically-related property types under a multiple property designation.

Other areas, all located in the Cibola Region, have been identified that may contain resources of sufficient significance and integrity to be eligible for listing in the NRHP as historic districts (YPG, 2012a), and include:

- Mohave Tanks
- Mohave Wash
- Yuma Wash

Built Environment

Currently, no buildings or structures at YPG are listed in the NRHP, and none are considered nor have been determined eligible for the NRHP except for a collection of 26 military residences. These buildings were previously determined eligible for the NRHP, but they are covered by the Program Comment for Capehart-Wherry Army residences. The only compliance measure required for them is consideration of the Neighborhood Design Guidelines that are part of the Program Comments when conducting actions that will affect Capehart-Wherry housing, and to document that consideration appropriately. There are no projects proposed under this PEIS that would affect these residences.

Tribal Resources

The White Tanks Management Area is considered a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) by affiliated Native American tribes, and it is likely that other notable site complexes (such as Mohave Tanks) would be considered TCPs. Although YPG has sponsored ethnographic studies for some of the area tribes, no TCPs have been formally identified on YPG (McDonald, 2011 personal communication). Due to the long-standing, rich, and varied Native American history associated with the installation area, it is highly likely that some recorded archaeological sites would also be considered TCPs, and that other TCPs are present in the area.

The YPG ICRMP identifies Native American tribes with an interest at YPG and includes recommendations and guidelines for the treatment of TCPs and sacred and ceremonial sites, as well as a delineated approach to the consultation process with the identified tribes. YPG has developed a consultation plan for Native American tribes with interests in the installation lands (Tierra Environmental Services, 2001). YPG has previously undertaken consultation with the regional tribes and has begun the process for this PEIS in accordance with this plan (see Section 3.4.2).

Paleobotanical Resources

Paleontological remains and deposits, which include paleobotanical resources, are considered objects of antiquity and are protected by the Antiquities Act of 1906, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and Chapter 6 of AR 200-1, "Cultural

Resources." Paleobotanical resources on YPG consist of petrified wood and occur in varying abundance in the southwest corner of the Laguna Region, which is not accessible to the general public. Petrified wood occurs as fragments typically ranging in size from 10 to 16 inches and occasionally reaching 6.5 ft (DoD, 1998). The quantity of petrified wood in this area ranges from abundant to none. Remnants of plants that grew along the Colorado River during the Pliocene were deposited on YPG when the Colorado River left alluvial deposits containing petrified wood in the Laguna Region. There are also areas where paleobotanical resources may have been lost to disturbance (YPG, 2012a). Paleobotanical resources can provide information of past climate characteristics and historical vegetation makeup of the Yuma area and also could contribute to understanding of the tectonic history of the region. Paleontological resources are managed through the YPG ICRMP. YPG directs people to not disturb petrified wood, as it is illegal to remove these resources from YPG (YPG, 2012a).

3.4.4 Environmental Consequences

Development projects have the potential to disturb soil surfaces and alter viewsheds at YPG, which has the potential to impact cultural resources.

The following were evaluated to determine the potential impacts to cultural resources from the Proposed Action:

- Construction and demolition activities that could physically diminish or destroy NRHPeligible archaeological sites, or information contained therein.
- Activities such as road grading that could damage archaeological sites.
- Activities that could impact archaeological sites by introducing human interaction to remote areas.
- Activities that could impact the viewshed of a historic property by altering the feeling, setting, or association of the property or by altering the visual landscape associated with that property.
- Activities that could impact a sacred site or TCP by physically altering or diminishing it, or by disrupting the traditional use or religious activities associated with that site, or that would hinder the access of a particular group to an associated sacred site or TCP.

The impact analysis was based on the probability of disturbance to sites considered eligible for listing in the NRHP or to sites identified but not yet evaluated for eligibility for listing in the NRHP. Sites previously evaluated that were determined to be ineligible for listing in the NRHP were not considered in the analysis.

3.4.5 Significance Criteria

Any impact to cultural resources is potentially irreversible and any data lost could be irretrievable. The significance criteria that were used to determine potential impacts to cultural resources were:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that affect known or unknown historic, prehistoric, or other cultural resources but do not alter their eligibility for listing in the NRHP.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Pedestrian activities that occur in areas known to contain paleobotanical resources.

- Severe (significant) Activities that result in alteration of an NRHP-eligible resource such that the resource would no longer be eligible for listing. Also, the loss of any NRHP-eligible resource.
- Severe (significant) Activities that include earthmoving in areas known to contain paleobotanical resources.
- Beneficial Activities that preserve or enhance identified cultural resources.

3.4.6 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no change in current practices and activities at YPG would occur. There would be no new construction activities or expansion of maneuver and munitions impact areas. YPG would continue to follow the procedures stipulated in its ICRMP, which contains specific guidance for the inventory, evaluation, and management of culturally significant properties on the installation. Continued implementation of the ICRMP will ensure that the Army is compliant with applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding cultural resources. YPG will conduct Section 106 consultation as required under the NHPA regarding current projects, testing, and training activities that have the potential to affect historic properties. The Army is committed to participating in the Section 106 process, including implementation of any resulting mitigation measures.

Buried archaeological deposits may not be detected during the cultural resource survey process and may be inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities. The potential for impacts to significant cultural resources identified through inadvertent discovery from current practices and activities at YPG would remain. Any inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources would be addressed through the inadvertent discovery process specified in the ICRMP. Implementation of inadvertent discovery procedures, as appropriate, would minimize the potential for impact to previously unknown cultural resources.

The YPG inadvertent discovery process requires that, in the event of discovery of previously unknown archaeological deposits, all activity would cease and the YPG Cultural Resources Manager be notified. The Cultural Resources Manager would inspect and test the archaeological deposits and determine the course of action based on the significance of the findings. The Arizona SHPO would be notified if the Cultural Resources Manager determined that the findings were of significance. Relocation of the proposed activity would be the preferred course of action if the findings are determined to be of significance. The Cultural Resources Manager would consult with the Arizona SHPO concerning documentation and mitigation if the activity cannot be relocated. The ground-disturbing activity would not resume until the inadvertent discovery process is completed (YPG, 2012a).

Considering the size of YPG, unauthorized access to portions of the installation may occur. Vandalism by unauthorized persons has the potential to impact cultural resources, including paleobotanical resources, and would be addressed through existing policies and procedures as situations arise.

3.4.7 Impacts of the Proposed Action

Some activities would occur in areas that have been previously surveyed and determined to contain no historic properties through NHPA Section 106 consultation with SHPO and

Federally Recognized Tribes that consider the YPG area to be part of their ancestral lands. These activities would not impact cultural resources and would have no potential for cumulative impacts to cultural resources. The potential would exist for inadvertent discovery of cultural resources in these areas and the YPG inadvertent discovery policy and process specified in the ICRMP would be followed should this occur. Areas containing known significant cultural resources were avoided through site selection during the planning process.

Proposed activities that would occur in areas where cultural resource surveys have not been completed or where surveys have been done but NHPA Section 106 consultation is not complete would be subject to site-specific cultural resource survey and evaluation as needed, and NHPA Section 106 consultation. The YPG Cultural Resources Manager would determine whether site-specific cultural resource studies or consultation would be required prior to implementation of proposed activities in these areas, in compliance with the PA. Any cultural resource identification and consultation requirements would be completed prior to implementation of these activities. Proposed activities with potential to impact significant cultural resources, if such resources are present, include:

- Construction of buildings, test courses, drop zones, landing pads, and other facilities
- Relocation and construction of roadways
- Installation of new utility infrastructure
- Off-road vehicle and equipment testing
- Munitions testing
- Establishment of TGPs

A site specific NEPA analysis would be tiered from this PEIS for any such projects that would have potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to known significant cultural resources. For projects where no impacts to known significant cultural resources would result, the tiered NEPA analysis would likely be a Record of Environmental Consideration for a Categorical Exclusion, assuming all screening criteria of 32 CFR §651.29 are met. Should there be unavoidable impacts to known significant cultural resources, a focused environmental assessment could be required. The potential for activities to impact cultural resources is discussed by region below.

Vandalism by unauthorized persons would continue to have the potential to impact cultural resources, including paleobotanical resources, and would be addressed through existing policies and procedures as situations arise.

Laguna Region. Most new building construction under the Proposed Action would occur in the Laguna Region. Most proposed activities in the Laguna Region would occur in cantonment areas or other previously disturbed areas. Activities were sited through the planning process to avoid known cultural resources and to be within areas previously surveyed to the extent practicable. Munitions testing does not occur in the Laguna Region and no TGPs would be established in this region. No new off-road vehicle testing in the Laguna Region would occur under the Proposed Action. Inadvertent discovery of cultural resources could occur in these areas and the inadvertent discovery process specified in the ICRMP and discussed in Section 3.4.6 would be followed should such discoveries occur.

Approximately 9,150 linear feet (lf) of electrical transmission and telecommunications lines would be installed in the Laguna Region. As long as these lines would be installed in existing previously disturbed rights-of-way, easements, distribution systems, or facilities, they would be

considered to have no adverse effect in accordance with Attachment D, Section A.1 of the PA. Should inadvertent discovery occur, the YPG inadvertent discovery process would be followed.

The primary potential for impacts to cultural resources would be from activities that would be implemented outside of previously surveyed areas. Activities sited outside of the previously surveyed areas would not be implemented until after completion of the consultation process and any measures stipulated as a result of that consultation.

As most proposed activities in the Laguna Region would occur in cantonment areas or other previously disturbed areas, they would not be expected to impact paleobotanical resources. Proposed activities in the Laguna Region with potential to impact paleobotanical resources are identified in Table 3-8.

TABLE 3-8

Activities that Could Impact Paleobotanical Resources Yuma Proving Ground

Proposed Action	Quantity and Potential Impact
L014	New construction would occur in areas where petrified wood occurs with frequencies ranging from uncommon to common but within a previously disturbed area (Comanche Flats), which would minimize the potential for impacts. Potential impacts could occur due to construction activities or from illegal removal by YPG or construction personnel.
L017	New construction would occur in areas where petrified wood occurs with frequencies ranging from uncommon to rare but within a previously disturbed area (TM Site 4), which would minimize the potential for impacts. Potential impacts could occur due to construction activities or from illegal removal by YPG or construction personnel.
L018	New construction would occur in areas where petrified wood is common but within a previously disturbed area (Sidewinder Sensor Site), which would minimize the potential for impacts. Potential impacts could occur due to construction activities or from illegal removal by YPG or construction personnel.
L019	Dismounted maneuver area expansion would occur in areas mostly where petrified wood has not been found and also in areas where petrified wood occurs with frequencies ranging from uncommon to rare. Potential impacts could result from illegal removal of the resource by personnel.
L101	New construction would occur in areas where petrified wood is abundant to none observed (area disturbed), but would be north of the LAAF vicinity, a previously disturbed area. Potential impacts could occur due to construction activities or from illegal removal by YPG or construction personnel.
L002, L003, L008, L102	New construction would occur in areas outside but near LAAF where petrified wood is abundant to none observed (area disturbed). Potential impacts could occur due to construction activities or from illegal removal by YPG or construction personnel.

Source: YPG, 2012a

Potential impacts to paleobotanical resources would likely be from minor to moderate with implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation for paleobotanical resources would include Environmental Awareness Training for troops, other YPG personnel, and construction contractors who would work in areas where paleobotanical resources occur. This training would provide instruction on the importance of these resources and the protection afforded petrified wood on YPG. Mitigation also would include siting ground-disturbing activities in areas where petrified wood does not occur to the extent practicable. The YPG inadvertent discovery process would apply to petrified wood.

Cibola Region. Activities including construction, aircraft armament testing, static detonation, conflagration testing, combat skills training, instrument DZs, and extraction zones would occur in the Cibola Region under the Proposed Action. Inadvertent discovery of cultural resources could occur in previously surveyed areas; the YPG inadvertent discovery process would be followed should such discoveries occur.

Two proposed activities in areas not previously surveyed for cultural resources would be unlikely to impact cultural resources:

- C031 Use Site 6 as a meteorological station. No new disturbance would occur at this previously disturbed site.
- C036 Increase use of Prospect Square for bombing or aircraft gunnery. Prospect Square is an existing impact area for inert and explosive weapons. Use would increase, but no land not previously disturbed through munitions impacts would be disturbed. Safety concerns associated with potential UXO in Prospect Square preclude additional cultural resource surveys in this area.

Effects to cultural resources from activities in the Cibola Region would be addressed through the consultation process, as stipulated in the PA.

Kofa Region. Proposed activities, including direct and indirect fire, the use of expanded range areas, and the creation of new GPs, would occur in the Kofa Region. Inadvertent discovery of cultural resources could occur in previously surveyed areas; the YPG inadvertent discovery process would be followed should such discoveries occur.

Effects to cultural resources from activities in the Kofa Region would be addressed through the consultation process, as stipulated in the PA.

Cumulative Impacts. When assessing cumulative impacts to cultural resources, the Quartzite Solar Energy Project was considered. The proposed project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County, and the project area contains one cultural property that is recommended as eligible for inclusion in the NRHP that could be affected; impacts would be mitigated through avoidance and construction monitoring. Any contribution to cumulative impacts to cultural resources from the Quartzite Solar Energy Project would be expected to be minor.

Development of this commercial scale, renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site, which is in the Laguna Region, or the Northeast Cibola Site in the Cibola Region could impact cultural resources, and any such impacts could interact with project activities analyzed in this DPEIS that impact cultural resources, resulting in cumulative effects. However, compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and implementation of appropriate mitigation developed through the consultation process would likely prevent significant cumulative impacts to these resources.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to regional cultural resources. At this time cultural resources in the project areas are unknown and the potential for cumulative impacts to this resource area cannot be assessed accurately. However, it is expected that BLM will require that these projects conduct appropriate investigations and consultation with SHPO regarding cultural resources to ensure that these resources are not negatively impacted or to develop and

implement appropriate mitigation for unavoidable impacts that would Reduce impacts to less than significant and minimize the potential for cumulative impacts.

3.4.8 Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation

The YPG ICRMP specifies how YPG can mitigate impacts to historic properties through avoidance, physical protection, data recovery, or other mitigation measures (YPG, 2012a). The following are measures for the protection and mitigation of prehistoric and historic archaeological sites.

- Avoidance of areas having significant sites is the preferred and most effective way to protect NRHP-eligible sites. Coordination of mission activity planning and cultural resource management can be useful in determining where significant sites exist and where to move or adjust the activities so that significant sites are avoided.
- Physical protection of individual sites by fencing, berming, or taking other protective measures to make them inaccessible during construction or project implementation may be necessary to protect archaeological sites. This can be accomplished by placing temporary fencing or berming around site boundaries or marking site boundaries with flagging or stakes, in combination with written, graphic, and verbal instructions for avoidance.
- When the protection of a cultural resource is not feasible, then data recovery may be performed to mitigate for a loss of site integrity and information potential. A data recovery plan would be structured to present a representative sample of the data that established the significance of the site. Data recovery would be in compliance with federal standards (36 CFR Part 66; 48 FR 44734-44737).

The U.S. Army YPG has determined that implementation of projects in this DPEIS would impact cultural resources at YPG. A Section 106 PA is being developed, in consultation with SHPO, ACHP, and interested tribes, which will establish areas at YPG requiring no additional cultural resources survey and will identify the types of projects that have been determined to have no effects or no adverse effects on historic properties. These project types will not require mitigation. Other project types will require further analysis and consultation.

Some proposed activities would have no potential to impact cultural resources. These activities either used the planning process to avoid impacts to cultural resources or by chance were sited in areas where known cultural resources do not occur. No further mitigation, beyond avoidance of known cultural resources, would be required for these activities.

There are some proposed activities for which the potential to impact cultural resources is unknown, either because the location for the activity is not known at this time or because the proposed location is within an area where cultural resource surveys have not been conducted or where consultation with the Arizona SHPO regarding the potential eligibility of identified cultural resources has not been completed. These projects would be evaluated prior to implementation, in compliance with the PA. If necessary, cultural resource surveys of the proposed project area would be completed.

Should consultation determine that significant cultural resources occur within a proposed project area, YPG would first attempt to modify the project design to avoid or protect the

identified resources. For activities where avoidance or protection of cultural resources would not be possible, YPG would consult with the SHPO, ACHP, and tribes as specified in the PA. Mitigation measures to protect paleobotanical resources on YPG would include Environmental Awareness Training for troops conducting dismounted maneuvers and for other persons working in areas where paleobotanical resources could occur. The site selection process would give consideration to avoiding locations of known paleobotanical resources. Where unavoidable impacts to paleobotanical resources would result from an activity, data recovery would be implemented. The inadvertent discovery process also would be applied should construction activities result in discovery of these resources.

3.5 Energy/Utilities

3.5.1 Existing Conditions

Most human activity and utility use is concentrated in cantonments, which make up approximately 0.2 percent of the YPG land area. Utility infrastructure is concentrated in those areas of heavy use. Water, electricity, telecommunications, and wastewater services are generally limited to cantonments and the immediate vicinity, although some downrange areas are equipped with water wells, electricity, and telecommunications. The majority of YPG has no utility services; water is typically trucked to remote testing and training sites, and power is provided by portable generators.

Privatization of utilities on YPG is scheduled to be completed in 2018-2020. Private firms would then be responsible for managing, controlling, and performing operations, maintenance, repairs, replacements, and upgrades for all utilities and associated infrastructure as needed.

3.5.1.1 Energy/Electricity

YPG receives electricity from four sources, with the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) being the primary provider. WAPA provides power from hydroelectric stations on the Colorado River and from Davis and Parker Dams (Gutierrez Canales Engineering, P.C., 2011). The Wellton-Mohawk Drainage District manages the electricity supply from the WAPA (Parsons, 2008). The Wellton-Mohawk Drainage District is the secondary power supplier. The Arizona Public Service Company also supplies power through two small delivery points (Skaggs, 2013, personal communication).

Low voltage power (480 volts and less) on YPG is provided from a variety of delivery points, but is primarily routed from the Kofa Region 161-kilovolt (kV) transmission substation to the rest of YPG through 69-kV, 34.5-kV, and 12.47-kV transmission lines and a series of substations. The low voltage system is supplied by overhead and pad-mounted distribution transformers connected to the high voltage system. Some substations may require upgrades or modifications to meet future needs, while others are underutilized and capable of supplementing areas nearing capacity or experiencing increased demand.

YPG has three operational solar arrays to augment electrical power supply. Two of the solar arrays, a 143.75kV system and a 95kV system, are in the YTC area and a 44kV system is in the northern part of Cibola. In addition, there are two other solar array systems on YPG that are not operational. A 600kV system at the MAA is off-line due to storm damage. A 131.25-kV solar field was constructed and operated historically in the Kofa Region but is not currently operational. YPG is investigating placing these systems back in operation (Skaggs,

2013, personal communication). YPG has 35 standby power generators for emergency power as needed (Brandon, 2011a, personal communication).

Many remote and down-range testing and training areas are not wired for electrical power from the existing transmission system. Non-road engine generators and stationary generators are used in these areas when power is needed to support activities.

3.5.1.2 Water

Drinking water quality at YPG conforms to the Federal criteria pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), as amended, and by State of Arizona or local regulations. The ADEQ has primacy for drinking water regulation enforcement under AAC Title 18, *Environmental Quality*, Chapter 4, *Department of Environmental Quality, Safe Drinking Water* (AAC R18-4); however, all federal regulation (40 CFR Part 141 & 142) is reviewed to ensure full compliance.

Much of the groundwater on YPG contains levels of fluoride, and arsenic above the national drinking water standards. Naturally occurring arsenic has been detected at levels averaging 18 to 29 ppb in YPG groundwater. In 2006, the USEPA lowered the maximum contaminant level for arsenic from 50 to 10 ppb, which resulted in a notice of violation issued by USEPA for three of YPG's Public Water Systems. To meet the new federal standard for public drinking water supply, YPG completed construction of two new water treatment facilities in 2011. All Public Water Systems on YPG currently meet Federal primary drinking water standards (Obregon, 2013b, personal communication).

Yuma Proving Ground currently has three Public Water Systems (as defined by 40 CFR 141.2). The three water systems on YPG are the MAA, KFR, and YTC cantonment areas. The MAA is unique in that it has a duel parallel system (potable and non-potable) and it is classified as a "community water system". The MAA is the only community water system on YPG (Obregon, 2013b, personal communication).

YPG has other smaller water systems that are not regulated by the SDWA provisions because they do not qualify as Public Water Systems. Other areas on YPG, including the Dynamometer building, Sites 4 & 4E, Cobra Flats, and other down range sites that are equipped with piped water are not supplied by the new water treatment facilities and continue to be supplied by existing wells (Obregon, 2013b, personal communication). Developed areas outside of the cantonment areas typically use bottled water for potable purposes. Drinking water either bottled or in bulk amounts, is delivered to remote areas lacking water treatment capabilities or water distribution (Parsons, 2011).

A total of three water treatment facilities, one for public water systems, produce potable water for the main cantonment areas (Obregon, 2013b, personal communication). Each of these treatment facilities uses electrodialysis reversal treatment technology to produce potable water. The MAA water treatment facility is supplied by two primary wells and a back-up well that draws from the Colorado River aquifer with a combined capacity of 6.61 million gallons per day (mgd) and operates at 33 percent capacity on average, with peak demand during August, rising to 46 percent capacity. The water treatment plant serving the YTC and LAAF cantonment areas can produce up to 72,000 gallons per day (gpd) and the Kofa cantonment plant can produce up to 144,000 gpd. Potable water is distributed primarily through cast iron pipes, and the systems include a series of storage tanks to aid distribution (Parsons, 2011).

Water distribution systems are tested regularly in compliance with Arizona Drinking Water Regulations, the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, and corresponding National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (40 CFR 141 & 142). The classification of each water system dictates a specific set of parameters (contaminates) and frequencies at which they need to be monitored. Testing is done monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, annually, and some are done on a 3-year cycle l depending on regulatory requirements (Obregon, 2013b, personal communication).

Non-potable water is mainly used for irrigation, cooling, dust suppression, and restrooms (Parsons, 2011). Non-potable water also is used for fire suppression, if excess water is available at the time of a fire.

Operational training is conducted in Training Area Bravo with water purification systems. Marine support squads conduct operational training using transportable RO systems in Training Area Bravo to purify water withdrawn from the Gila Gravity Main Canal under a permit issued to YPG. Brine from the purification process is released in the fording basin, where it evaporates.

YPG complies with EOs 12423 and 13514, which target reduction of water use and introduction of water reuse initiatives. To help meet these requirements, water usage by all on-post customers is metered and is charged based on use.

3.5.1.3 Telecommunications

YPG uses an information transfer system, which includes 600 miles of fiber optic cable, with four main connecting points. The bandwidth typical of this system is 1 gigabyte per second. Voice and data connectivity systems function well at YTC, the Kofa cantonment, CDH, and CDA, but service in the MAA can be unreliable (Parsons, 2011). Remote locations, such as test areas and GPs, typically are not connected to the data network and must use satellite uplinks powered by portable generators to relay data to YTC and the Kofa cantonments for analysis.

A total of 57 registered radio and cell towers are in Yuma County, mostly in the City of Yuma or along U.S. Interstate 8 (I-8) (Homefacts.com, 2011a). Nineteen towers are in La Paz County, 13 of which are found in Quartzsite, Arizona (Homefacts.com, 2011b). One cell tower is located on Hill 630 within the YPG boundary.

3.5.1.4 Wastewater

There is no centralized treatment of wastewater on YPG. Wastewater disposal systems on YPG consist of individual septic systems, chemical toilets, and localized collection systems served by sewer lagoon systems (Parsons, 2008). There are 23 active sewer lagoon cells, 8 lift stations, and 38 individual septic systems (Parsons, 2011). The number of wastewater disposal systems will likely change in the future but specific designs for additional wastewater disposal systems have not been developed and are not included in this analysis (Brian Hoon, 2013, personal communication). Sewage lagoons are used at MAA, YTC, LAAF, and the Kofa cantonment.

Wastewater on YPG is managed by a no-discharge process permitted by ADEQ aquifer protection permits, with final disposal through septic system leach fields or through sewer lagoon evaporation. Industrial stormwater discharge is authorized by the Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Multi-Sector General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity from Non-Mining Facilities to Waters of the U.S. (AZMSGP2010-002).

Localized wastewater collection systems typically are gravity fed, with pump stations where needed. Collection systems consist of vitrified clay pipes, asbestos cement pipe, and polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipes. Sewer systems receive domestic sewage from connected sources and minor industrial discharge such as, brine from potable WTPs, vehicle wash water after it passes through oil water separators, and water from air conditioning units. Sewage lagoon cells are inspected and operated by certified wastewater operators and typically operate below capacity. The wastewater system in the Kofa cantonment is close to capacity during peak usage periods and is approaching capacity for average use (Brian Hoon, 2013, personal communication). Plans are in place to expand the Kofa cantonment sewer system.

The wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) at CDH consists of one un-lined sewage lagoon with a capacity of 7,000 gpd. Wastewater data for the CDH area are currently not available, although no concerns have been identified for these areas (Parsons, 2011). Septic systems or chemical toilets are used for domestic wastewater treatment at CDA and in other remote areas and other areas lacking lagoon systems. Septic tanks and chemical toilets are maintained regularly to assure proper functioning (YPG, 2012b).

3.5.1.5 Non-Hazardous Solid Waste

YPG has a non-hazardous solid waste landfill permitted under an Arizona Aquifer Protection permit that accepts household waste, vegetative waste, dried sewage sludge, and inert material such as brick, rock, gravel, and sand. The landfill can accept up to 20 tons per day, averaged annually and no more than 10 percent of its daily volume can be vegetative waste. Construction and demolition (C&D) waste is sent to commercial landfills. As part of the housing privatization in 2009, any municipal waste from housing is taken to an off-post landfill. The current non-hazardous waste landfill is tentatively scheduled for closure in 2020. An extension may be requested from ADEQ if the landfill has not reached capacity by 2020 (Jason Associates Corporation and North Wind Environmental, 2000).

3.5.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to energy and utilities:

- Change in energy demand resulting from construction and operation of proposed activities or from increased testing or training activities
- Change in water/wastewater demand resulting from construction and operation of proposed activities or from increased testing or training
- Increased landfill demand resulting from construction and demolition activities.

3.5.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to energy and utilities include:

• Negligible (less than significant) – Activities that have barely perceptible impacts on local and regional energy, water, landfill, and sewer service demand.

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would have noticeable impacts on local and regional energy, water, landfill, and sewer service demand
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would result in increased groundwater consumption but that would not deplete groundwater resources.
- Severe (significant) Groundwater is depleted to the degree that subsidence causes fissures to form.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would create energy, water, landfill, or sewer service demand in excess of existing supply or capacity
- Beneficial Activities that would result in a reduction of demand for energy, water, landfill, or sewer services

3.5.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, testing and training activities would continue at current levels and no new construction would occur. No remote locations would receive utility extensions, and use of portable generators for power and satellite uplinks for telecommunications/data transfer would continue at current levels. Cantonments outside of the MAA would continue to use bottled water or individual RO systems for potable water. The wastewater system in the Kofa cantonment would continue to be undersized to meet the needs of that area until the sewer system is expanded as planned. The non-hazardous solid waste landfill would continue to be used until it is closed, which is tentatively scheduled for 2020 (Jason Associates Corporation and North Wind Environmental, 2000). Under the No Action Alternative, no significant increase in non-hazardous waste is anticipated. No significant impacts to the non-hazardous landfill capacity are anticipated.

The continued use of portable generators at current levels would be less efficient than installation of hard power to many areas. Considering the cost of transport of a generator and its fuel, portable generators are less efficient compared to large power sources that provide electricity to the power grid and also contribute greater amounts of air pollution per unit of power produced than permanent sources (U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment, 1993). Air emissions from use of portable generators would remain unchanged under the No Action Alternative. In addition, there would be continued emissions from vehicles used to transport fuel to the remote generators during testing events. The potential for impacts to air quality from continued use of portable generators at current levels is discussed further in Section 3.2. There would be no beneficial impacts associated with installation of hard power under the No Action Alternative.

The cell and radio towers located on or near YPG have the potential to cause interference with sensor testing and communication. Ongoing activities at YPG would continue to be sited to avoid interference from the towers. There would be potential for scheduling conflicts when multiple users need to use areas free of electromagnetic interference at the same time. No additional impacts are expected to occur.

Other beneficial impacts associated with utility improvements would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

3.5.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Proposed Action includes training and testing activities that would occur under the No Action Alternative, an increase in training and testing activities, and new construction.

Construction of new facilities to replace existing structures would result in a net reduction in energy demand because the new buildings would be more energy-efficient than the older structures that would be replaced. Where new structures would be built to provide new services rather than replacing an existing structure, the increased energy demand of the new building would be less than the demand of a comparably sized older structure due to the efficient designs that would be required. Because much of the new construction would provide new services rather than replacement, a net increase in energy demand would be expected. Because of the efficient design requirements, the impact on regional utility use would be minor to moderate and within the capacity of the existing infrastructure.

Increased testing and training under the Proposed Action would likely result in increased consumption of energy on YPG. It is not possible to quantify the increase due to the lack of specific information on number of personnel, duration of tests, specific equipment to be tested, and other details. Increased use of lighter-than-air UASs, rather than conventional UASs, would result in reduced energy needs to operate the equipment being tested. YPG would be testing alternative fuel and hybrid vehicles/equipment in the future, and this could result in decreased energy demand for some tests. Because this type of equipment has not previously been tested on YPG, actual energy demand is not known. The increased demand is expected to be within the capacity of existing energy supplies, particularly when coupled with other energy/utility activities discussed below that would result in reduced demand for energy on YPG. The overall effect is expected to be a small net increase in demand, which would be a minor impact to energy use in the region. Energy/utility construction improvements would result from certain proposed activities (Table 3-13).

Yuma Proving Ground			
C004-b	C005-b	C007-b	C008-b
C012-b	C013-b	C014-b	C017-b
С020-b	C021-e	C023-d	C024-b
C025-b	C026-c	C029-b	C030-b
C033-b	C040	C048	C050-b
K004-b	K005	K007-b	K009
K012-b	K023	K025-b	K029
K031	L001-b	L002-b	L013-b
L014-c	L015-b	L016-b	L104

TABLE 3-13 Proposed Activities that Would Result in Utility Improvements

Installation of solar-powered lights would reduce the demand for energy derived from fossil fuels and currently provided by portable generators on an as-needed basis. This action would result in a small decrease in demand and a minor benefit to regional utilities.

Approximately 9,150 lf of electrical transmission lines would be installed in the Laguna Region. Approximately 2,050 lf of transmission line would be installed down-range in the Kofa Region. The Cibola Region would see the largest increase in access to electrical power to remote test locations, with approximately 213,000 lf of new lines. The installation of hard power to multiple locations across YPG would reduce the use of portable generators. Because power from the grid would be produced more efficiently than power from portable generators, there would be a reduction in energy consumption during testing once these areas receive electrical power via transmission lines. There also would be a reduction in energy used to transport generators and fuel to test locations. Replacement of portable generate benefit to energy consumption in the region. A long-term cumulative benefit to air quality (Section 3.2) would be expected from this action due to the reduction in emissions.

The installation of fiber and telecommunication service to remote locations and other areas across YPG would further reduce the use of portable generators to power satellite uplinks or data transfer and communications. The benefits to energy use would be similar to those described for installation of hard power. Any indirect benefits to air quality also would be similar to those described for hard power.

The reduction in the use of portable generators also would reduce the need to transport fuel for operation of generators to the areas receiving hard power and telecommunications services. This would reduce the use of vehicles to transport fuel, with associated reductions in fuel consumption and air emissions. As a result, the elimination of transporting fuel to these sites would indirectly benefit regional energy use and provide beneficial cumulative impacts to air quality. In addition, there would be reduced potential for petroleum spills, either from transport accidents or from refueling spills. This would be an indirect beneficial impact with regard to hazardous material by reducing the potential for a release of petroleum products to the environment. See Section 3.9 for more information.

The proposed WTP for CDH would result in a small increased demand for groundwater, which would be within the capacity of the aquifer. Any impacts to groundwater would be minor. See Section 3.20 for additional information.

The CDH WTP would reduce the need for bulk and bottled water at CDH, which would be a minor positive impact on water utilities. Operation of this plant also would reduce generation of solid waste associated with bottled water and fuel consumption from the delivery of bottled water. This would be a minor cumulative benefit to waste generation and fuel consumption. There would be an increase in groundwater consumption, but any subsidence associated with the increased withdrawal of water to supply the CDH WTP would be minor to moderate and no surface fissures would result.

The proposed wastewater treatment facility at CDH would replace the outdated system and provide increased capacity and treatment quality. This new facility would provide benefits to wastewater utilities compared to the existing system.

The proposed sewage lagoon for the Kofa Sewage Lagoon Expansion would provide increased capacity and treatment quality and would provide benefits to wastewater utilities compared to the existing system.

Sewer services are proposed for a few remote locations on YPG and would slightly reduce the use of septic or portable wastewater systems. The number of remote locations proposed for sewer connections is minimal and any change in the use of septic or portable wastewater systems in remote areas of YPG would be negligible.

Several areas remote from existing telecommunications infrastructure and associated electromagnetic interference would be established for use in testing activities. As a result of the increased testing areas without electromagnetic interference, YPG would have greater flexibility to avoid conflicts when scheduling multiple users for these areas, which would benefit the mission of YPG.

Construction and operation of an East Kofa Operations Center (K025 a and b) would include a small building complex, perimeter fencing, vehicle maintenance area, storage areas, tactical vehicle wash rack, 40-ton crane, and all utilities. No utilities are available at this site, so the facility would represent a new demand on these resources. Water would be addressed onsite through construction, operation, and maintenance of a water well. Wastewater would be addressed through an onsite treatment facility and septic system. Electrical power and telecommunications would require new infrastructure through placement of new transmission lines (1,370 ft² for utilities and 170 lf for electrical and telecommunication lines). The new demands would not overly burden utility services on YPG or in the surrounding area.

The proposed location of Project K030 (UAS launch/recovery system and multiple buildings) in the northern portion of the East Arm has no utility service. Electrical power would have to be provided by generators or through onsite production by solar, wind, or geothermal methods. No potable water or water treatment would be available. Water would have to be shipped in or a well system installed. Wastewater treatment would have to be provided through an onsite septic system. Construction wastes and solid wastes generated onsite during operation would have to be hauled away for appropriate disposal or incinerated onsite.

The proposed construction and demolition activities would temporarily increase the quantities of waste disposed. All C&D waste is taken off-post for disposal at one of two landfills in Yuma County that accept C&D waste. C&D waste resulting from the proposed action would not substantially alter the projected useful life of these landfills. It is not anticipated that implementation of the Proposed Action would impact the non-hazardous waste landfill located at YPG. The non-hazardous solid waste landfill would continue to be used until it is closed, which is tentatively scheduled for 2020 (Jason Associates Corporation and North Wind Environmental, 2000). The Proposed Action would not significantly alter or increase the waste stream currently being accepted by this facility. No significant impacts to the non-hazardous waste landfill capacity are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action.

YPG is considering development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site through use of an EUL with private business. Electrical power would be generated to reduce YPG's demand on electricity generated from fossil fuels and for commercial supply. Usage of renewable energy from the EUL would aid YPG in complying with the following Federal renewable energy targets:

• Energy Policy Act of 2005. Requires that Federal agencies have at least 7.5 percent of their electricity provided by renewable energy by 2013 and thereafter. The Act also allows for "double credit" for renewable energy produced onsite or on Federal lands.

- EO 13423, Sec 2 (b). Requires that at least 50 percent of Energy Policy Act of 2005 requirements be met from new sources of renewable energy and that Federal agencies implement renewable generation projects on agency property for use by the agency.
- Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. Sets a goal that 25 percent of electricity consumed in the U.S. should come from renewable resources by 2025.
- National Defense Authorization Act of 2007. Mandates that 25 percent of electricity consumed by the DoD be from renewable resources by 2025.

It is likely that any such project would result in beneficial cumulative impacts to energy and utilities by providing increased renewable energy sources in the region.

Several current or reasonably foreseeable energy projects are proposed in the YPG area and may result in cumulative impacts. The Quartzite Solar Energy Project (affiliated with WAPA) would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. An EIS has been completed for that project. There are four proposed solar projects on BLM lands within approximately 10 miles of YPG, but the sizes of these projects are unknown at this time. Arizona Public Service proposes to construct a 500-kV transmission line in 2014 that would extend from Palo Verde to Yuma and would be generally parallel and adjacent to an existing transmission line. These proposed projects would be expected to result in increased demand for water for construction, cleaning, and operation, which could cause cumulative impacts on water utilities from incremental increased consumption. In addition, these projects also would result in reduced demand for fossil fuels to generate electrical power, which would result in beneficial impacts to energy supply and usage in the region.

YPG has one reasonably foreseeable project in the Kofa Region, as plans are in place to expand the Kofa cantonment sewer system. The Secure Border Initiative has reasonably foreseeable future projects involving the construction of communication towers at various locations along the U.S. and Mexico border. The communication towers would have the potential to cause interference with sensor testing and communication at YPG that would occur in the vicinity of any new communications towers. The proposed activities at YPG would be more than 15 miles from these towers and impacts would likely be negligible. No other energy or utility cumulative impacts are expected.

3.5.2.4 Mitigation

YPG will incorporate energy-efficient design into new buildings and use solar lights where practicable. YPG also will recycle/reuse to the extent practicable to reduce waste generation. Because no significant impact to energy or utilities would occur, no additional mitigation measures are proposed for this resource area beyond the design measures that would be incorporated to comply with the Federal renewable energy targets.

3.6 Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

3.6.1 Existing Conditions

EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, is designed to ensure fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, tribal, and local programs and policies. Disproportionate impacts are defined as affecting a meaningfully greater population.

EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks, was issued in 1997 to prioritize the identification and assessment of environmental health risks and safety risks that may affect children, and to ensure that federal agency policies, programs, activities, and standards address environmental risks and safety risks to children. These risks are defined as "risks to health or to safety that are attributable to products or substances that the child is likely to come in contact with or ingest."

Yuma County and the City of Yuma exhibit similar racial profiles, with 60 percent and 55 percent of residents, respectively, indicating Hispanic or Latino heritage, which is over 25 percent higher than the State of Arizona as a whole (Table 3-14). La Paz County has a percentage of residents of Hispanic and Latino heritage similar to that of Arizona, but is 13 percent Native American, a substantially larger percentage than Yuma County or Arizona. The percentage of individuals living in poverty in Yuma County and La Paz County are similar and approximately 6 percent and 3 percent higher than in Arizona, respectively. The City of Yuma has 3 percent fewer individuals living in poverty than Yuma County and 3 percent more than Arizona (Table 3-15).

In 2010, Yuma County had a Native American population of 3,056 and there were 2,628 Native Americans dwelling in La Paz County (USCB, 2011a). The Cocopah Indian Reservation and the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation are in the vicinity of the City of Yuma. The Colorado River Indian Reservation is approximately 32 miles north of YPG near the city of Parker (University of Arizona, 2011).

TABLE 3-14
2010 Census Racial Data by Area
Yuma Proving Ground

_	Race							
Location (Population)	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	Native American Indian or Alaska Native Alone	Asian Alone	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Alone	Other Race Alone	Two or More Races	Latino ^a or Hispanic
City of Yuma, AZ (77,515)	69%	3%	2%	2%	0%	20%	5%	55%
Yuma County, AZ (160,026)	70%	2%	2%	1%	0%	21%	4%	60%
La Paz County, AZ (19,715)	70%	1%	13%	1%	0%	13%	4%	24%
State of Arizona (5,130,632)	73%	4%	5%	3%	0%	12%	3%	30%

TABLE 3-14								
2010 Census Racial Data by Area								
Yuma Proving Ground								
United States (281,421,906)	72%	13%	1%	5%	0%	6%	3%	16%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (USCB), 2011a

^a Hispanic: The 2010 Census included a category for Hispanic or Latino for individuals who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories such as "Mexican," "Puerto Rican," or "Cuban," as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino." Origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before arrival in the U.S. People who identify their origin as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino may be of any race. Totals may not add up to 100%.

TABLE 3-15

2010 Census Percentage of Children and Individuals Living Below Poverty Level *Yuma Proving Ground*

	Yuma City, Arizona	Yuma County, Arizona	La Paz County, Arizona	Arizona	United States
Children Under 18 ^ª	28%	28%	18%	25%	24%
Population Living Below Poverty Level ^b	19%	22%	19%	16%	14%

Sources:

^aUSCB, 2011a;

^bUSCB, 2011b

The Cocopah Indian Reservation covers 9.4 square miles adjacent to the Colorado River and has a population of 817 with 880 enrolled members (USCB, 2011a; University of Arizona, 2011). Agriculture, supported by irrigation from the Colorado River, is an important component of the Cocopah community economy (University of Arizona, 2011). Other businesses on the Cocopah Indian Reservation include a convenience store, a gas station, and a smoke shop, a museum, two golf courses, a casino, and a recreational vehicle (RV) park (Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, 2011a; Cocopah Indian Tribe, 2011).

The Fort Yuma Indian Reservation is home to the Quechan Indians and covers 68.1 square miles along the Colorado River in Arizona and California. The Fort Yuma Indian Reservation had a population of 2,197 in 2010 and currently has 2,668 enrolled tribal members in Arizona and California (USCB, 2011a; University of Arizona, 2011). The Tribe is mainly an agricultural community, but also relies on tourism and a sand and gravel operation to support its economy. To support tourism, the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation has five trailer and RV parks, a small grocery store, a bingo hall with plans for a new casino, a utility company, a fish and game department, and a museum (University of Arizona, 2011; Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, 2011b).

The Colorado River Indian Reservation covers 420 square miles in La Paz County, Arizona and San Bernardino and Riverside Counties in California, with 80 percent of the Reservation located in Arizona. The Reservation has a population of 8,764, with 3,389 enrolled members (USCB, 2011a; University of Arizona, 2011). The economy of the Reservation includes agriculture, recreation, light industry, casino, and government. The Tribes have senior water rights to 717,000 acre-feet of the Colorado River and produce cotton, alfalfa, wheat, feed

grains, lettuce, and melons (University of Arizona, 2011; Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, 2011c).

The percentages of children in the City of Yuma, Yuma County, and Arizona are similar. The percentage of children in La Paz County is 10 percent less than in Yuma County and 7 percent less than in Arizona as a whole. There is no disproportionate number of children in Yuma or La Paz Counties when compared to Arizona (Table 3-15).

3.6.2 Environmental Consequences

Because there would be no potential for impacts to this resource area, the discussion of impacts is abbreviated and significance criteria and proposed mitigation are not provided.

3.6.2.1 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

There would be no change to existing conditions under the No Action Alternative. As a result, there would be no potential for direct, indirect, or cumulative negative impacts to environmental justice or protection of children.

There would be no short-term beneficial impacts to the local economy as a result of construction jobs and purchase of building materials.

3.6.2.2 Impacts of the Proposed Action

All of the activities that would be implemented under the Proposed Action would be confined within the YPG boundaries and there would be no adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations living outside the installation. There may be minor short-term beneficial impacts to these communities because the construction workforce for building and demolition projects would likely be drawn from the local community and because of indirect induced benefit to the local economy. Implementation of the Proposed Action would not disproportionately impact minority and low-income populations and there would be no environmental justice impacts.

Children are not allowed within the testing and training areas of YPG. Implementation of the Proposed Action would not create any environmental health or safety issue for children. There would be no potential for direct, indirect, or cumulative negative impacts to environmental justice or protection of children.

3.6.2.3 Mitigation

Because there would be no impacts to environmental justice populations and no environmental health or safety risks to children would be created, no mitigation is proposed for this resource area.

3.7 Fire Management

3.7.1 Existing Conditions

Fire is a potentially disruptive force on both the environment and the military mission on YPG. The installation implements fire management to minimize the potential for environmental or mission effects. YPG Regulation (YPGR) 420-1 and AR 520-90 (Fire Prevention and Protection) are implemented to provide fire safety on the installation.

Native vegetation of the Sonoran Desert is not well-adapted to wildfire. Typical presettlement wildfires in the southwestern deserts were of low intensity and confined to

small areas. Post-fire recovery of vegetation in the creosote bush-bursage community typical of much of YPG is a long process and may require 100 years (Brown and Smith, 2000). With the increase in fuel load associated with invasive vegetation growth, the intensity and magnitude of desert fires have increased, potentially altering desert ecosystems at multiple levels (soil microflora, soil crusts, and vegetation) (Neary et al., 2005). The desert ecosystem can be permanently changed by frequent or intense fires. Impacts from fires on long-lived species, such as the saguaro (*Carnegia gigantea*) and the Sonoran desert tortoise (*Gopherus morafkai*), are generally considered catastrophic.

Wildfires on YPG result from natural causes, such as lightning, as well as military activities, with ignition a by-product of testing or training activities. The potential for major fires is a function of the short-term climate. When conditions are normal or dry for a period of years, the fuel load is low and disconnected due to sparse vegetation and plant-free gaps. Under these conditions, it is difficult for a wildfire to grow and spread. When conditions are wetter than normal, invasive Mediterranean grass (*Schismus barbatus*), buffelgrass (*Pennisetum cilare*), Sahara mustard (*Brassica tournefortii*), and other annual desert vegetation may fill bare areas between perennial vegetation, resulting in increased fuel loads and greater potential for wildfire to spread (Sonoran Desert Museum, 2011; YPG, 2012b). Other invasive vegetation, such as tamarisk, creates increased fuel loads along roads and other disturbed soil where water can pool, such as in borrow pits, and contributes to wildfire spread.

Wildfires on YPG also may spread and affect Kofa NWR. In early October 2005, a wildfire that originated on YPG burned more than 30,000 ac, including 26,000 ac on Kofa NWR (YPG, 2012b).

Wildfires are expensive to control, detrimental to the natural ecosystem, and can destroy equipment and structures. Large, intense wildfires may inhibit the mission of YPG. Wildfire in munitions impact areas cannot be contained by firefighters due to the presence of UXO. YPG sometimes clears plants from testing areas and impact zones to minimize the potential for wildfires to start as a result of testing or training activities (YPG, 2012b).

YPG works with the Kofa NWR to coordinate fire monitoring efforts and to interpret vegetation data from burned areas. Wildfire monitoring plots have been established across YPG and on Kofa NWR to monitor the effects of fires on vegetation and to determine the density, frequency, and diversity of vegetation that existed before the burn. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) incorporates data from YPG to model wildfire potential as part of its LANDFIRE wildfire monitoring and mapping program (YPG, 2012b). These efforts increase the understanding of wildfires and could be used to reduce the potential for fires in the future. The BLM, along with local agencies, serves as the primary responder to wildfire emergencies in the area (YPG, 2012b).

3.7.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to fire management:

- Increased fire ignition potential during construction due to the presence and operation of construction equipment
- Increased fire ignition potential from increased testing and training activities that involve potential ignition sources

- Increased wildfire spread potential as an indirect result of expansion of exotic vegetation that has a higher fuel load than native Sonoran Desert vegetation
- Increased fire management measures as an indirect result of increased wildfire ignitions

3.7.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to fire management include:

- Negligible (less than significant) Activities that have barely perceptible impacts on wildfire frequency or intensity
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would increase the likelihood or potential severity of wildfire ignition
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would contribute to an increase in the size of wildfires
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would affect wildfire response capabilities
- Severe (significant) Actions that are inconsistent with the goals and objectives of YPGR 420-1 and AR 520-90

3.7.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative there would be no change from existing conditions with regard to fire management. No new munitions impact areas would be created, no existing munitions impact areas would be expanded, and there would be no increases in testing and training activities. The potential for wildfires would remain unchanged. Conditions during years with higher rainfall would typically increase the amount of exotic invasive plant species and the fuel load in areas where these species grow. This would increase the potential for more severe fires in subsequent dry periods.

YPG implements an INRMP (YPG, 2012b) to maintain natural conditions of the installation. Continued implementation of the INRMP includes control and eradication of exotic invasive plant species, which can create very heavy fuel loads if left unchecked. Control of these species reduces the risk of extensive and intense wildfires. In addition, the ITAM program helps maintain natural desert habitats to provide suitable training and operational testing conditions. This program also reduces the potential for extensive and intense wildfires. There would be no impact to fire management under the No Action Alternative.

A new EOC would not be built near LAAF and there would be no benefits to fire management.

3.7.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

Areas that would be disturbed but not converted to impervious surfaces, such as DZs and UAS launch/recovery areas, bivouacs, and areas where vehicle operation or live-fire testing and training occur, offer the greatest potential for increased wildfire under the Proposed Action. Bivouacs, vehicle operation, and live-fire activities provide ignition sources that can result in wildfire. TGPs also could contribute to spread of wildfire.

Vegetation clearing and other areas where the ground is disturbed provide conditions favorable to establishment of exotic invasive Mediterranean grass, buffelgrass, and Sahara mustard. The role of Mediterranean grass in the spread of wildfire is controversial. Where stands become dense after wet winters, they may provide sufficient fuel to carry fire along what otherwise would be bare ground or desert pavement. Relatively small patches of buffelgrass are established at scattered locations on YPG, including some which are very remote. Should the population expand, buffelgrass will become YPG's most dangerous vegetation in terms of fuel load to carry wildfire (Merrill, 2012, personal communication). Sahara mustard is widely established on YPG and extensive stands of this species can carry fire or increase fire intensity. Mature Sahara mustard plants dry, break off at ground level, and blow across the landscape, scattering seeds. These tumbleweed-like plants can accumulate against fences and structures, creating pockets of fuel (Merrill, 2012, personal communication). The role of invasive exotic species on vegetation and potential impacts of these species are further discussed in Section 3.18. Efforts to control the spread of exotic invasive species through continued implementation of the INRMP and the ITAM program reduce the potential for severe wildfire that cover extensive acreage of the desert.

Because wildfires are suppressed in the Laguna Region, the potential for wildfire escape in the Laguna Region is low. Wildfire suppression would continue in the Laguna Region under the Proposed Action. The areas with the greatest potential for wildfire in the Laguna Region would be vehicle test courses and LTAs, because there would be ignition sources from the activities conducted in these areas. Any fires that start would be suppressed. Any impacts to activities or safety from wildfire in the Laguna Region as a result of the Proposed Action would be negligible to minor.

The potential for ignition of fires and development of extensive wildfires would be greatest in the Kofa and Cibola Regions, where live fire activities occur. In the Cibola Region, approximately 760 ac of desert scrub vegetation would be cleared for activities associated with UAS launch/recovery areas, TGPs, construction, and utilities installation. An additional approximately 71,050 ac would be converted for use as a dismounted maneuver area or vehicle test course. Approximately 16,310 ac in the Cibola Region would be converted to new or expanded munitions impact areas. In the Kofa Region, approximately 245 ac of vegetation would be cleared for activities associated with UAS launch/recovery areas, TGPs, construction, and utilities installation. An additional approximately 53,180 ac would be converted for use as a dismounted maneuver area. An additional 29,757 ac in the Kofa Region would be used for new or expanded munitions impact areas. Live-fire provides potential ignition sources and the potential for ignition is frequently down-range in very remote areas. Even if fire suppression could be implemented in areas where UXO is not a concern, the time to respond would result in the potential for substantial spread of a wildfire prior to the start of control efforts.

Operation of Project K030 in the northern portion of the East Arm would result in increased potential for wildfire ignition in northern Kofa due to operation of vehicles as staff report for and depart from work and from testing activities in an area not currently used for these purposes. Travel would be limited to existing established routes to minimize the potential for vehicle-related ignitions. Any impact on fire management would be minor.

TGPs would be established at 23 locations in the Cibola Region and up to 12 TGPs could be established in the Kofa Region annually, depending on mission needs. Individual TGPs

would clear up to 2.2 ac for use. During use, these areas would not provide substantial ignition sources because they would be maintained clear of potentially interfering vegetation. Because TGPs are multiple use areas, they are unlikely to be abandoned once established. Should a TGP be abandoned, the area would be susceptible to colonization by exotic invasive plant species, which could contribute to long-term elevated risk of wildfire ignition or spread. Continued implementation of the INRMP and ITAM program would minimize this risk.

Activities at DZs and UAS launch/recovery areas would not be expected to create substantial ignition opportunities. Areas that are cleared or disturbed would be susceptible to colonization by exotic invasive plant species, which could contribute to long-term elevated risk of wildfire ignition or spread and potentially to increased wildfire severity. Continued implementation of the INRMP and ITAM program would minimize this risk.

The proposed dismounted maneuver areas would not be cleared, but the activities conducted during training and operational testing would provide ignition sources. Likewise, new and expanded munitions impact areas would provide potential ignition sources.

The ITAM program would restore disturbed areas in testing and training areas where feasible. A program to conduct monitoring and eradication of exotic invasive plants on YPG is in development and, when complete, will be implemented in conjunction with continued implementation of the INRMP.

Expanded and new munitions impact areas would result in a long-term increase in the amount of UXO, which would continue to hamper or prevent efforts to control wildfires in down-range areas. It is not expected that any new areas would become off-limits to firefighting, as the proposed new and expanded munitions impact areas already contain UXO from historical activities.

A new EOC would be constructed near LAAF, which would be a benefit to fire management and would improve firefighting at LAAF and the surrounding area. This also would be a beneficial impact to fire management on YPG.

Impacts to fire management and the potential for wildfire to affect the YPG mission would be expected to be minor to moderate with the mitigation measures proposed.

There would be potential for cumulative impacts relative to fuel loading and potential spread of wildfires from increased potential for establishment and growth of exotic invasive plant species in areas disturbed but not converted to impervious surface. There also would be potential for incremental increase in ignition of wildfires from live fire activities resulting from the proposed action. No additional projects were identified that would have potential to interact with fire management on YPG to create cumulative impacts.

3.7.2.4 Mitigation

Mitigation measures would reduce the potential for fires and improve fire management. YPG is developing a program to monitor and manage all invasive plants on YPG. YPG would continue to implement ITAM and restore disturbed areas to natural conditions when practicable to prevent the spread of exotic invasive species.
YPG would also continue to coordinate with BLM, the Kofa NWR, and the USFS to address fire issues. YPG will share information on burn data and wildfire monitoring with these other organizations to improve fire management in the future.

To the extent allowed within safety constraints associated with UXO, efforts to control and manage wildfires on YPG would be implemented.

YPG would continue cooperative efforts with other agencies in the region to develop and interpret wildfire data.

3.8 Geological Resources

3.8.1 Existing Conditions

YPG is located within the Basin and Range Geologic Province, which is characterized by numerous mountain ranges that rise abruptly from broad, plain-like basins. Altitudes of mountains range from approximately 300 ft to more than 10,000 ft above sea level. Mountain ranges and basins in the Basin and Range Geologic Province of Arizona generally trend north to northeast and range in length from a few miles to more than 60 miles and in width from 1 mile to more than 15 miles. In the Basin and Range Geologic Province of Arizona, intermountain basins typically are through-flowing and this is the condition on YPG. Due to the proximity of the Gila and Colorado Rivers, basin washes on YPG tend to flow through to the rivers (Hendricks, 1985; U.S. Geological Survey [USGS], 2004).

The mountain-basin features of YPG result from block faulting. Exposed mountain rock weathers and is deposited as sediments, forming broad flat valleys and alluvial fans (Hendricks, 1985; USGS, 2004). Typically, sediments in basins of the Basin and Range Geologic Province result from terrestrial weathering, although some sediments in the Lower Colorado River Valley, including the YPG area, may be of marine origin (Hendricks, 1985). In this province, basin sediment depths may extend to 10,000 ft below ground surface (Hendricks, 1985); on YPG the sediment depth in basins is typically much less, but still may extend to more than 1,300 ft below ground surface (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). The type of sediment and the rate of weathering of bedrock depend on the composition of the bedrock. Sediments within basins typically contain gravels, sands, silts, clays, marl, gypsum, and salt from combinations of fluvial, lacustrine, colluvial, and alluvial fan deposits (Hendricks, 1985).

The mountain ranges in and around YPG comprise mostly tertiary and quaternary volcanic materials. The mountainous areas cover approximately 25 percent of YPG, with a maximum elevation of 2,822 ft in the Chocolate Mountains (YPG, 2012b). Dome Rock, Middle Mountains, and Castle Dome Mountains are mainly sedimentary limestone from the Paleozoic and Mesozoic eras with some sandstone, siltstone, shale, and conglomerate. The Muggins Mountains are mostly Cambrian metamorphic rocks consisting of schist, granite, and gneiss. These metamorphic rocks also crop out in the Castle Dome, Chocolate, Trigo, and Dome Rock Mountains. Minor amounts of pre-Cambrian and post-Cretaceous granites occur in the Palomas, Dome Rock, Chocolate, and Trigo ranges (YPG, 2012b).

Gold was historically mined from the Kofa, Trigo, Castle Dome, and Muggins Mountains, and also from the stream beds of the Laguna Mountains. Silver deposits, sometimes associated with lead and zinc, were mined from the Muggins and Laguna Mountains. Lead was mined in the Middle Mountains. Iron and copper were mined from the Palomas Mountains. Current mining operations are primarily limited to sources of gravel and sand for construction use. Borrow sites managed by YPG are in designated locations in developed areas, with one site in the northern Cibola Region leased to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for supply of fill materials (YPG, 2012b).

The Lost Trigo Fault is 4 miles south of the Cibola Region, Arizona and approximately 31 miles northwest of the Laguna Region cantonment. The Sheep Mountain Fault is southwest of Wellton, Arizona and approximately 35 miles from YPG. The Salton periphery zone, including the Cargo Muchacho fault zone, is 6 miles northwest of the City of Yuma. The Algodones fault zone is in the southwest corner of Arizona. The proximity to seismically active faults in southern California puts the YPG area at risk of earthquakes, though the potential for health hazard and property damage is considered low (YPG, 2012b). The chance of an earthquake with a magnitude greater than 5.0 within 50 years ranges from less than 10 percent to 40 percent across the installation. The greatest potential for earthquakes is in the southwest potential for earthquakes is in northern Cibola and eastern Kofa Regions (Parsons, 2011). The peak ground acceleration with a 2 percent chance in 50 years that would be expected from seismic activity ranges from 0.06 to 0.21 g (the acceleration due to gravity), which is considered minimal to moderate (USGS, 2008).

3.8.2 Environmental Consequences

Because there would be no potential for impacts to this resource area, the discussion of impacts is abbreviated and significance criteria and proposed mitigation are not provided.

3.8.2.1 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

There would be no change to existing conditions under the No Action Alternative. As a result, there would be no potential for direct, indirect, or cumulative negative impacts to or from geology.

3.8.2.2 Impacts of the Proposed Action

None of the considered activities would affect the geology of the region. Geologic conditions, including seismicity, are not expected to affect implementation of any considered activity. There would be no potential for direct, indirect, or cumulative negative impacts to or from geology.

3.8.2.3 Mitigation

Because no impacts to geological resources would occur, no mitigation is proposed for this resource area.

3.9 Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste

3.9.1 Existing Conditions

3.9.1.1 Background

Hazardous substances are defined as any of the following: any substance designated pursuant to Section 311 (b)(2)(A) of the Clean Water Act (CWA); any element, compound, mixture, solution, or substance designated pursuant to Section 102 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA); any hazardous waste having the characteristics identified under RCRA; any toxic pollutant listed under the Toxic

Substances Control Act (TSCA); any HAP listed under Section 112 of the CAA; or any imminently hazardous chemical substance or mixture on which the USEPA Administrator has taken action pursuant to Subsection 7 of the TSCA. A list of hazardous substances is found in 40 CFR 302.4.

Environmental programs at YPG use management actions to minimize use of hazardous substances and reduce resulting waste streams. Chapter 3 of YPGR 385-1 addresses environmental health risks and applies to all activities on YPG. Strict spill prevention requirements add additional protection for human health and the environment. Industrial processes, routine maintenance activities, testing, and support activities are the primary operations on YPG that use hazardous substances or generate wastes (YPG DPW, 2010b). Lead, in the form of as lead-based paint (LBP), and ACMs also may be present in older structures on the installation. Renovations of residences and other buildings are gradually eliminating these materials from buildings at YPG (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). The hazardous materials that are stored on YPG include live high explosives (HEs) and white phosphorus (WP) artillery and mortar ammunition, propellants for such projectiles, various fuels, and projectiles containing DU. Waste products produced by these items are disposed of by various safe methods (Mittlehauser Corporation, 1994).

No hazardous substances or waste are permanently stored, treated, or disposed of at any of the off-post locations used by YPG. Transport of hazardous substances is in accordance with legal requirements. Periodic audits are conducted at YPG facilities where hazardous substances are used and all hazardous substance use is tracked through the Hazardous Material Control Center (HAZMART) using the Hazardous Substances Management System (HSMS). These audits serve as a tracking system for hazardous substance use. In addition to obtaining material usage amounts, storage and containment are investigated. Emphasis is placed on the prevention and control of spills.

As discussed in Section 3.20, groundwater in the vicinity of YPG contains naturally high levels of arsenic.

3.9.1.2 Hazardous Substances Management

YPG stores gasoline, diesel, and chlorine in quantities above reporting limits set by the Arizona Emergency Response Commission (AERC). These substances are reported annually in a Tier II Emergency and Hazardous Chemical Inventory submitted to the AERC and the local Emergency Planning Commission. The Tier II form provides State, tribal, and local offices and the public with specific information on hazardous substances present at YPG. Submission of the Tier II form is required by the Arizona Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA), which implements Title III of the Federal Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986 (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). EO 13423, *Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management,* requires federal facilities to continue implementing EPCRA, including Toxic Release Inventory reporting, as clarified in the *Instructions for Implementing E.O. 13423.* As an Army testing facility, YPG stores, utilizes, and destroys considerable quantities of propellants, explosives, and pyrotechnics (PEPs). Additionally, small quantities of oil, paint, and acetone are consumed. Industrial radiography for examination of ammunition utilizes photographic chemicals and hydraulic fluids.

Historically, YPG operated several solid waste management units (SWMUs) under a RCRA permit issued by the Arizona Department of Health Services in 1980 and subsequently amended as needed, usually every 10 years, with the most recent revision in 2007 (YPG, 2007). In 1996, ADEQ and YPG agreed on a management strategy for SWMUs that involved investigation and cleanup under CERCLA. Additionally, the Army completed a remedial investigation of the installation as part of the DoD Installation Restoration Program in 2002. Several removal actions have since been conducted at YPG, as well as interim remedial actions involving soil vapor extraction. Data indicate that other sites on YPG warrant remedial response and ongoing studies at these sites will be used to determine an appropriate response strategy. Contaminants of concern include petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), metals, and PEPs (ADEQ, 2009).

YPG uses a Hazardous Waste Tracking System for all hazardous wastes generated through industrial activities. Hazardous wastes at YPG are managed successfully through the Hazardous Waste Storage Facility (HWSF) located in the YTC area. The HWSF consists of multiple storage pads, Buildings 2668 – 2677, with each storage pad numbered as a separate building. Hazardous wastes and expired hazardous substances accumulate at this location until disposal. No wastes from outside YPG are accepted at the HWSF and no treatment or permanent disposal of wastes occurs at the HWSF. Hazardous substances are stored according to Army regulations and all applicable Federal, State, and local ordinances and then disposed of properly in appropriate facilities (YPG, 2012b).

3.9.1.3 Solid Waste Management Units

Historically, YPG operated several SWMUs under a RCRA permit issued by the Arizona Department of Health Services in 1980 and subsequently amended as needed, usually every 10 years, with the most recent revision in 2007. In 1996, ADEQ and YPG agreed on a management strategy for SWMUs that involved investigation and cleanup under CERCLA. Additionally, the Army completed a remedial investigation of the installation as part of the DoD Installation Restoration Program in 2002. Several removal actions have since been conducted at YPG, as well as interim remedial actions involving soil vapor extraction. Data indicate that other sites on YPG warrant remedial response and ongoing studies at these sites will be used to determine an appropriate response strategy. Contaminants of concern include petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, SVOCs, metals, and PEPs (ADEQ, 2009).

There are 32 SWMUs at YPG, primarily in the West Environmental Test Area and the Former Waste Disposal Area. Two of the sites are in the Cibola Range area. Many of these sites are concrete pads, municipal sewage septic tanks, and inactive disposal areas classified as No Further Action Required or are in the process of closure. All proposed projects are reviewed by TPG Environmental Sciences staff for potential impacts prior to implementation (Lewis, 2011, personal communication).

3.9.1.4 Ordnance

Munitions and explosive materials are stored in designated areas. Munitions and explosive storage areas are buffered by EQSD arcs, which provide a safe zone if an unexpected explosion were to occur. There are numerous storage facilities located on the KFR, including a facility for the preparation and modification of all calibers of ammunition, experimental munitions, and small rockets. This facility can store 4.5 tons of explosive items.

Most munitions testing at YPG is conducted at the KFR, which also is used for artillery and mortar testing. GPs at the Kofa Region are both fixed and temporary. The Cibola Region, the other major range at YPG, primarily supports aircraft armament testing. Tested systems at the Cibola Region include rockets, cannons, and an array of other armaments.

The heavy use of live-fire testing areas for military weapons results in the presence of UXO throughout test areas that must be cleared by Explosive Test Operators. Special techniques are required and regular sweeps of the ranges occur. Substantial quantities of UXO remain on Cibola and Kofa Regions (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

Data collected from the Kofa Region indicate that no degradable explosives remain following firing events. Further, explosives residues were not detected in rodents, insects, vegetation, groundwater, or air from the Kofa Region. Data indicate that the alkaline desert soil may promote degradation of explosives compounds (YPG DPW, 2010b).

YPG is licensed through the NRC to conduct firing involving munitions that contain DU and beryllium. No munitions containing beryllium have been fired or tested at YPG. The NRC-licensed DU impact area is in the northwestern part of the Kofa Region and is regularly monitored to ensure that no adverse environmental impacts occur. After firing, the NRC-licensed DU impact area is searched to recover spent DU rounds (YPG, 2012b). Spent DU rounds are stored by YPG Radiation Protection until packaged and transported to a licensed disposal facility by the Army's Radioactive Waste Authority. The NRC-licensed DU impact area has a DU Catchment Structure designed to capture DU penetrator rods fired in the DU impact area. An evaporative lagoon designed to collect runoff from the DU Catchment Structure is capable of accommodating a 100-year flood event. This lagoon minimizes the potential for transport of DU (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

MCOCs that result from testing include cadmium, mercury, arsenic, barium, chromium, copper, lead, and zinc. Data indicate that none of these metals migrate beyond the munitions impact areas. MCOCs may be acutely hazardous in the immediate area of explosive munitions (YPG DPW, 2010b).

Ordnance management is highly controlled. Basic requirements for care of ammunition are defined in Chapter 22 of AMC Regulation (AMC-R) 385-100. Personnel do not handle ammunition unless they are certified under AMC-R 350-4. Ammunition is stored in specially designed magazines. These facilities are located in isolated areas with controlled access.

3.9.1.5 Open Burn/Open Detonation Management Unit

Waste munitions items are treated for hazardous characteristics due to ignitability and/or reactivity by deactivation and subsequent disposal. The open burn/open detonation (OB/OD) treatment process for waste munitions is conducted in accordance with AAC R18-8-264, CFR, Title 50, and the RCRA Part B Permit for YPG. OB/OD is normally the safest method available for the effective destruction, decontamination, and treatment of explosives and explosive wastes for subsequent disposal. These munitions items pose a safety hazard to transport prior to destruction/decontamination.

The OB/OD management unit commonly operates at 100 percent of its daily capacity: 4,000 lb of propellants for open burning and 1,000 lb of explosives or open detonation (RCRA permit attachment). On an annual basis, the OB/OD management unit operates well below its yearly capacity, 191,500 lb of propellants and 36,210 lb of explosives.

The OB/OD site is a satellite accumulation area for waste ash. Waste ash is a by-product of propellant burning, and chemical analysis has detected lead in the waste ash. For this reason, the ash is treated as hazardous waste. Waste ash is accumulated in a sealed and labeled 55-gallon drum, located inside the safety bunker. When full, the drum is transported from the OB/OD site to the HWSF.

The OB/OD facility is completely surrounded by military land used for military activities, and public access is prohibited. No residential communities are located within several miles of the OB/OD facility. Locked gates and warning signs limit site access. Security police patrol the area 24 hours per day.

The Kofa Region OB/OD fenced area measures approximately 7,000 ft by 7,000 ft (approximately 1,125 ac). The OB/OD management unit is a large cleared area consisting of open trenches and two 100-ft x 80-ft open-burn, concrete pads. The open burn areas are lined with high-density polyethylene, with 4-inch refractory ceramic fiber concrete topping coat and three pans on each pad. The pads and pans are used to treat (by burning) excess propellant and ammunition-related materials. Propellant and powder are carefully loaded in burn pans and the material is ignited and left to burn completely. Lead-contaminated ash is collected from the pans and pads for disposal as hazardous waste. The OB/OD facility is operated in accordance with a RCRA Part B Interim Permit authorized by ADEQ. Lined concrete stormwater detention basins about the pads, and secondary containment is provided by reinforced earthen berms. Monitoring wells are located at each site in accordance with the RCRA permit and an Aquifer Protection Permit (YPG, 2008c).

The OB/OD management unit is a satellite accumulation area. No waste explosives (USEPA Hazardous Waste Code D003) are stored at the OB/OD treatment facility. All waste explosives are destroyed by OB/OD treatment. Waste ash (USEPA Hazardous Waste Code D008) is a by-product of burning propellants, and is accumulated in a 55-gallon drum marked with USEPA and U.S. Department of Transportation labels. The ash is temporarily held on the OB/OD treatment facility, inside the safety bunker approximately 3,000 ft from the burn pads and trenches, for later transport to the HWSF.

3.9.1.6 Fuels and Petroleum Products

Fuels at YPG are stored in aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) and underground storage tanks (USTs) for use on the installation. There are 22 ASTs at YPG with a total capacity of 139,298 gallons (Brandon, 2011b, personal communication). These ASTs primarily are used for storage of fuel oil, used oil, aviation fuel, gasoline, or diesel fuel. Many of the ASTs have secondary containment structures to prevent release to the environment in the event of a spill (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). USTs on the installation primarily contain Jet Propellant 8 (JP-8), heating oil, or gasoline. YPG currently maintains 20 active USTs with a total storage capacity of 27,569 gallons for this purpose (Brandon, 2011b, personal communication; Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). Under USEPA regulations, facilities with USTs are required to replace them or to install corrosion protection and spill/overflow prevention technology. YPG

conducted leak testing of regulated USTs under a POL contract between 1991 and 1995, and is in the process of removing its remaining USTs (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). Most POLs, including fuels, are stored either in USTs or ASTs. There are three new fuel facilities with ASTs that are used to store and dispense fuel for government fleet vehicles, including emergency services such as ambulance and fire trucks, and vehicles being tested by Yuma Test Center (YTC), including aviation systems and assets. These three fuel facilities, contractor owned and contractor operated, are located in the Laguna Region at YTC, LAAF, and the Kofa Cantonment (YPG DPW, 2011a). In addition, small amounts of POLs are stored at individual sites and various industrial working locations around the installation for use as necessary in maintenance and repair of vehicles and equipment. In compliance with USEPA regulations, YPG has begun removal of its regulated USTs and all remaining regulated USTs are scheduled for removal and final site characterization. In the meantime, USTs are monitored monthly. Inactive USTs are monitored by vacuum testing and those with good integrity are buried in place (Brandon, 2011b, personal communication).

YPG recycles used oils, which are collected in ASTs and stored in labeled 55-gallon drums. The used oil is picked up by a private contractor for recycling. Control practices such as oil/water separators attached to vehicle wash racks minimize the potential for discharge from normal operations.

The annual volumes of the most often used POLs have not changed substantially in the past 20 years. An exception to this is gasoline. A gasoline station that had three 10,000-gallon tanks was replaced with a station with a two-compartment tank with a 15,000-gallon capacity (Brandon, 2011b, personal communication; Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

3.9.1.7 Solvents

Solvents are used for parts cleaning during routine maintenance of vehicles and weapons systems. The two most commonly used solvents are Safety-Kleen® solvent and PD680 (Stoddard solvent). Most maintenance activities use Safety-Kleen® solvent, while PD680 is used in aircraft and vehicle maintenance. Safety-Kleen® cold degreasing tanks are located in various buildings on YPG, and degreasing tanks are equipped with a solid stream dispensing nozzle and an interior drain rack. Safety-Kleen® solvent is reclaimed by Safety-Kleen® Corporation on a quarterly basis and pickup manifests are maintained for this activity. PD680 is maintained in a cold cleaner immersion tank with an enclosed design in aircraft maintenance areas (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

3.9.1.8 Pesticides and Herbicides

Pesticide and herbicide use is minimized and chemicals are mixed only in quantities needed for specific application. Annual use of pesticides and herbicides is tracked via the Pest Management Report (Form DD1532). An inventory of chemical pesticides and herbicides is maintained at the installation. Pesticides and herbicides are stored on a concrete spill containment pad within a fenced complex. Information on pesticides and herbicides used on the installation, as well as a copy of the inventory, are included in the YPG Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan (SPCCP) and the RCRA Contingency Plan (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs) for all chemicals used on YPG are available with the chemical inventory. Pesticides and herbicides used on YPG are registered with USEPA, and containers are properly labeled in compliance with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act: Part II (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

3.9.1.9 Asbestos, Lead, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

YPG has identified buildings on the installation with ACM and has implemented a program of systematic removal from structures as they are renovated or replaced. A site-specific survey for ACM is required prior to initiation of renovation or demolition. Asbestos abatement during construction and renovation is implemented per Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act regulations. ACM is managed and disposed of in accordance with the YPG Asbestos Management Plan (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

Lead may occur on YPG either as LBP in older buildings or as a by-product of OB/OD activities. A lead abatement survey was completed for the general housing area and older industrial buildings. An LBP Management Plan was implemented in 1995. The plan is followed before and during renovations of housing and administrative facilities. The management of LBP continues in accordance with Department of Housing and Urban Development guidelines. LBP is disposed of according to RCRA guidelines. Lead ash from OB/OD activities is managed in accordance with RCRA requirements and pollution prevention principles (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

The only known PCBs at YPG were associated with transformer oil. As of April 1997, all transformers known to contain PCBs had been removed and replaced with non-PCB transformers (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). No PCBs are known to remain on the installation.

3.9.1.10 Hazardous Waste Management

U.S. Army regulations specify that management of hazardous wastes must comply with the most stringent Federal, State or local requirements. These regulations not only define hazardous wastes, but in compliance with Arizona Department of Health Services specifications, define testing and inspection procedures at the OB/OD facility.

The YPG (HAZMART) tracks all hazardous substance use on-post using the HSMS. Exceptions to the HAZMART tracking are the health clinic, veterinary clinic, and post housing (Jason Associates Corporation, 2008d). The HSMS is an automated chemical tracking system designed to provide "cradle-to-grave" tracking for hazardous substances at the chemical constituent level. The program is designed to centralize the ordering of hazardous substances. The program facility (HAZMART) is the primary collection, storage, distribution, and disposal center for all quantities of hazardous substances at YPG. The functional categories of the HAZMART are control and management, regulated distribution, material reuse and recycling, and reduction of hazardous waste.

Hazardous wastes generated at YPG are managed using the HWSF located in the YTC area. Hazardous wastes and expired hazardous substances accumulate at this location until disposal. No wastes from outside YPG are accepted at the HWSF. No treatment or waste disposal occurs at the HWSF. YPG maintains a thorough hazardous waste tracking system (HWTS) for all hazardous wastes generated on-post. As wastes are prepared for shipment, the waste generator logs into the HWTS and produces a waste analysis sheet based upon laboratory analysis, generator knowledge, or MSDSs. This analysis is reviewed and approved by the installation environmental coordinator for submittal to the HWSF. The Hazardous Waste Manager generates a DD Form 1348-1A for submittal to the Defense Logistics Agency Disposition Services (formerly Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office) and the waste is again temporarily stored. HAZMART personnel then prepare shipping manifests. Finally, licensed disposal contractors pick up the waste. This system allows detailed tracking of hazardous waste during the entire disposal process (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001; and Jason Associates Corporation, 2008d).

The potential for fuel spills exists in all YPG regions, but the potential is highest in the Laguna Region, where the largest storage tanks are found and where most maintenance operations occur. Tank truck loading and unloading has the potential for large quantity spills. SOPs have been developed to ensure that tank car, tank truck, and vessel loading and unloading procedures meet the requirements and regulations established by the Arizona Department of Transportation and are conducted appropriately to prevent spills. POLs are necessary for maintenance activities and these materials are used in large quantities that fluctuate based on mission requirements.

Routine maintenance and industrial processes are performed in the Cibola Region, and field maintenance of test equipment and weapons occurs in both the Kofa and Cibola Regions. These activities utilize various oils and small quantities of paint, solvents, and lubricants. The Light Armored Vehicle Division at Castle Dome Annex conducts welding, maintenance, and mechanical work that consumes oils, antifreeze, sulfuric acid, paint, and acetylene gas. Conex boxes are used to store in-use hazardous substances (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). There is no long-term storage of hazardous substances or treatment of hazardous wastes in the Cibola or Kofa Regions, except for munitions bunkers in the Kofa Region. Any wastes generated are taken to the HWSF until disposal offsite. Fuel for vehicles and generators is available from portable fuel tanks and there is potential for spills from refueling activities.

Maintenance of tracked and wheeled vehicles accounts for most of the hazardous substances used and stored in the Laguna Region. Other facilities in the Laguna Region use and store hazardous substances in small quantities.

Chlorine is stored and used in the Laguna Region and the quantities are reported to the EPCRA Reporting Center under Section 313, Title III of SARA and the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990. During years when YPG has no accidental chlorine releases, reporting information is based on storage amounts. YPG works to decrease the use of chlorinated solvents where military specifications provide flexibility. YPG has replaced chlorinated solvents with more environmentally responsible alternatives where mission requirements allow. Safety Kleen® solvent has replaced PD680 solvent in many applications at YPG. Used Safety Kleen® solvent is collected and recycled by Safety Kleen® Corporation outside the installation.

3.9.1.11 Spill Containment

The installation fire department can provide emergency response in the event of a large spill. The RCRA Contingency Plan and the SPCCP provide information on the storage and handling of petroleum-based products, hazardous substances, and appropriate response actions in the event of fire, explosion, or release of hazardous substances and wastes.

3.9.1.12 Disposal

The Universal Waste Rule issued by USEPA (40 CFR 273) is designed to reduce the amount of hazardous waste items in the municipal solid waste stream, encourage recycling and proper disposal of certain common hazardous wastes, and reduce the regulatory burden on businesses that generate these wastes. The rule is intended to promote recycling of batteries, mercury-containing thermometers, and recalled pesticides by relaxing collection, handling, and transportation requirements; and to make it easier to properly treat and recycle these wastes. YPG coordinates with MCAS Yuma and other government agencies to consolidate wastes that are subject to the Universal Waste Rule to increase the cost-effectiveness of recycling and disposal of the waste.

3.9.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to identify potential environmental consequences associated with hazardous materials/hazardous waste:

- Increased use of hazardous materials in testing and training activities
- Increased generation of hazardous wastes from operations on YPG
- Increased risk of exposure to hazardous materials or hazardous wastes through testing or training activities
- Use of explosive or incendiary materials in areas where not previously used

Observed impacts of past use and storage of hazardous materials/hazardous waste were used to identify the expected impacts of future use and storage. Potential impacts from hazardous materials/hazardous waste used in testing and training activities were analyzed in a similar manner. Potential impacts of construction and infrastructure improvement activities were analyzed using the best available information for proposed site-specific actions.

3.9.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to hazardous materials/hazardous waste include:

- Negligible (less than significant) Activities that result in barely perceptible increases in environmental or human exposure to hazardous materials and hazardous waste and existing management plans and procedures are sufficient to mitigate the risk without establishment of new or additional measures.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that have potential to increase environmental or human exposure to hazardous materials and hazardous waste through explosion, spill, or other release and existing management plans and procedures are sufficient to mitigate the risk without establishment of new or additional measures.

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that increase the risk for an accidental spill of hazardous or toxic materials in or near a body of water or a desert wash and existing management plans and procedures are sufficient to mitigate the risk without establishment of new or additional measures.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that have potential to increase the risk of danger to the public or environment during the storage, transport, or use of hazardous materials and existing management plans and procedures are sufficient to mitigate the risk without establishment of new or additional measures.
- Severe (significant) Activities that have potential to increase environmental or human exposure to hazardous materials and hazardous waste through explosion, spill, or other release such that existing management plans and procedures are not sufficient to mitigate the risk and additional measures must be established.
- Severe (significant) Activities that have potential to violate one or more applicable regulations.
- Severe (significant) Activities that have potential to increase the risk for an accidental spill of hazardous or toxic materials in or near a body of water or a desert wash such that existing management plans and procedures are not sufficient to mitigate the risk and additional measures must be established.
- Severe (significant) Activities that have potential to affect contaminated sites or the progress of remediation activities to a significant degree and require significant regulatory re-negotiation of selected site remedies or result in significant delays to existing remediation plans.
- Severe (significant) Activities that have potential to increase the generation of hazardous substances to a level that existing management plans and procedures, waste handling contracts, and/or disposition alternatives must be re-evaluated.
- Severe (significant) Activities that have potential to increase the risk of danger to the public or environment during the storage, transport, or use of hazardous materials such that existing management plans and procedures are not sufficient to mitigate the risk and additional measures must be established.
- Beneficial Activities that have potential to reduce the use of hazardous materials, reduce the generation of hazardous wastes, or reduce the potential for exposure to hazardous materials or hazardous wastes.

3.9.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, testing and training would continue at current levels and no new construction or demolition would occur. No test areas, munitions impact areas, or DZs would be expanded under the No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, use of hazardous materials would continue at current levels and the amounts of regulated and non-regulated hazardous wastes would be unchanged. Contaminated sites would continue to be managed with existing agreements with USEPA and ADEQ. Localized hazardous waste impacts could result from minor leaks associated with on-road and offroad vehicle use and maintenance, POL spills, and chemical decomposition of military constituents from live-fire activities. The program to close or remove all USTs would continue. Implementation and use of the HSMS would minimize the potential for release of hazardous materials. All activities would be conducted in compliance with the YPG SPCCP (Zia Engineering and Environmental Consultants, 2011).

The low annual rainfall, generally level gradient of desert pavement, and high specific gravity of DU limit the transport of DU to washes. Insufficient rainfall also limits the flow in washes, thereby limiting the probability of transporting DU off-post to the Gila or Colorado Rivers (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). Additionally, spent DU rounds are collected by Ammunition Recovery personnel and spent DU rounds are stored by YPG Radiation Protection until packaged and transported to a licensed disposal facility by the Army's Radioactive Waste Authority. YPG has an evaporative lagoon to collect and contain runoff from the DU Catchment Structure that can accommodate a 100-year flood event. This lagoon minimizes the potential that migration would occur from stormwater runoff. Studies have shown (Obregon, 2013c, personal communication) that DU is contained within the DU licensed area and does not migrate. There is no reasonable potential for off-post migration of DU as the NRC-licensed DU impact area is more than 10 miles from the boundary.

There would be no beneficial impacts associated with new POL storage areas and reductions in handling and transportation of fuel from installation of hard power under the No Action Alternative.

3.9.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

Testing and training activities included in the No Action Alternative would continue and increase under the Proposed Action. The impacts from hazardous materials/hazardous waste that would occur under the No Action Alternative also would occur under the Proposed Action.

None of the activities that would be implemented under the Proposed Action would involve testing or training with DU rounds. As discussed under the No Action Alternative, no off-post impacts from DU would be expected.

All activities that would be implemented under the Proposed Action would be confined within the existing YPG boundaries and there would be no potential for off-post impacts, except as a result of stormwater transport of contaminants (e.g., MCOCs) to washes and downstream receiving waters. Activities that create increased impervious area or clear vegetation could result in increased stormwater runoff. Appropriate construction and post-construction BMPs would be implemented to minimize the potential for increased stormwater runoff during or following land-disturbing activities (see Sections 3.15 and 3.20). Potential impacts would be similar to those of the No Action Alternative. Any impacts would likely be minor.

If new facilities would be sited in previously contaminated sites, appropriate protective measures would be implemented to safeguard construction workers who may be exposed to contaminants. In addition, the Army would consult with State and federal agencies. Completing this regulatory consultation would add time and cost to projects planned in such areas.

Construction and facility improvement activities would have little potential for direct impacts from hazardous materials. There could be temporary and minor indirect impacts

from building renovations or demolition if the buildings have ACM. This risk would be greatest in the Laguna Region, where most renovation and demolition would occur. Appropriate protective procedures would be implemented when activities could result in exposure of construction workers to ACM. Any impacts would likely be minor. Demolition of existing buildings that may contain hazardous substances such as ACM could create an increase in hazardous waste generation. Any such waste would be managed and disposed of appropriately following established procedures. Any impacts would likely be minor.

Construction areas would have the potential for stormwater runoff to transport minor quantities of hazardous materials from spills into washes and ultimately to downstream receiving waters. Standard construction BMPs (see Sections 3.15 and 3.20 for further discussion of construction stormwater BMPs.) and procedures in the Construction SWPPP would be in place during construction to minimize the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials to impact the environment. Impacts would likely be minor to moderate.

Increased impervious area following construction and paving would have the potential for increased stormwater runoff, which could transport minor quantities of hazardous materials from spills into washes and ultimately to downstream receiving waters. Appropriate post-construction stormwater BMPs (see Sections 3.15 and 3.20 for further discussion of post-construction stormwater BMPs.) would be implemented to minimize the potential for impacts. Impacts would likely be minor.

The proposed increases in testing and training activities throughout YPG would have the potential for increased use of hazardous materials and an increase in the need for disposal of hazardous wastes. Expansion of munitions impact areas in the Kofa and Cibola Regions would increase the potential for hazardous wastes from HE and inert munitions to accumulate in soils. Additional training activities throughout YPG would have the potential for increased use of hazardous materials and increased demand for disposal of hazardous wastes. Materials in soil would have the potential to subsequently enter the shallow groundwater table through infiltration. The ITAM program would maintain suitable conditions for training areas and development and implementation of activity-specific SOPs for testing and would minimize the potential for impacts. Increased testing and training activities could impact soils and groundwater as a result of contamination from spills of POLs and use of explosives. See Sections 3.15 and 3.20 for further discussion of measures to minimize the potential for impacts to soils and water resources. Impacts would likely be minor to moderate.

Operation and maintenance of new facilities and equipment would require some use of hazardous materials and generation of hazardous waste. These materials would continue to be used only in the minimum amount needed. Any increase in use and storage would be minor. Impacts from increased use and storage would be negligible to minor. Disposal of hazardous wastes would follow the established procedures on YPG. Because quantities generated would be small, any impacts would be minor.

Air conditioning systems for buildings that would be constructed could use hazardous materials as a coolant. To comply with1996 Federal Regulations that require Class I or II refrigerants for new air conditioning equipment. YPG will procure non-ozone depleting chemicals refrigerants for new air conditioning components.

Increased live-fire training activities would require an increase in the transport of ordnance and hazardous substances. Existing policies and procedures for storage and transport of ordnance and hazardous substances would not need to be modified to address this increase. Any impacts would likely be minor to moderate. See Section 3.17 for further discussion.

Installation of hard power and telecommunications lines at training and testing sites would decrease down-range transport of fuel because the number of portable generators in use would be reduced. This would result in less transport of fuel to test locations and less handling of fuel at the test location, which would reduce the potential for spills and reduce the potential for impacts. This would be a minor to moderate benefit.

Through the continued implementation and use of the HSMS, steps would be taken to minimize the potential release of hazardous materials and all activities would be in compliance with the YPG SPCCP (Zia Engineering and Environmental Consultants, 2011).

Increased testing of wheeled and tracked vehicles and vehicle components would have the potential for contamination from leaks or spills of POL and other vehicle fluids. Development and implementation of activity-specific SOPs for testing would minimize the potential for impacts. Impacts likely would be minor.

The POL storage area and fuel farm planned for the Laguna Region would have the potential for impacts from spills during storage or during transport to these facilities. Secondary containment and implementation procedures outlined in the SPCCP would minimize the potential for release to the environment. Impacts would be negligible to moderate.

Proper handling, treatment, and disposal of munitions and munitions components at the munitions treatment facility proposed for the Laguna Region would minimize the potential for impacts at this facility. BMPs and procedures outlined in the SPCCP would be followed to further minimize the potential for releases of hazardous materials. Impacts would likely be minor.

New POL storage facilities or improvements to existing POL storage facilities would occur at multiple locations in the Cibola Region. By providing appropriate facilities for storage and containment of POLs, the potential for spills would be reduced and the potential for release of hazardous materials to the environment would be minimized. This would be a minor to moderate benefit.

Operation of Project K030 would introduce onsite storage of small quantities of POLs in the northern portion of the East Arm. The East Kofa Operations Center (K025a) would provide appropriate facilities for storage and containment of POLs and the potential for spills or for release of hazardous materials to the environment would be minimized. Any impacts would be negligible.

YPG is considering development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site through use of an EUL with private business. While minor amounts of hazardous materials would likely be used during construction of such a facility, no cumulative impacts to hazardous materials would be expected from construction. Should a dry-cooled concentrating solar facility be selected as the technology to be implemented, thermal cooling fluid and brine would be by-products of electrical power generation that would require disposal. The heat transfer

material for a dry-cooled concentrating solar facility typically would be a Therminol compound. There are 13 Therminol heat transfer fluids marketed in North America, which encompass a range of hazardous waste classifications when disposed of, ranging from not a hazardous waste to may be a hazardous waste, to is a hazardous waste (Solutia Inc., 2012a-n). Depending on the Therminol compound used, there could be a moderate potential for cumulative impacts to hazardous materials from use and disposal of Therminol heat transfer fluids during operation of a dry-cooled concentrating solar facility.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. A variety of chemicals and hazardous substances would be stored and used during construction and operation of the Project. The storage, handling, and use of all chemicals would be conducted in accordance with applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations. Because of the appropriate measures proposed, the Quartzite Solar Energy Project would not be expected to contribute to hazardous materials cumulative impacts.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to hazardous materials cumulative impacts. At this time details on hazardous materials in the project areas are unknown and the potential for cumulative impacts cannot be assessed accurately. However, it is expected that BLM will require that these projects implement appropriate use, storage, and disposal measures to minimize the potential for cumulative impacts.

No other future projects with potential hazardous materials impacts are known at this time. The current SPCCP would be updated as necessary to cover future projects or actions with the potential for spills of regulated materials. Testing and training requirements are expected to continue to evolve over time. This could result in an increase in testing and training activities throughout YPG. This would have the potential for cumulative impacts from increased use of hazardous materials, an increase in the need for disposal of hazardous wastes, and the potential for exposure of existing subsurface contamination.

3.9.2.4 Mitigation

Mitigation of the potential impacts from the Proposed Action includes the continued management of hazardous materials using existing environmental programs and guidance to manage the handling and disposal of hazardous materials and waste.

If new facilities would be sited in previously contaminated sites, appropriate protective measures would be implemented to safeguard construction workers who may be exposed to contaminants. In addition, the Army would consult with State and federal agencies. Completing this regulatory consultation would add time and cost to projects planned in such areas. If contaminated soil is encountered during construction, it would be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with appropriate State and/or Federal regulations.

The YPG SPCCP would be updated as necessary and would be implemented to minimize potential for impacts from accidental spills.

YPG will procure non-ozone depleting chemicals refrigerants for new air conditioning components.

Appropriate protective procedures would be implemented when renovation or demolition of existing buildings would result in potential exposure of construction workers to ACM.

In the event that munitions and explosives of concern are discovered in areas of proposed construction, they would not be disturbed until qualified personnel could properly assess and implement appropriate disposition.

3.10 Land Use

3.10.1 Existing Conditions

YPG is primarily used for military testing and evaluation. Land use on YPG is dictated by the Real Property Planning Board, which describes the long-range development of YPG and ensures that YPG meets real property mission requirements, achieves land use compatibility, incorporates holistic and sustainable planning principles, and promotes environmental stewardship. Most land on YPG is reserved for firing ranges, munitions impact areas, mobility test courses, and DZs. These activities typically require large open areas with safety and buffer zones. Test ranges are officially closed to civilian use, except for specifically designated public hunting areas. Seven land use categories are defined for YPG in the DPEIS (Parsons, 2011):

- **Airfield:** designated for flight operations, including runways and taxiways, along with airfield support facilities, including airfield operations, aviation refueling, aviation maintenance, and related test facilities.
- **Range/Open Land:** used for live-fire ranges, non live-fire ranges, and special training areas, including confidence courses, driver training, and land navigation. Land that is undeveloped or unused also is included.
- **Industrial:** includes land designated for production, maintenance, depot and other storage, activities that generate substantial heavy vehicle traffic, loud outdoor equipment operations, and similar activities.
- **Community:** provides facilities, including religious, family support, personnel services, professional services, medical, community, commercial, and recreational activities.
- **Professional and Institutional:** designated land that supports non-tactical organizations, including military schools, headquarters, major commands, and non-industrial research, development, test, and evaluation.
- **Residential:** family housing and senior unaccompanied personnel housing. Family services and other neighborhood services are also included within this category.
- **Troop:** land designated for operational facilities for units. There are no permanent troop areas designated on YPG.

3.10.1.1 Laguna Region

The Laguna Region is used mainly for vehicle and aircraft testing. The Laguna Region includes the MAA, YTC, LAAF, and the CDH. This region also includes the Hot Weather Test Complex, which is a vehicle testing area for hot weather conditions, and a variety of other vehicle testing and training courses. Mobility equipment test facilities within YTC provide courses and obstacles to evaluate vehicle endurance, performance, reliability, and maintainability. The West Environmental Test Area was used exclusively for environmental surveillance testing of nontoxic chemical agents, protection devices, and other military

materiel. This area is has been closed and is no longer usable under the established land use controls.

EQSD arcs are established for three categories of facilities: Test Facilities, Explosives Storage, and Ordnance Buildings. In the Laguna Region, EQSD arcs are associated with LAAF and also along its eastern edge associated with the Kofa Firing Front (Parsons, 2011).

The MAA is a diverse area that supports community, industrial, residential, and professional land use categories. The MAA contains the main cantonment and provides community support activities, family housing, and unaccompanied personnel housing. Community support at MAA includes facilities such as medical, schools, day care centers, commissary, shoppette, and a chapel (Parsons, 2011).

YTC is classified as industrial and professional and contains the YPG Headquarters and a mix of administrative, vehicle maintenance, and other activities (Parsons, 2011).

LAAF supports airfield and industrial land uses. The LAAF includes facilities and runways to support aviation and airfield operations for the command test mission. Aircraft used here provide aerial spotting of test items and support the Airborne Test Force Branch (Parsons, 2011). Facilities for the MFFS are located in LAAF and MAA.

CDH includes airfield and industrial land use categories. CDH is used for air-ground testing of aircraft armament systems and UAS testing. It includes administrative facilities, aircraft storage and maintenance facilities, a small airfield, and a drone launch site (Parsons, 2011).

3.10.1.2 Cibola Region

The Cibola Region is used for a variety of purposes, including aircraft armament testing, static detonation, conflagration testing, combat skills training, instrument DZs, and extraction zones (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). Cibola supports a diverse variety of developmental testing of unmanned aerial systems, aircraft systems, diversified sensor testing including, but not limited to, moored sensor systems, electro-optical, infrared, radar, acoustic, and unattended ground sensors, and wireless communication, air-to-ground, ground-to-ground, and ground-to-air munitions, flares, chaff and other counter measures, lasers, radars, precision-guided and unguided personnel and cargo parachute systems, direct and indirect fire artillery systems, and combat and automotive systems (Franklin, 2013, personal communication). Little development occurs within this region and is limited to CDA, multiple airfields supporting UASs and helicopters, GPs, vehicle courses, and JERC sites. JERC sites reconstruct urban-like battle zones similar to conditions encountered in the Middle East. The CDA includes various buildings and test support facilities.

The Cibola Region is dominated by large munitions impact areas and DZs, with Prospect Square being the largest munitions impact area. These areas are undeveloped and open but do contain instrumentation to monitor performance of activities. Range instrumentation may include cameras, radars, and fuse chronographs (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). Munitions impact areas may be cleared of vegetation so that fired projectiles can be relocated. Munitions impact areas may contain UXO left over from historical testing of munitions. Drop zones typically are used to test parachutes and airdrop techniques. Parachute pack maintenance and rigging facilities support the testing of airdrops and other air-to-ground delivery methods (Parsons, 2011). Extraction zones are typically used to test low-altitude parachute extraction systems (Global Security, 2013).

3.10.1.3 Kofa Region

The Kofa Region is used primarily for direct and indirect firing of weapons and munitions, mainly artillery pieces. YPG has over 400 firing positions, most of which are in the Kofa Region with a concentration along the Kofa Firing Front (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). The Kofa Region also contains mainly industrial and range land uses, but also includes professional and community uses, most of which are at the western edge along the Kofa Firing Front. The area to the east of the Kofa Firing Front is primarily used as munitions impact areas within the KFR. These munitions impact areas have been designated for a variety of projectiles and mines, including a dedicated NRC-licensed DU impact area. The KFR is outfitted with range instrumentation to monitor performance of weapons and munitions. Supporting facilities include testing and environmental simulation facilities and are typically located along the Kofa Firing Front. The East Environmental Test Area tests materials requiring additional security.

3.10.1.4 Surrounding Land Uses

Land uses adjacent to YPG are primarily undeveloped open space and sparsely populated area where the land ownership includes BLM, USFWS, state and private entities, including agricultural interests. Federally owned land borders YPG on the west, north, and east. Neighboring refuge areas include the Kofa NWR, Cibola NWR, and Imperial NWR. Nearby wilderness areas include the Muggins, New Water, and Trigo Mountains. Refuges along the Colorado River protect wetland and waterfowl habitat and provide recreational areas, such as the Hidden Shores RV Village (Parsons, 2011). Activities on Kofa NWR and other nearby NWRs and wilderness areas may be impacted by activities on YPG, mainly through noise intrusion and the spread of wildfires. The Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-628) established the wilderness areas and wildlife refuges and also included specific allowances for military activities (see Section 3.11).

Residential, commercial, and recreational development is present near the southwestern part of the installation near Martinez Lake and the City of Yuma. Martinez Lake is the closest community on the southwest side of YPG, while the City of Quartzsite is north of the Cibola Region. The Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District extends along the Gila River between the southern YPG boundary and I-8 and supports crop production (Parsons, 2011; Yuma Area Ag Council, 2011).

Rezoning requests for additional residential development on the south side of YPG are increasing, but zoning for residential development in that area is limited to 1- to 2-ac suburban ranch parcels (Parsons, 2011). Fishing camps between the Colorado River and the western YPG boundary have been converted for use as second homes. Use of these homes is increasing and some are now used as retirement homes and occupied full-time. There are numerous campgrounds, RV parks, resorts, and other lodging facilities along unfenced sections of the YPG boundary. These facilities are commonly used as seasonal residences for individuals who spend the winter in this part of Arizona. People tend to concentrate in these areas during winter months.

3.10.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to land use:

- Conflict with existing land use on YPG
- Conflict with adjacent, offsite land uses

3.10.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to land use include:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) –Activities that would conflict with YPG land use designations but would not have a substantial negative effect on the YPG mission.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would conflict with local or regional planning but would not require substantial changes to local or regional development planning efforts.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would permanently degrade land on YPG so that it could not be used for current or planned use.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would require substantial changes to local or regional development planning efforts.

3.10.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, testing and training would continue at current levels and no new construction would occur. At present, there are no conflicts with local or regional planning efforts or with YPG land use designations.

All Noise Zone (NZ) II and III noise contours, as defined in Section 3.11, are within the YPG boundary, with the exception of a small area extending into a portion of the Kofa NWR north of the Kofa Range and an uninhabited area east of the Cibola Range (YPG, 2010a). No development would occur within the NWR, and the extension of the noise contours into this area does not affect land use. The Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-628) established wilderness areas, including Kofa NWR. Provisions within the Act allow continued low-level overflights by military aircraft, the designation of new units of special airspace, and the use or establishment of military training flight routes over the wilderness areas created by the Act. The Act further states that the ability to see or hear non-wilderness activities or uses from within a wilderness does not preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area. The U.S. Department of the Interior has granted permission to YPG to use 171,000 ac of Kofa NWR as an artillery fire buffer zone (YPG, 2012b). More information on the potential for noise impacts to Kofa NWR is included in Section 3.11. Testing and training activities conducted under the No Action Alternative would not be expected to affect land use on Kofa NWR.

To address potential land use incompatibility issues, the State of Arizona developed the *Arizona Military Regional Compatibility Project Policy Guidebook* (Arizona Department of Commerce, 2006) as a proactive tool to prevent encroachment around military installations. The guidebook offers feasible and sustainable solutions consistent with Arizona compatibility legislation. Due to potential land use issues in the vicinity of military air bases and military air operations, state legislation requires that:

- Areas within high-noise or accident potential zones be addressed in municipal general plans and county comprehensive plans
- Land development within high-noise or accident potential zones be compatible with military airfield operations

• Jurisdictions with property in the vicinity of military airfields consider military operations in their General and Comprehensive Plans (Arizona Revised Statutes Sections 28-8480, 28-8481, and 28-8482)

The Yuma County 2020 Comprehensive Plan (Yuma County, 2013) has designated the lands abutting YPG as either open space or agricultural/rural residential, which will maintain compatibility with the military use on the adjacent YPG lands. Full-time occupied dwellings near the YPG boundary could be incompatible with noise contours and safety requirements of military flight operations. Future development south of Martinez Lake is considered unlikely to affect YPG because of the anticipated low rate of population growth and associated residential development. Additionally, YPG activities are generally compatible with adjacent land uses in this area (Parsons, 2011).

There would be no impact to land use on adjacent lands under the No Action Alternative.

3.10.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

The noise-related impacts that would occur under the No Action Alternative also would occur under the Proposed Action. Off-post zoning and development would be the same as discussed for the No Action Alternative. The slight changes in the noise zones associated with large artillery would not require any changes to the land uses designated in the Yuma County 2020 Comprehensive Plan. Additional noise-related impacts that would result under the Proposed Action are discussed below.

New construction that would occur under the Proposed Action would be compatible with YPG land use designations and would not conflict with any off-post land uses. No effects to land use would result from new building construction under the Proposed Action.

Testing and training activities included in the No Action Alternative would continue and increase under the Proposed Action. The proposed increases would occur in areas designated as Range/Open Land and would not conflict with designated land uses. All activities conducted by YPG would continue within the current boundary and airspace of YPG and none of the increases in testing and training included in the Proposed Action would affect adjacent land uses.

Under the Proposed Action, up to 54,560 ac of land would be converted to munitions impact areas and up to 147,879 ac would be converted to new dismounted maneuver areas. There would be approximately 1,100 ac of land dedicated to air support operations as new or expanded runways and taxiways or as new UAS launch/recovery areas. An additional approximately 1,330 ac of land would be converted to DZs. All of these areas are classified as Range/Open Land, which is compatible with proposed testing and training projects, so there would be no change in land use designation within YPG as a result of these activities, except for the Project K025 (East Kofa Operations Center) and Project K030. The East Kofa Operations Center would convert 10 ac of Range/Open Land to Institutional use and Project K030 would convert 26.1 ac of Range/Open Land to Institutional use. These changes in land use in the eastern and northern portions of the Kofa Region would be a minor impact on land use.

Conversion to munitions impact areas could preclude other future uses unless the areas are appropriately cleared of UXO and other munitions components that could cause contamination. Land uses and development on adjacent lands would continue to be dictated by municipal and county comprehensive and general plans, the *Arizona Military Regional Compatibility Project Policy Guidebook*, and Arizona legislation. YPG would continue coordination and participation in local plans and development meetings to ensure that encroachment and land use incompatibilities are avoided. No impacts to adjacent land uses would occur as a result of the Proposed Action.

There would be potential for foreseeable future projects to interact with land use on YPG. YPG is considering development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site through use of an EUL with private business. Up to 1,000 ac of Range/Open Land in the Cibola Region or up to 322 ac in the Laguna Region within YPG would be converted to industrial use and would no longer be available for meeting the military mission (USAEC, 2012). When combined with land use impacts from other projects on YPG, development of a renewable solar facility could result in minor cumulative impacts to land use on YPG.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Approximately 1,675 acres would be converted from open land, which would reduce available rangeland. The Quartzite Solar Energy Project is not expected to contribute to regional land use cumulative impacts.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects would cause land to be converted from open land into solar facilities, which would reduce available rangeland. At this time details on the amounts of land that would be converted and the specific land uses in the project areas are unknown. The potential for these solar projects to contribute to regional land use cumulative impacts cannot be assessed accurately, but there is a reasonable probability that implementation of these projects would contribute to regional land use impacts.

Should solar facilities be developed on BLM land around YPG, glare from such facilities could affect aircraft operations within YPG airspace, which would conflict with current designated use within YPG. No other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would have the potential to interact with land uses on YPG, and YPG actions would not interact with land use outside the installation boundary. No other cumulative impacts are expected.

3.10.2.4 Mitigation

YPG would continue coordination and participation in local plans and development meetings to ensure that encroachment and land use incompatibilities are avoided.

3.11 Noise

3.11.1 Existing Conditions

Noise is defined as unwanted or annoying sound that interferes with or disrupts normal human activities. Although exposure to very high noise levels can cause hearing loss, the principal human response to noise is annoyance. The response of different individuals to similar noise events is diverse and is influenced by the type of noise, the perceived importance of the noise, its appropriateness in the setting, the time of day, type of activity

during which the noise occurs, and the sensitivity of the individual. The Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act (42 U.S.C. 4901 et seq.), provides guidelines and regulations for noise. Chapter 7 of AR 200-1 dictates guidelines and regulations to reduce noise impacts and establishes an Environmental Noise Management Program.

YPG has an Installation Operational Noise Management Plan (IONMP) to guide operations. The IONMP describes the current noise environment and predicts future noise conditions through computer modeling. Installation noise contours from the IONMP are provided in Appendix F. The IONMP provides guidelines to attain land use compatibility between noise generated by military activities on YPG and the surrounding communities (U.S. Army Public Health Command, 2011). An annual evaluation and 5-year updates of the IONMP are recommended by the U.S. Army Public Health Command.

Army environmental noise policies are based on land use compatibilities as indicated by objective noise levels. A number of noise measurements are used to assess compatibility, including the following:

- Decibel (dB): A measurement of the sound pressure level.
- dBA (A-weighted sound pressure level): Sound pressure level adjusted by an A-weighting filter. The A-weighting filter places greater emphasis on those frequencies within the sensitive range of the human ear by de-emphasizing the very low and very high frequency components. Typically, human hearing is best approximated by using a dBA scale (USEPA, 1974). For activities on YPG, noise generated by transportation sources (such as vehicles and aircraft) and from continuous sources (such as generators) is assessed using an A-weighted day-night level (ADNL). The Yearly Day-Night Average dBA (YDNL) is used for aircraft noise and is calculated over 365 days.
- dBC (C-weighted sound pressure level): Sound pressure level adjusted by a C-weighting filter, which emphasizes the very low frequency components of sound. For activities on YPG, impulsive noise generated by armor, artillery, and demolition activities is assessed using a C-weighted day-night level (CDNL). The CDNL average is calculated over a "training year," which is typically 250 training days for active military.
- Peak (PK): The peak or maximum, single event sound level measurement without weighting. This measurement includes the effects of everything from berms, to weather, to the length of grass on the noise, but is only accurate for a specific moment under the specific conditions at that point in time.
- PK15 (met): The peak sound level, using statistical variations caused by weather that is likely to be exceeded only 15 percent of the time. The PK15 (met) accounts for 85 percent of all meteorological conditions including those favorable to sound propagation. PK15 (met) is used for land use planning with small caliber munitions and is used to supplement land use planning for large caliber munitions and other impulsive sounds.

The decibel scale is logarithmic rather than arithmetic. When sound pressure doubles, the sound pressure level, as expressed by dBA increases by 3. Psychologically, most humans do not perceive a doubling of sound until there is an increase of 10 dBA (USEPA, 1974). Sound pressure decreases with distance from the source. Typically, the amount of noise from a

continuous source is halved (reduced by 3 dBA) as the distance from the source doubles (USEPA, 1974).

Using the noise measurement scales described above, ICUZs have been established for YPG based on the level of noise exposure in three different types of areas, designated as NZs. NZ I has the least noise exposure and NZ III having the greatest (Table 3-16). The intent of ICUZ is to prevent land use incompatibilities as a result of placing noise- sensitive activities in high-noise exposure areas. Generally, all types of land use are suitable in NZ I. NZ II is typically limited to activities such as manufacturing, warehousing, transportation, and resource protection and is not recommended for noise-sensitive land uses. No noise-sensitive land uses are recommended in NZ III. The Land Use Planning Zone, where noise-sensitive land uses are acceptable, is defined within the upper range of noise levels in NZ I. Noise levels at LAAF do not exceed 65 dB YDNL at current operational levels (U.S. Army Public Health Command, 2011).

TABLE 3-16 YPG Installation Compatible Use Zones Yuma Proving Ground

Noise Zone	Aviation (YDNL)	Impulsive, Large Caliber, Demolitions, etc. (CDNL)	Small Caliber (PK)
Land Use Planning Zone	60-65 dBA	57-62 dBC	N/A
1	Less than 65 dBA	Less than 62 dBC	Less than 87 PK
II	65-75 dBA	62-70 dBC	87-104 PK
III	More than 75 dBA	More than 70 dBC	More than 104 PK

Source: U.S. AR 200-1, Chapter 7 Environmental Noise Management Plan

Physiological hearing damage to the human ear using the PK threshold occurs at approximately 140 dB, but the threshold for annoyance varies among individuals. PK levels are typically used to determine annoyance levels instead of averages to show with 85 percent certainty how loud a single event at a particular location might get. Table 3-17 shows the risk of complaints generally from small caliber noise events.

TABLE 3-17

Anticipated Risk of Noise Complaints from Predicted Peak Sound Levels Yuma Proving Ground

Predicted Sound Level PK (dB)	Risk of Noise Complaints
less than 115	Low risk of complaints
115-130	Moderate risk of complaints
more than 130	High risk of complaints

Source: U.S. Army Public Health Command, 2011

Vibrations could become a concern to homeowners due to structural rattling and potential structural damage when the PK from an activity exceeds 120 dB; however, structural damage generally does not occur when the PK is below 150 dB (U.S. Army Public Health

Command, 2011). The general public may be annoyed by noise levels from aircraft, with louder aircraft having a greater probability of causing annoyance (Table 3-18).

TABLE 3-18 Percentage of Public Likely to be Highly Annoyed by Aircraft Noise Yuma Proving Ground

Maximum Level (dBA)	Percentage Highly Annoyed	
70	5%	
75	13%	
80	20%	
85	28%	
90	35%	

Source: U.S. Army Public Health Command, 2011

Ambient noise on YPG includes natural sources, such as wind, and man-made noises, such as aircraft noise, traffic on US 95 and other roads, munitions testing, military vehicle and equipment testing, and military training activities. Aircraft noise includes fixed- and rotary-wing military aircraft from YPG and MCAS Yuma, Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) wildlife surveys, and commercial air traffic. The main noise sources on YPG are related to transportation, aviation, and firing activities. The IONMP indicates that all NZ II and NZ III contours are contained within the YPG boundary, except for two areas (Appendix F; YPG-DPW, 2010a):

- Three small areas extending into the southern portion of the Kofa NWR from noise generated in the Kofa Range
- A small area to the east of the Cibola Range around the North UAV complex and the Tyson DZ, that is more than 2 miles from US 95

YPG personnel use the Kofa and Cibola Regions for testing and training, and portions of these areas not used for testing and training may be used for limited recreational hunting use. Both regions are unpopulated and contain no permanent sensitive receptors.

The only noise-sensitive land uses surrounding YPG are the Martinez Lake area on the Colorado River near the western boundary of the Cibola Range and the Dome Valley agricultural/rural residential area to the south of the Laguna Region. The majority of land within NZs where a risk of complaint exists consists of open space, agricultural, recreational, un-zoned, and BLM land (U.S. Army Public Health Command, 2011).

The Kofa NWR, Trigo Mountain Wilderness Area, Imperial NWR, and the Muggins Mountain Wilderness Area are considered sensitive noise receptor areas around YPG (See Appendix F) due to their proximity to firing ranges and the use of airspace over these areas for military testing and training (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). The Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-628), established the Muggins Mountain Wilderness Area, Trigo Mountain Wilderness Area, Kofa Wilderness Area, and Imperial Refuge Wilderness Area, among other Arizona desert wilderness areas. This Act does not preclude or otherwise affect continued low-level overflights by military aircraft over NWR wilderness areas and does not preclude low-level overflights of military aircraft, the designation of new units of special airspace, or the use or establishment of military flight training routes over wilderness areas. The Act also states that the ability to see or hear non-wilderness activities or uses from areas within a wilderness does not preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area. A letter dated December 3, 1958, from the Secretary of the Interior granted permission to YPG to use 171,000 ac of Kofa NWR as an artillery fire buffer zone (YPG, 2012b).

YPG implements a noise complaint management procedure, which provides guidance to those responsible for handling noise complaint issues. The facility point of contact for noise complaints has the following responsibilities:

- Receive noise complaints and complete Noise Complaint Questionnaire while talking to the complainant
- Investigate complaint-causing activities with personnel involved in activities described in the complaint. Determine if the complaint involved mission-related activities or non-routine tasks, and whether any unusual circumstances existed that may have caused the incident
- Notify and forward copies of completed Complaint Forms to the YPG Public Affairs Office (PAO) and the YPG Environmental Department within 24 hours of completion, or on the first business day after receiving the complaint

The YPG PAO:

- Review all reported noise complaints
- Assist units and facility managers in responding to complaints and any required followup to resolve public concerns to the maximum extent practicable
- Maintain a log of all noise complaints for future reference

The YPG Environmental Department reviews noise complaints and coordinates responses with the YPG PAO.

YPG typically receive less than five complaints per year. YPG receives complaints about airplane overflight noise and from bombing activities at the Barry M. Goldwater Range, which is southeast of Yuma. A majority of aircraft-related noise complaints have been attributable to aircraft operating from MCAS Yuma rather than aircraft from YPG. Persons raising these issues have been informed of the situation and advised to redirect the complaint to appropriate offices at MCAS Yuma or the Barry M. Goldwater Range (Glover, 2011, personal communication; U.S. Army Public Health Command, 2011).

Noise generated by UAS operations was not included in the operational data analyzed to develop the IONMP (U.S. Army Public Health Command, 2011). YPG has received complaints regarding operation of UASs within established YPG airspace, which have been limited to UAS operations based out of CDH. UAS flight paths from CDH have been altered in response to complaints, even though noise from these operations does not exceed the established levels for the designated noise contour (Glover, 2011, personal communication).

To reduce the risk of complaints YPG implements a noise abatement program that is specified in Annex T of the LAAF Standard Operating Procedure, dated November 1, 2010. The noise abatement program identifies the following areas where overflights should be conducted a minimum of 2,000 ft AGL:

- MAA, mainly the housing and school area
- Hidden Shores RV Park
- Martinez Lake area (includes Fisher's Landing Village and the MCAS Yuma Recreation Area)
- Imperial National Wildlife Refuge
- Kofa NWR

3.11.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts from new sources of noise on YPG:

- Amount of noise from new construction: incremental noise increases would occur from the use of heavy equipment, earthwork, and construction-related truck traffic. Sites with larger construction footprints and sites with intensive earthwork would have greater potential noise impacts.
- Proximity of new construction to sensitive noise receptors: construction sites near sensitive receptors would have greater potential noise impacts.
- Amount of noise from new testing and training activities: incremental noise increases would occur from weapons and munitions testing, military vehicle testing, training exercises that use live or dummy munitions or involve vehicle/equipment operation, and operation of aircraft and UASs. The scale of specific testing or training activities would influence their potential for generating noise impacts.
- Proximity of new testing and training activities to sensitive noise receptors: actions near sensitive receptors would have a greater potential for noise impacts.

3.11.2.1 Significance Criteria

Noise impacts would be considered significant if any of the following criteria are met:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would generate noise above current levels detectable to residents and users of YPG and the surrounding areas.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would generate noise that results in temporary changes in wildlife behavior.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would generate noise of 115 130 PK15 (met) beyond the installation boundary.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would exceed 65 ADNL beyond the installation boundary and affect sensitive receptors on and off of YPG.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would exceed 62 CDNL beyond the installation boundary and affect sensitive receptors on and off of YPG.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would exceed 130 PK15 (met) beyond the installation boundary and affect sensitive receptors on and off of YPG.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would generate noise that results in property damage or adverse health effects to humans.

• Severe (significant) – Activities that would generate noise that causes long-term changes in animal behavior, results in disruption of animal reproductive cycles, or causes a reduction in survivability.

Public Law 101-628, the enabling legislation for designated wilderness areas in Arizona contains provisions authorizing military overflights over wilderness areas adjacent to military installations and also authorizing non-wilderness activities, including generation of noise, up to the boundaries of wilderness areas. Because the noise from military operations at YPG are allowed under Public Law 101-628, no significance criteria for noise related to the adjacent wilderness area were established.

3.11.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Potential sensitive receptors would include on-post personnel and families, nearby civilians and travelers not associated with YPG, recreational hunters, and wildlife that could perceive noise caused by activities on YPG. Each of these receptors is discussed below.

YPG personnel are at risk of exposure to elevated noise during testing and training activities. Soldiers could be exposed to elevated noise from weapons and combat vehicles during training and operational testing, live-fire exercises, powered aircraft operation, and ground vehicle operation. Testers could be subject to similar exposures during performance and reliability testing of vehicles, weapons, munitions, and equipment. On-post personnel are protected from high noise levels through safety training, use of appropriate hearing protection, and compliance with SOPs developed for specific testing and training activities. YPG has an industrial hygienist and trained safety professionals on staff to ensure that proper procedures are designed and implemented for unusual military activities and for standard industrial activities, including construction (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

The slight changes in the noise zones associated with large artillery would not affect use of nearby lands outside the installation boundary. The sparsely populated and undeveloped land surrounding YPG typically lacks potential sensitive human receptors. NZ II and NZ III noise contours are within the YPG boundary except for two locations. NZ II and NZ III extend for short distances into the Kofa NWR at three points to the north of the Kofa Range (Appendix F). These areas within Kofa NWR are uninhabited desert and mountainous areas. There are no sensitive human receptors in these areas. NZ II extends just outside the installation boundary to the east of Cibola Range in the area of Tyson DZ and the North UAV Complex. This uninhabited area is designated as open space and is more than 2 miles from US 95 (U.S. Army Public Health Command, 2011). Civilians and travelers not associated with YPG could be exposed to nuisance noise levels when travelling on US 95 or when using camping facilities/areas in the vicinity of YPG, but these noises would be intermittent and of short duration. Typically, noise from military operations along US 95 would be minimal and likely unnoticed by vehicle occupants talking or listening to radio. Most recreational camping facilities/areas are across mountains from areas where testing and training occurs. The intervening mountains act to reduce the noise from military activities and the exposure would be to nuisance noise levels.

Noise generated in the Kofa and Cibola Regions from munitions testing and live-fire or operational testing typically is contained by the surrounding mountains and does not reach potential human receptors. Any such noise extending beyond the YPG boundary would not

exceed noise levels allowed in wilderness areas and would be unlikely to adversely affect wildlife (Glover, 2011, personal communication; Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

Should flights from MCAS Yuma or the Yuma Airport increase in the future, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to noise. Aircraft operations on YPG could incrementally add to the noise from MCAS Yuma and the airport. Because most aircraft operated on YPG are rotary wing aircraft or UAS, the incremental contribution to the noise environment would be less than that from commercial jet aircraft operating from the airport or military jet aircraft operating from MCAS Yuma. Any incremental contribution from aircraft noise from YPG operations would be expected to be minor.

Noise from testing and training activities can cause wildlife in the immediate area to relocate or alter behavior. Noise generated by ongoing testing and training activities would continue to cause temporary, but recurring, impacts to wildlife. The effects of noise on wildlife are further discussed in Section 3.21 (Wildlife and Fisheries).

3.11.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

The impacts of noise from the Proposed Action would be similar to the impacts described in the previous section for the No Action Alternative. No expansion of the YPG boundary would occur but an increase in testing and training activities would occur. The area encompassed by noise contours for large caliber sources outside installation boundaries would increase slightly (Appendix E).

YPG operational data from 2010 were doubled as a conservative estimate to analyze potential future noise levels. Noise levels anticipated from the Proposed Action would not be expected to double existing noise levels. Based on computer modeling the doubling of 2010 operational data concerning large caliber noise using CDNL, noise levels would increase outside the YPG boundary in unassigned desert and mountainous regions along the northern boundary of Kofa Range, mostly emanating from Bravo, Delta, and Echo impact areas, extending approximately 2.5 miles into the Kofa NWR (Appendix F). Also, open space/recreational resource areas east of the Cibola Range at the North UAV Complex and the Tyson and La Posa/Robby drop zones would increase as a result of doubling the expenditure rate from existing testing and training activities extending less than approximately 1 mile to the east (U.S. Army Public Health Command, 2011; Appendix F). Two small areas also extend outside the YPG boundary south of the Laguna Region in the Muggins Mountains area, but noise levels would be within the LUPZ (57-62 CDNL; Appendix F). Most new or increased testing and training would be done in areas remote from potentially sensitive human receptors and no impacts to human activity as a result of increased noise from testing and training would be expected.

Should flights from MCAS Yuma or the Yuma Airport increase in the future, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to noise. Aircraft operations on YPG could incrementally add to the noise from MCAS Yuma and the airport. Because most aircraft operated on YPG are rotary wing aircraft or UAS, the incremental contribution to the noise environment would be less than that from commercial jet aircraft operating from the airport or military jet aircraft operating from MCAS Yuma. Any incremental contribution from aircraft noise from increased YPG operations under the Proposed Action would be expected to be minor.

There would be construction-related noise that would not occur under the No Action Alternative. Construction-related noise would be spread over several years as a series of separate construction projects are implemented. Construction activities also would be spread spatially across YPG rather than concentrated in a single area. Construction-related noise would not be expected to extend to off-post sensitive receptors. Construction workers would be required to wear appropriate hearing protection, and YPG employees would be instructed on proper safety procedures in and around construction sites.

Operation of Project K030 would result in a noise source in the northern portion of Kofa where there are no permanent man-made noise sources at present. The only potentially sensitive receptors to this noise, which would be typical of cantonment areas on the installation, would be the personnel working there. No impacts associated with noise would be expected from operation of Project K030.

A large portion of proposed construction would occur in previously developed areas, which does not offer the preferred habitat of most species occurring on YPG. Wildlife would be temporarily disturbed by construction noise and would likely relocate to similar habitat nearby until construction is complete. Construction noise related to the Proposed Action would have a temporary negative minor effect on wildlife.

YPG has begun investigating the possibility of developing a solar renewable energy resource on the installation to increase YPG's energy security and meet federal mandates and legislative requirements to increase production and consumption of renewable energy resources. This development would be through an EUL with a private company. Two proposed locations have been identified: a Northeast Cibola Site and a West Kofa Site. Potential noise impacts would be limited to the construction phase of the solar facility, as operational noise would be minimal. Because no long-term noise source would be created and because there would be no permanent receptors in the vicinity of construction, no cumulative impacts to noise would be expected from development and operation of a solar facility on YPG.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. There could be short-term noise impacts during construction, but the Project would not contribute to cumulative noise impacts because operational noise would be minimal.

Construction of the four BLM solar projects could cause short-term noise impacts. Operation and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects would likely not contribute to cumulative noise impacts, as any noise impacts would likely be limited to the duration of construction. Operational noise from solar systems typically would not be substantial.

No cumulative noise impacts would be expected from development and operation of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site. No substantial long-term noise would result from operation of the system.

3.11.2.4 Mitigation

Measures to prevent land use incompatibilities with adjacent lands, including impacts from noise, would include active participation and coordination in local and regional planning, as discussed in Section 3.10. To reduce the potential for noise impacts, YPG would implement physical and procedural mitigation objectives to the extent practicable. Physical mitigation

includes placing barriers between the source and receiver or orienting the source in a position so that noise is directed away from the receiver. Physical mitigation measures include the following:

- Locating/relocating ranges relative to natural impediments such as in valleys or behind large mountain ranges.
- Constructing artificial berms or enclosing a small caliber range within walls and baffles.
- Orienting noise sources toward the interior of the installation and position activities that generate noise in remote locations away from sensitive receptors.

Certain weather conditions affect impulsive noise propagation (Table 3-19). Favorable conditions occur when noise does not propagate as far as when compared to nonfavorable conditions. Testing and range management would conduct potential noise generating tests under favorable conditions to the extent practicable.

Yuma Proving Ground	
Favorable Conditions for Conducting Tests	Nonfavorable Conditions for Conducting Tests
Clear skies with billowy cloud formations, especially during warm weather.	Days of steady winds 5-10 miles per hour (mph) with gusts of greater velocities (above 20 mph) in direction of nearby residences.
A rising barometer immediately following a storm.	Clear days, when layering of smoke or fog is observed.
	Days following large temperature differences (about 20°C) between day and night.
	Generally high barometer readings with low temperatures.

TABLE 3-19

Firing Conditions Related to Noise Propagation

Source: Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001

Procedural noise mitigation includes the following:

- Implementing fly-neighborly programs that adjust aircraft training times and routes to lower the impact on the community to the greatest extent possible given mission requirement.
- Adjusting the timing, when feasible, of particularly disruptive activities to avoid conflicts with local events such as church services or holidays.
- Keeping the community informed, when practicable, making public any unusual increases in the intensity of training or if training is to be resumed after a period of inactivity.
- Reviewing of EAs and EISs to ensure that the noise impacts of the proposed actions are addressed and are consistent with the IONMP.
- Monitoring the noise environment (as opposed to computer modeling) when the noise environment is controversial, when a NZ III exists in a noise-sensitive area, or when a noise is unique and cannot be modeled.

- Incorporating noise contours as a layer on the facilities GIS so that the contours may be combined with other layers (such as land use) and referenced when siting new facilities.
- Continuing implementation of the noise complaint management procedure described in Section 3.11.1.
- Maintaining aircraft operations in compliance with established ICUZ.

YPG personnel and construction workers would wear proper hearing protection and receive appropriate training as required by specific testing, training, or construction activities. To minimize human exposure safety zones and hazardous noise areas would be established as needed and would include the use of noise level meters and warning signs (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

3.12 Recreation

3.12.1 Existing Conditions

Much of the Cibola Region is within designated Game Management Unit (GMU) 43B and is also within the southern portion of GMU 43A (AGFD, 2010a and AGFD, 2012) and much of the Kofa Region is within GMU 41 (AGFD, 2010b). GMU 41 has established hunting seasons for mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) (November through January), desert bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*) in December, Gambel's quail (*Callipepla gambelii*) from October through January, and mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*) in September. GMU 43A has established hunting seasons for mule deer (November and January), desert bighorn sheep in December, quail from October through February, mourning dove in September and again from November through January, and Canada geese from October through January. GMU 43B has seasons for desert bighorn sheep in December, mule deer rifle season in November and archery season from December through January, mountain lion (*Puma concolor*) from August through May, Gambel's quail from October through February, mourning dove in September and again from mid-November through early January, and waterfowl from October through February.

YPG is closed to the public and outdoor recreational opportunities are limited. Hunting is the primary recreational activity on YPG. In coordination with AGFD, five recreational hunting areas have been established in portions of YPG where safety constraints were not an issue and where hunting would not interfere with the military mission of the installation:

- Cibola Hunting Area
- Highway 95 Hunting Area
- Arrasta Hunting Area
- Martinez Hunting Area
- East Arm Hunting Area

In-season hunting for mule deer, desert bighorn sheep, Gambel's quail, mourning dove, white-winged dove (*Zenaida asiatica*), Eurasian dove (*Streptopelia decaocto*), and African collared dove (*Streptopelia rosogrisea*) is permitted in all five designated areas. No areas suitable for waterfowl hunting occur within YPG boundaries, and mountain lion hunting has not been conducted on YPG. Hunters are required to obtain an annual YPG hunting license in addition to required state and federal licenses, permits, and tags.

Overnight camping in conjunction with hunting is permitted, but hunters are required to obtain proper advance authorization. Hunters who camp may use only downed wood for campfires and must properly dispose of their trash (Yuma Proving Ground Hunting Program [YPG HP], 2011). Since 1979, YPG has gradually increased the number of public hunting days and the available hunting acreage. While the potential for hunting on YPG is limited due to mission constraints and security concerns, YPG typically allows up to the maximum number of hunting days in accordance with state law in the designated areas (YPG, 2012b).

There is no recreational fishing on YPG. Natural waters on YPG are ephemeral and do not sustain recreational fisheries. Man-made and natural storage ponds are not feasible for recreational fishing due to constraints associated with the military mission.

An area in the southern portion of the Laguna Region is authorized for use by the BSA and D.A.R.E. During hunting season, YPG permits BSA scouting trips to designated hunting areas (YPG HP, 2011). In 2009, YPG approved an All-Terrain Vehicle Recreational Use Area adjacent to the MAA (YPG DPW, 2009). Horseback riding by YPG staff and their families is allowed on-post, and a stable within the YTC area is available for boarding privately owned horses. Horse owners are responsible for maintenance and upkeep of their animals. MCAS Yuma operates a recreational facility at Martinez Lake adjacent to the Colorado River that is open to local military personnel and their families (YPG, 2012b). The MAA has a bowling alley, fitness center, and other Morale, Welfare, and Recreation facilities that serve the YPG community (AECOM et al., 2011).

Three USFWS NWRs are located in the vicinity of YPG. As discussed in Section 2.1.1, the land between the arms of the YPG "U" is the Kofa NWR, which was established in 1939. The Kofa NWR encompasses approximately 665,400 ac of desert habitat. Kofa NWR offers a variety of recreational activities, including hiking, camping, sightseeing, photography, and nature observation. Regulated hunting for quail, desert bighorn sheep, deer, desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus auduboni*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), and gray fox (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*) is permitted (USFWS, 2008a).

The Cibola NWR, established in 1964, is located in the Lower Colorado River floodplain. The Cibola NWR encompasses both the historic Colorado River channel and the channelized portion constructed in the late 1960s. The refuge includes a nature trail and several wildlife viewing areas. Hunting is permitted in specific areas for Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*), snow goose (*Chen caerulescens*), various duck species (family Anatidae), American coot (*Fulica americana*), gallinules (family Rallidae), Gambel's quail, mourning and white-winged doves, mule deer, and desert cottontail. The refuge also offers recreational fishing opportunities (USFWS, 2011a).

The Imperial NWR is directly south of the Cibola NWR and also within the Lower Colorado River floodplain. The Imperial NWR encompasses approximately 25,768 ac and was established in 1941 as a refuge and breeding area for migratory birds and other wildlife. Similar to the other NWRs in the area, the Imperial NWR offers hiking, birding, wildlife viewing, hunting, and fishing opportunities (USFWS, 2010).

The Imperial Sand Dunes, managed by the BLM, are located in southern California approximately 15 miles west of Yuma. The dunes were formed by windblown sands from ancient Lake Cahuilla and extend for more than 40 miles. The Imperial Sand Dunes offer

scenic views and opportunities for off-highway vehicle driving with appropriate permit(s) (Bureau of Land Management California, 2011). The Picacho State Recreational Area is part of the California State Park System and provides fishing, hiking, wildlife viewing, swimming, and camping opportunities (YPG, 2012b).

3.12.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to recreation:

- Temporary impact to public access through temporary closure of areas or access roads within YPG that are used by the public.
- Permanent loss of existing recreational opportunities due to new construction or use of new areas for testing or training activities.
- Reduced recreational use due to occasional closure of an existing area used for recreation due to new or increased testing or training activities.

3.12.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to recreation include:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would affect the regional availability of recreational opportunities, access to public lands, or on-post recreational opportunities.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would eliminate the regional availability of a particular recreational opportunity or that result in long-term closure of an important public access point.

3.12.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, recreational activities and opportunities on or near YPG would not change. Testing and training activities conducted on YPG would continue at current levels and areas designated for recreation and hunting would not be affected. All of Cox Field would remain in irrigated grass and would be available for passive recreation. There would be no significant impacts to recreation under the No Action Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, the following proposed activities that would benefit recreation would not be implemented:

- Construct addition to youth services center.
- Construct an outdoor park at YTC.
- Convert Street D into pedestrian walkway.

3.12.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

There would be no effects to off-post recreational opportunities as a result of the Proposed Action. All impacts of the Proposed Action on recreation would be limited to within the boundaries of YPG.

Seven proposed activities could conflict with recreational hunting on YPG:

• Project C047-r (Ehrenberg TGP) would result in potential impacts with hunting in a small portion of the Cibola Hunting Area. Should testing or training events requiring use of this TGP be scheduled during hunting season, public hunting would be

suspended for the duration of the testing and training activities. Any impacts on public hunting would be expected to be minor.

- Project K001(1,640-ft radius DZ for personnel and cargo drops in southern portion of East Arm) would result in potential conflicts with recreational hunting in portions of the East Arm Hunting Area. Should testing or training events requiring use of this DZ be scheduled during hunting season, public hunting would be suspended for the duration of the testing and training activities. Any impacts on public hunting would be expected to be minor.
- Project K021 (Create an LTA in the East Arm) would result in potential conflicts with recreational hunting in portions of the East Arm Hunting Area. Should training events be scheduled in this LTA during hunting season, public hunting would be suspended for the duration of the training activities. Any impacts on public hunting would be expected to be minor.
- Project K030 (Construct runway, taxiway, aircraft shelter, command and control room, simulator training room, classroom, maintenance area, POL storage area, graded area for parking, and concrete or asphalt pad, clear area for GCSs, and clear area for UAS launch/recovery) would result in conflicts with recreational hunting in a small portion of the East Arm Hunting Area. Implementation of this activity would result in conversion of 26.1 ac of land currently available for hunting to institutional use where hunting could not occur. In addition, there would likely be restrictions on hunting in proximity to this area to prevent risk to personnel and equipment from public hunting activities. Any impacts on public hunting would be expected to be minor.
- Project L016-a (Construct building, concrete or asphalt pad, shade structure, and install solar lights at Site 2) would result in potential hunting conflicts in the Martinez Hunting Area. If construction of this activity were to occur during hunting season, public hunting would be suspended until the construction was complete in the area of the construction activity. Some land available for hunting would be converted to buildings and pads, but the amount of converted land would be minor. Should training events be scheduled in this LTA during hunting season, public hunting would be suspended for the duration of the training activities. Any impacts on public hunting would be expected to be minor.
- Project L016-b (Install hard power, fiber, and communication service at Site 2) would result in potential hunting conflicts in the Martinez Hunting Area. If construction of this activity were to occur during hunting season, public hunting would be suspended until the construction was complete in the area. Any impacts on public hunting would be expected to be minor.
- Project L019 (Expand and combine West LA LTA, K-9 Village LTA, Site 2 LTA, and Site 4 LTA) would result in potential hunting conflicts in the Martinez Hunting Area. Should training events be scheduled in the portion of this LTA that overlaps the Martinez Hunting Area during hunting season, public hunting would be suspended for the duration of the training activities. Any impacts on public hunting would be expected to be minor.

The construction of the ISR/EO ground truth sites across Cibola and Kofa, including some areas where public hunting is allowed, would not be expected to affect public hunting due to the small size and passive nature of the ISR/EO sites.

No proposed activities would be conducted within the Arrasta and Highway 95 Hunting Areas and there would be no changes to public hunting in these areas.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in loss of hunting opportunities on up to 1,000 ac in the Cibola Hunting Area (USAEC, 2012). In conjunction with the DPEIS projects that would reduce some hunting opportunities on YPG, there could be minor to moderate cumulative impacts to recreational hunting on YPG, but the cumulative impacts on regional hunting would be minor. Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site would have no potential for cumulative impacts to hunting on YPG or in the region.

The following proposed activities would have the potential to affect other on-post recreational activities:

- Construct addition to youth services center.
- Construct an outdoor park at YTC.
- Construct Cox Field improvements.
- Convert Street D into pedestrian walkway.

The current youth services center is not configured correctly for multiple purpose uses and lacks a high ceiling for sports such as basketball or volleyball. These activities are conducted outdoors and can be unsafe in extreme temperatures. The proposed addition to the youth services center would create additional recreational opportunities for the youth on YPG and meet the minimal requirements of a Community and Family Support Center. The addition to the youth services center would be a benefit to on-post recreation for children. Minor temporary disruptions of services at the center could occur during construction, but any impacts would be minor.

The construction of an outdoor park at YTC would create new opportunities for passive recreation in this area. There is no outdoor open space for YPG employees in the YTC cantonment. The construction of the outdoor park would add to the quality of life of employees in this area and would create additional recreational opportunities. This would be a benefit to on-post recreation in the YTC area.

Improvements at Cox Field would result in the removal of a portion of the grass turf that is used by YPG residents for passive recreation, such as picnics and casual play with children. The xeriscaped area that would replace the turf would offer different passive recreational opportunities, primarily nature observation, that would likely be less used by residents than the turf field. There would be a net minor negative impact to recreation on YPG due to reduced area available for this use.

The conversion of D Street to a pedestrian walkway would provide opportunities for increased walking within the MAA. Creating an area where regular walking could occur would be a minor benefit to passive recreational opportunities in the MAA.

There would be no impacts to off-post recreational opportunities and minor to moderate impacts to public hunting on YPG. Impacts of the Proposed Action would include beneficial improvements to recreational activities and opportunities on YPG and would have minor negative impacts to some recreational activities. Minor temporary disruption of some recreational activities could result from construction activities at facilities where recreation occurs. There would be a minor loss of green space used for casual play and picnics in the MAA. No other impacts to recreation would occur.

There could be minor to moderate cumulative impacts to recreational hunting on YPG from loss of hunting opportunities in the Cibola Hunting Area from development of a renewable solar electric generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Approximately 1,675 acres would be converted from open land, which could cause indirect impacts to nearby recreational uses through alteration of the visual landscape. The Quartzite Solar Energy Project could contribute to cumulative impacts to regional recreation.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects would likely result in incremental loss of recreational opportunities on BLM lands as projects are implemented. In addition, the appearance of the solar facilities could be a negative experience for recreational users in the area. The combination of loss of usable land and degradation of the recreational experience through altered visual character could contribute to cumulative impacts to regional recreation.

No other cumulative impacts to recreation would be expected beyond the minor incremental benefits to recreation from the Proposed Action.

3.12.2.4 Mitigation

No mitigation is proposed for recreation as no significant impact to recreational opportunities would occur.

3.13 Safety

3.13.1 Existing Conditions

The main safety concerns on YPG are related to contamination, UXO, fires, and traffic and safety, which are present both in military and non-military activities. Safety also is the basis for establishment of AT/FP setbacks and use of controlled access points on the installation. The YPG safety program educates and protects people from injury and exposure to conditions that could lead to injury. The safety program applies to all persons on YPG, including military, civilian, dependent, and contractor personnel.

Safety for military personnel and contractors involved with mission-related activities is a priority and personnel are trained individually for the various testing and training activities through specific programs. AR 385-1 (*Safety and Occupational Health Program*) and YPGR 385-1 (*Yuma Proving Ground Safety and Occupational Health Program*) define the safety program on YPG. Contractor personnel are required to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act in addition to all YPG safety requirements. Range safety during testing and training events is governed by YPG SOP YP-MTRO-P-1000 (*Airspace and Range Operations*). Each individual operation or test is required to have a specific SOP, which must meet the requirements of SOP YP-MTRO-P-1000 at a minimum and may include greater safety controls. Medical evacuation pads for helicopter access are located throughout much of YPG. The very remote areas of YPG, such as north Cibola Region or East Arm, lack medical evacuation pads.
Range Control oversees all activities conducted on the Cibola and Kofa Regions. Military or contractor personnel must receive clearance from Range Control prior to entering these areas. Range Control tracks all activities in down-range areas, including all testing or training using live fire or explosives. In addition to obtaining clearance prior to entry into the Cibola or Kofa Regions, persons also must check in with Range Control when changing positions on the range or upon leaving these areas.

Contamination on YPG primarily occurs as a result of industrial processes, routine maintenance activities, testing, and support activities and could affect personnel if an exposure pathway exists. The environmental programs on YPG minimize the use of hazardous substances and the resulting waste streams. Spill prevention measures are implemented to further protect personnel and the environment (YPG DPW, 2010b). Chapter 3 of YPGR 385-1 addresses environmental health risks and applies to all activities on YPG. Areas where contamination could occur are restricted and non-military persons are not at risk of exposure.

Contamination from PEPs and MCOCs is present in designated munitions impact areas, and munitions containing DU have been used in the NRC-licensed DU impact area in the Kofa Region. Contamination of munitions impact areas and other contaminants on YPG, including safety measures, are discussed in Section 3.9. There is no evidence that contamination from PEPs and MCOCs have migrated from designated munitions impact areas (YPG DPW, 2010b). Because these areas are restricted, non-military personnel are not at risk of exposure.

UXO from testing and training activities on YPG poses a safety concern for YPG personnel and fire-fighters. UXO is present in designated munitions impact areas (see Section 3.9). Safety procedures for explosives and usage of the Cibola and Kofa Regions are specified in YPG Regulation 385-1. Areas used to store explosives are buffered by EQSD arcs, which provide a safe zone if an explosion were to occur. Because the munitions impact areas are restricted, non-military persons are not at risk of exposure.

Civilians are not permitted on YPG, except as military contractors, dependents, and hunters. Appropriate speed limits and traffic controls are placed throughout the installation and provide for traffic safety for all persons on YPG. Hunters are allowed in designated areas during official hunting seasons. An annual YPG range safety briefing is required before anyone can obtain a hunting permit.

Trespassers could enter restricted areas on YPG and be at risk from UXO. In the past, campers have been found on YPG who indicated that they were unaware they were trespassing. Warning signs are posted along the boundary and roads through YPG to deter trespass.

Because non-lightning ignited wildfires occur on munitions impact areas that are in restricted and remote areas of the Cibola and Kofa Regions, fires on YPG typically do not affect the public. Fires in areas contaminated with UXO frequently cannot be fought or contained and must be allowed to burn out due to the risk to firefighting personnel (see Section 3.7).

US 95 and County Highway S24/Imperial Dam Road cross portions of YPG. Both are twolane paved roads with typical rural road speed limits. US 95 and County Highway S24 experience the heaviest traffic volume from 5:00 to 7:00 am and from 3:30 to 5:30 pm and YPG-associated traffic is the primary component of the heavy traffic (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). AR 385-55, Prevention of Motor Vehicle Accidents, provides guidance to drivers, which includes off-duty safety, training, and other vehicle safety guidance. YPG enforces speed limits and advocates YPG personnel to obey traffic laws. YPG implements DoD requirements that vehicle operators not use cellular phones while driving. Most materials are delivered to YPG via US 95. The transportation of explosives and other hazardous substances is discussed in Section 3.17.1.5. Guidance for the proper transportation of hazardous material is provided in AR 385-55, which addresses training, storage instructions, inspections, and planned routes.

The YPG safety program educates and protects people from injury and exposure to injurious effects. The safety program applies to all persons on YPG, including military, civilian, dependent, and contractor personnel.

3.13.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to safety:

- Potential construction-related safety risks to workers
- Potential for safety risks from new or increased testing and training activities
- Potential for traffic-related safety risks from increased military traffic on US 95, Imperial Dam Road, or Martinez Lake Road as a result of increased testing and training activities

3.13.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to safety include:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would affect, or have potential to affect, the health and safety of persons on- and off-post.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would violate established Federal, State, and local health and safety laws and regulations or create new safety hazards off-post.
- Beneficial Activities that would reduce potential safety risks.

3.13.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no new construction or changes to current levels of testing and training. YPG personnel would continue to comply with the YPG Safety Program, including developing test-specific SOPs and coordinating activities through Range Control. No impact on safety would be expected.

Beneficial impacts to safety associated with construction of MEDEVAC pads, safe haven relocation, hard power, and road improvements would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

3.13.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Proposed Action includes an increase in testing and training activities and new construction. Measures that would be implemented under the No Action Alternative would be implemented under the Proposed Action. The following sections discuss the potential for safety impacts from construction activities and from YPG operations.

Construction. Construction activities would create short-term increased safety risks to workers. During construction, workers would have the potential for accidents as a result of routine job exposure to heavy equipment and construction debris. Construction workers also would be exposed to elevated noise levels from heavy equipment and construction activities. Potential safety issues related to construction noise are further discussed in Section 3.11. Workers would use appropriate protection and comply with appropriate safety standards. Any potential safety impacts from construction would be minor.

Construction-related traffic could result in a minor increase in traffic-safety risk. Construction-related traffic and appropriate mitigation measures to minimize safety risk are further discussed in Section 3.17. Any impacts would be minor.

Construction of TGPs in the Cibola and Kofa Regions and construction of Projects K001, K025, and K030 would require that construction workers access the restricted portion of KFR. All movement to and from these sites would be coordinated through Range Control to avoid conflicts with munitions testing. Helicopters would be used to evacuate injured workers should immediate care be required. Because of the coordination with Range Control and the availability of helicopter evacuation, no adverse safety impacts would be expected from construction activities in these remote restricted areas in the Cibola and Kofa Regions.

Operations. Implementation of the Proposed Action would be expected to result in net minor to moderate benefits to safety on YPG. Certain proposed activities are specifically intended to benefit safety, while many others would provide indirect safety benefits. No activities are proposed that would directly increase safety risks on YPG.

AT/FP improvements would be constructed at multiple locations in the Laguna Region. These activities would reduce the risk of external threats to security and safety on YPG. Helicopter landing pads for MEDEVAC would be constructed in the northern Cibola Region, which would result in more prompt response and treatment should serious injury or illness occur at a JERC site. Flood upgrades on Aberdeen Road at Castle Dome Wash would improve safety conditions for persons traveling between US 95 and the Kofa cantonment. In the MAA, D Street would be converted to a walkway, which would enhance pedestrian safety. Shade would be installed at multiple locations (K-9 Village, Site 2, CM 4, Lightweight Shock Facility, and Stinger Pole target) to reduce exposure to the sun and associated heat stress for persons working in these areas.

Installation of hard power and telecommunication service at multiple locations on the Cibola and Kofa Regions would reduce the use of portable generators, which would provide indirect benefits to safety. Transportation of generators and fuel to remote areas on the Cibola and Kofa Regions would be reduced, which could benefit transportation safety on range roads in these areas. Less fuel would be managed at test sites, reducing the potential for fuel-related accidents at down-range locations.

Personnel manning the East Kofa Operations Center would have to cross KFR to reach the site. All movement to and from the East Kofa Operations Center would be coordinated through Range Control to avoid conflicts with munitions testing. Because of the coordination with Range Control, no adverse safety impacts would be expected from staff travelling to the East Kofa Operations Center.

Personnel training in the proposed dismounted maneuver areas at SCAM Flats, Tower 71, East Arm, and SWTR would have to cross KFR to reach the site. In addition, use of SWTR would be coordinated among the following uses: personnel training at dismounted maneuver area, UAS launch/recovery, and use of SWTR as an impact area. All movement to and from the proposed dismounted maneuver areas and proposed UAS launch/recovery sites would be coordinated through Range Control to avoid conflicts with munitions testing. Because of the coordination with Range Control, no adverse safety impacts would be expected from operations.

Testing at the DZ that would be created by Project K001, operation of the testing/training complex in the northern portion of the East Arm (K030), and training activities at the East Arm LTA (K021) would result in personnel operating in very remote areas. Personnel working at these sites would coordinate with Range Control for access and any serious injuries would require use of helicopters for evacuation. Because of the coordination with Range Control and the availability of helicopter evacuation, no adverse safety impacts would be expected from operational activities in these remote areas in the Kofa Region.

The relocation of Safe Haven would reduce the risk that an overnight accident at a truck awaiting cargo delivery to YPG would affect persons in the Kofa cantonment.

Increased testing and training and increased vehicle use would not be expected to change the rate of safety-related incidents on YPG. There could be an increase in the number of safety-related incidents because more activities would be ongoing. Because the YPG Safety Program would be implemented, safety issues from incidents related to increased activity would be expected to be minor.

Increased testing and training could increase the risk of wildfire on YPG through creation of additional potential ignition sources. Vegetation clearing and land disturbance associated with construction, creation, and use of UAS launch/recovery areas, DZs, and TGPs may create conditions favorable to establishment of exotic invasive vegetation, which would create increased fuel loads and increase the risk of severe wildfire. See Sections 3.7 and 3.18 for further discussion of fuel loads and wildfire. Wildfire would continue to be suppressed in the Laguna Region and any impacts to safety from increased risk of wildfire or severe wildfire would be expected to be minor.

There would be potential for foreseeable future projects to interact with safety on YPG. Should a solar powered electrical generation facility be constructed in the Cibola Region, glare from such a facility could affect aircraft operations within YPG airspace, which could increase safety risks.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. There would be minimal health and safety risks during construction and operations of the project, and they would not contribute to regional safety cumulative impacts.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects would be unlikely to contribute to cumulative impacts to regional safety. It is anticipated there would be minimal health and safety risks during construction and operations of the projects.

Proposed Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) improvements to US 95 would provide increased traffic safety along this road for public travel and for YPG-related travel.

This would be a cumulative benefit to safety in the region and would also occur under the No Action Alternative. No other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would have the potential to interact with safety on YPG. No other cumulative impacts are expected.

3.13.2.4 Mitigation

YPG would implement mitigation to minimize the potential adverse impacts to safety from construction and active munitions areas. During construction, workers would follow appropriate OSHA standards to prevent injury. On-post personnel would comply with the YPG safety program and coordinate with Range Control.

3.14 Socioeconomics

3.14.1 Existing Conditions

This section describes the socioeconomic environment in the vicinity of YPG, which includes the impact of YPG on the regional economy. YPG is relatively isolated within a large county containing few large urban areas. The potential for socioeconomic impacts would be confined primarily to YPG and the nearby urban area (the City of Yuma).

The City of Yuma is the largest population center in the region and, like Yuma County as a whole, the population has been increasing. The Yuma metropolitan area was the third fastest growing metropolitan area in the country between 1990 and 2000 (Yuma County Chamber of Commerce, 2011). Almost all YPG civilian personnel reside in Yuma or the surrounding area and only 450 people live on YPG (YPG, 2011a). From 1990 to 2010, the population of the City of Yuma grew by approximately 69 percent and the population of Yuma County grew by approximately 83 percent. The climate is attractive to temporary winter residents and the winter population of Yuma County typically increases by 80,000 to 100,000 each year (Yuma County, 2011). Yuma County population projections for 2020 indicate an approximately 39 percent increase from 2010 levels, with the City of Yuma growing by approximately 28 percent in that same timeframe (Table 3-20).

_	Yuma Proving Ground	
	Population Data for Local Cities and Counties, the State of Arizona, and the United Stat	es
	TABLE 3-20	

	1990 Census ^a	2000 Census ^b (% change from 1990)	2010 Census Estimates [°] (% change from 2000)	2020 Projections ^d (% change from 2010)
Yuma City, Arizona	54,923	77,515 (41%)	93,064 (20%)	119,464 (28%)
Ehrenberg, Arizona	1,226	1,357 (11%)	1,470 (8%)	1,486 (1%)
Quartzsite, Arizona	1,876	3,354 (79%)	3,677 (10%)	4,317 (17%)
La Paz County, Arizona	13,844	19,715 (42%)	20,489 (4%)	25,487 (24%)
Yuma County, Arizona	106,895	160,026 (50%)	195,751 (22%)	271,361 (39%)
Arizona	3,665,228	5,130,632	6,392,017	8,779,567

_ . _

2010 Const	
Yuma Proving Ground	
Population Data for Local Cities and Counties, the State of Arizona, and the United States	5
TABLE 3-20	

	1990 Census ^a	2000 Census ^b (% change from 1990)	2010 Census Estimates ^c (% change from 2000)	2020 Projections ^d (% change from 2010)
		(40%)	(25%)	(37%)
United States	248,709,873	281,421,906 (13%)	308,745,538 (10%)	324,927,000 ^e (5%)

Sources: ^a USCB, 2011c; ^b USCB, 2011d; ^c USCB, 2011a, ^d Arizona Department of Economic Security, 2006, ^e USCB, 2000

YPG also extends northward into La Paz County, but there are no large metropolitan centers abutting YPG in this county. The cities of Quartzsite and Ehrenberg are located north of the installation in La Paz County. La Paz County grew by 48 percent from 1990 to 2010, but growth slowed greatly after 2000, with only a 4 percent increase from 2000 to 2010. Growth is projected to increase again in La Paz County, with an increase of 24 percent over the 2010 population expected by 2020 (Table 3-20).

YPG and MCAS Yuma, along with farming, cattle ranching, and tourism, are the main employers in Yuma County. Agriculture, tourism, and the military account for \$900 million, \$450 million, and \$300 million, respectively, of the local economy (Yuma County Chamber of Commerce, 2011). The military in Arizona, indirectly and directly, accounts for \$9.1 billion in economic output and 96,328 jobs (The Maguire Company, 2008).

YPG contributes over \$425 million a year to the Arizona economy, most of which stays within Yuma County. YPG is the largest employer in Yuma County, with more than 3,000 military and civilian employees and also is the county's largest civilian employer. Approximately 23,000 visitors per year come to YPG and more than 100 military units, which include up to 10,000 Soldiers, Marines, and other military personnel who come to YPG each year to train under realistic hot desert conditions (YPG, 2011a). These visitors contribute to the revenue of airlines, local hotels, restaurants, and other area businesses. Among government organizations, YPG is one of Yuma County's main consumers of local goods and services. Federal impact funds are provided as payment to the local school districts to defray the cost of accommodating military children in the public school system (YPG, 2011a).

YPG implements a variety of assistance and outreach programs for personnel and families. For example, the federally funded Women, Infants, and Children Program assists participants in maintaining a nutritionally balanced diet. The Financial Readiness Program offers financial assistance and assists in resolving problems with local businesses. YPG also operates a volunteer program for activities in the local community (YPG, 2011b).

3.14.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to socioeconomic resources:

- Wages from employment associated with new construction projects
- Spending to acquire construction materials from local or regional merchants

- Secondary spending by construction workers among local or regional merchants
- Secondary spending by non-assigned personnel and supported components who temporarily visit YPG for testing or training activities
- Reduced spending for fuel for operation of portable generators and for delivery of portable generators, fuel for portable generators, and potable water.

3.14.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to socioeconomic resources include:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would affect, or have potential to affect, short-term income, jobs, and population levels.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would affect, or have potential to affect, long-term or permanent income, jobs, and population levels.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would result in changes in population levels (particularly declines) that appreciably exceed typical historical fluctuations and could burden community services.
- Beneficial Activities that would contribute to the local and regional economy.

3.14.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no change in existing conditions, including the number of staff at the YPG. The existing YPG complex would continue to operate. YPG would remain the largest employer in Yuma County and would continue to contribute over \$425 million a year to the AZ economy. No impacts to socioeconomics would be anticipated.

Short-term beneficial impacts to the local economy as a result of increased spending due to purchase of building materials and construction jobs would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

3.14.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

Direct Impacts. There would be short-term minor benefits to the local economy from the purchase of building materials and construction jobs as a result of the various construction projects. Construction workers would come from the general Yuma area and no new permanent jobs would be created. No new long-term jobs are anticipated at YPG as a result of new construction activities or from increased testing and training activities. These impacts are considered minor. Because there would be no permanent change in workforce and no long-term construction would occur, no cumulative impacts to socioeconomic resources would be expected.

There could be minor cumulative beneficial impacts to socioeconomics from development and operation of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site. There would be long-term creation of a few jobs, which would have a negligible beneficial impact on regional employment. Operation of this facility would reduce the demand for electricity from the grid for YPG, which could contribute to reduced rates paid for electricity and provide incremental benefits to the regional economy. There could be minor cumulative beneficial impacts to regional socioeconomics from development and operation of the Quartzite Solar Energy Project, approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. There would be short-term creation of 280 jobs and long-term creation of 47 jobs, which would incrementally benefit regional employment.. Operation of the facility would provide an additional source of electrical power, which could contribute to reduced rates paid for electricity and provide incremental benefits to the regional economy.

There could be minor cumulative beneficial impacts to regional socioeconomics from development and operation of the four BLM solar projects. There would be likely be short-term and long-term job creation, which would incrementally benefit regional employment. Operation of the facilities would provide additional sources of electrical power, which could contribute to reduced rates paid for electricity and provide incremental benefits to the regional economy.

Indirect Impacts. No new employees are anticipated to relocate to the area as a result of the Proposed Action. There would not be an increased demand for housing, education, or other public services. The workers who would be employed on the construction project may have increased income, and would continue to spend money in Yuma, which is a minor indirect beneficial impact.

There could be an indirect minor negative impact on local fuel and water retailers. If hard power is installed to many test locations, fuel would no longer be required for portable generators at those locations. Likewise, a reduction in the amount of potable water purchased from local retailers would occur if potable water is provided to cantonment areas from the proposed WTPs. The effect on the local economy due to the reduction of purchased fuel or potable water would be less than significant.

3.14.2.4 Mitigation

Mitigation is not required for socioeconomic impacts because direct and indirect impacts are minor and temporary or beneficial.

3.15 Soils

3.15.1 Existing Conditions

The soils on YPG are of the aridisol and entisol soil orders. Aridisols generally are older and more developed soils and are characterized by light-colored surface layers with low amounts of organic matter and at least one diagnostic sub-horizon (Hendricks, 1985). As the aridisols soils age under arid conditions, cemented layers of salts and carbonate, commonly referred to as caliches and hardpans, may form (YPG, 2012b). Entisols typically are younger than aridisols and occur in areas subject to wind erosion or scour by surface water runoff. Entisols have little or no horizon development, but may have a thin surface layer with accumulated organic matter (Hendricks, 1985).

Nine soil complexes occur on YPG. Most soil complexes on YPG are not susceptible to water or wind erosion. Some soils become more susceptible to erosion following disturbance or under certain landscape position/slope conditions (Table 3-21).

TABLE 3-21

Soil Complexes on YPG Yuma Proving Ground

Soil Complex Name	Landscape Position	Percent Slope	Areas of YPG	Hazard of Water Erosion	Hazard of Wind Erosion
Carsitas family- Chuckawalla family Complex	Dissected relic beach terraces; fan terraces	4-30%; 1-7%	Laguna Region; Southern boundary of Kofa Region	Slight	None
Chuckawalla family- Gunsight family Complex	Fan Terraces; summit/shoulder and sideslopes	1-7%; 3-15%	Kofa Region – East arm	Slight	None
Cristobal family- Gunsight family Complex	Fan Terraces; crest/summit and sideslopes	1-3%; 3-15%	All regions	Slight; high in disturbed areas	None; moderate in disturbed areas
Gilman family- Harqua family- Glenbar family Complex	Mixed stream alluvium; floodplains and basin floor	0-2%	Eastern Kofa Region; Northern Cibola Region	Medium to high in floodplains; slight on basin floor	Medium to high in floodplains; none on basin floor
Gunsight family- Chuckawalla family Complex	Fan Terraces; summit/shoulder and sideslopes	1-7%; 3-15%	All regions	Slight	None
Lithic Torriorthents and Typic Torriorthents	Hills and mountains	15-60%	All regions	Sight	None
Riverbend family- Carizzo family Complex	Stream Terraces and Floodplains	1-3%	All regions	Slight	None; very slight in disturbed areas
Superstition family- Rositas family Complex	Relic beach terraces and dunes	1-10%; 2-15%	Laguna Region	Slight	Very high; extremely high in disturbed areas
Tucson family- Tremant family- Antho family Complex	Alluvial fans	1-2%	Eastern Kofa Region; Northern Cibola Region	Moderate to high	Very slight; high in disturbed areas

Source: Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), 1991

Aridisols at YPG include the Cristobal, Chuckwalla, and Gunsight soil types. Cristobal and Chuckwalla are the soils in areas with desert hardpan or desert pavement. Gunsight soils occur on adjacent side slopes. Entisols at YPG include the Carrizo, Lithic Torriorthents, Typic Torriorthents, Rositas, Carsitas, Antho, Gilman, and Glenbar soil types. Carrizo soils are located in the dried riverbeds. Lithic and Typic Torriorthents are young shallow deposits on mountainsides. Rositas and Carsitas consist of active shifting sands. Antho, Gilman, and Glenbar soils occur in the broad valley floodplains along washes (YPG, 2012b).

Desert pavement, which consists of a surface covering of closely packed fragments of pebbles, gravel, cobble, or debris weathered from bedrock, is common in bajadas (level plains between washes) throughout much of YPG (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason

Associates Corporation, 2001). A silt- and clay-rich soil horizon, designated as the Av horizon due to its position in vesicles among the rocks, underlies the armored, tightly packed desert pavement surface layer. The Av horizon ranges from 0.01 to 3.94 inches thick and forms through an accrectionary process by trapping atmospheric dusts. The eolian dusts are a combination of clay, silt, calcium carbonate, and soluble salts. The accumulation and vertical distribution of the dusts over time form into well-developed soil horizons. The upper horizons have a large percentage of fine-grained material and are underlain by the reddish, gravel-rich Bw horizon (Caldwell et al., 2008). These fine-grained arid soils have high porosities and pronounced secondary structure (Berli et al., 2007).

Hardpans, desert pavements, biological soil crusts, and vegetation naturally protect the soils of YPG from erosion. When these protective surfaces are disturbed, soil erosion can be rapid, particularly in sloped areas. Winds and occasional heavy rain are the primary causes of erosion on YPG (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). The extensive porous and secondary structure of the Av horizon collapses quickly upon disturbance, resulting in high dust emissions (Caldwell et al., 2008). The Av horizon is also predominantly clay and silt materials and could be more susceptible to fluvial erosion once the desert pavement is disturbed. A recent study of desert shrubs along first-order streams found an accumulation of high silt and clay soils underlying the upper channels. This accumulation was attributed to fluvial erosion from nearby plant scars, or disturbances in the desert pavement caused by plant mortality (McDonald et al., 2004). The same study also found that the infiltration rate increased and the runoff decreased once desert pavement was disturbed. This change in soil characteristics had a direct adverse impact on the surrounding vegetation communities, which is further discussed in Section 3.18.

3.15.2 Environmental Consequences

This section discusses direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to soils that may result from the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action. The types of impacts considered in this soils impact analysis include:

- Permanent loss of native soil, which includes loss of soils due to direct impacts such as creation of impervious surface area, excavation, or placement of fill material.
- Soil compaction, which could result from use of heavy equipment during construction or from off-road testing of large military equipment. Compaction can adversely affect soil functions, including the ability to filter water, resist erosion, or support native vegetation.
- Wind erosion, which includes loss of the upper soil horizons by wind action on exposed soils or across areas where desert pavement is disturbed or removed.
- Water erosion, which includes loss of the upper soil horizons by runoff across exposed soils, erosion from areas where desert pavement is disturbed or removed, or increased runoff as a result of increased impervious area.
- Soil instability, which could result from testing and training activities that result in loss of vegetative cover or desert pavement and that would likely contribute to subsequent conditions prone to wind and/or water erosion.
- Beneficial impacts, which could result from actions that reduce or eliminate the potential for soil disturbance during testing and training activities.

Contamination of native soils from hazardous materials, including POLs and explosives, also would represent an impact to soils, but these impacts are discussed under hazardous materials (Section 3.9) rather than in this section.

Indirect impacts to other resource areas could result from soil disturbance, including air quality (Section 3.2), cultural resources (Section 3.4), vegetation (Section 3.18), and water quality (Section 3.20). Such impacts are discussed in those sections, as appropriate.

3.15.2.1 Significance Criteria

The significance criteria used to assess impacts to soils are:

- Negligible (less than significant) Activities that have barely perceptible impacts on soils or erosion potential
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that could cause soil erosion but in areas where management practices are sufficient to minimize the effects
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would disturb less than 25,000 ft² of desert pavement
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would disturb and permanently unstabilize less than 25,000 ft² of highly erodible soils
- Severe (significant) Activities that would result in uncontrolled and irreparable erosion (in areas where management practices are insufficient to minimize the effects)
- Severe (significant) Activities that would result in changes to native soils that would preclude the restoration of native plant communities in a contiguous area greater than 5 ac
- Severe (significant) Activities that would result in the disturbance or loss of a contiguous area of more than 25,000 ft² of desert pavement in an undeveloped area

3.15.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, continuing mission operations would result in impacts to soils, as testing and training activities would continue in currently authorized areas at currently authorized levels. Soil impacts could result from off-road vehicle and equipment activity and maneuvers, dismounted maneuvers, set-up for test operations, and live-fire exercises. Impacts of these activities have been previously evaluated under NEPA in the assessments listed in Section 2.3.2.

The evaluations and analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed in Section 2.3.2 provide an assessment of the potential impacts to soils that would result from the No Action Alternative, with testing and training continued at current levels and no new construction. The analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed above are incorporated into this DPEIS by reference.

Vehicular studies were conducted at existing YPG dust courses (Caldwell et al., 2008) and in areas of undisturbed desert pavement at YPG (Berli et al., 2007) to further evaluate the impact of disturbing desert pavement.

The objectives of the Caldwell et al. (2008) study were to characterize the current dust courses at YPG to gain a better understanding of their current fine-grained content and

assess the overall sustainability of high dust potential soils needed for military testing. Dust courses are generally short ovals constructed on Cristobal-Gunsight desert pavements. The three dust courses at YPG used in the study include the active Kofa and Cibola courses and the retired Muggins Mesa course. Soil samples were collected from the test track, from adjacent undisturbed soils, and from test vehicle exteriors. The results indicated that the secondary structure of the Av horizon is easily destroyed by vehicular traffic, resulting in dust emissions necessary for military testing. However, routine testing and surface preparation have eroded and mixed the top layer with the lower B horizon, and thus decreased the dust potential of the course. As a result, desert pavement is considered non-sustainable for dust track courses. The construction of additional dust tracks is not included in the Proposed Action. However, the study recommended that future dust tracks be constructed in active distal fan environments found on gentler-sloped alluvial environments that provide a sustainable dust supply.

The Berli et al. (2007) study aimed to model the deterioration of fine-textured desert pavement due to heavy vehicle traffic. Two models were used to predict rut formation from the eight-wheeled tactical "Stryker" vehicle on desert pavements at YPG. For model evaluation, traffic experiments at YPG were performed to measure rut depth and soil bulk density based on the number of "Stryker" vehicle passes. The study found that rut formation was a result of two processes: (1) compaction of underlying soil and (2) wear of the soil surface due to abrasion by the tire. In the first vehicle pass, compaction was probably the dominant rut forming process, while for subsequent passes abrasion of the soil surface controlled rut formation. For multiple passes, a simple linear rut depth versus vehicle pass model is most appropriate. Overall, the rut depth and erosion potential increases with increased number of vehicle passes.

Range sustainability on YPG is managed through the ITAM program, which is implemented to maintain conditions that realistically simulate conditions in other desert regions for operational testing and training activities. Range management and rehabilitation prevent deterioration of conditions that could adversely affect operational testing and training if allowed to proceed unchecked. Part of range management is recovery of spent metal from munitions testing. Use of vehicles to retrieve scraps of metal results in minor soil disturbance, but the action removes a potential source of contamination as metal and remnant MCOCs on the metal are removed from the range.

3.15.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

The analysis of potential impacts to soils as a result of implementing the Proposed Action is based on the difference in impacts that would occur under the Proposed Action compared to those that would occur under the No Action Alternative. Potential impacts to soils could occur from the following activities:

- Building/facility construction
- Utility infrastructure installation
- Off-road vehicle and equipment testing
- Dismounted maneuver activities
- Munitions testing
- Live-fire training and operational testing
- DZ establishment
- TGP establishment

During site selection and site design, soil erosion potential would be considered and activities that would cause loss of vegetation or soil disturbance or that would create new impervious areas would be identified; to the extent practical, such activities would be placed in areas where onsite and downslope soils are not susceptible to erosion. It is not possible to completely avoid highly erodible soils due to the sheer volume of activities proposed and the dispersed occurrence of such soils across the YPG landscape. YPG would minimize the location of activities that could lead to increased erosion potential on highly erodible soils. Further, efforts would be made in site designs to result in conditions where post-disturbance site hydrology is unchanged with respect to stormwater runoff velocities and volumes.

Where soils that are susceptible to wind erosion are disturbed, increased wind erosion could occur and would have the potential to create dust and contribute to PM_{10} in the air. Increased dust generation could contribute to air quality impacts, which are discussed in Section 3.2.

The following sections discuss the potential impacts to soils that could result in each of the three areas on YPG.

Laguna Region. Within the Laguna Region, new building/facility construction, airfield runway/taxiway construction/improvement, roadway improvements, and ACP improvements would be the primary activities that would cause impacts to soils. Limited additions to utility infrastructure would occur in the Laguna Region and these would have minor impacts to soils. Expanded dismounted maneuver areas and new vehicle test courses are proposed for parts of the Laguna Region, and the subsequent use of these areas could impact soils. A new DZ is proposed for the Laguna Region. Figure 3-2 shows the distribution of soils types on YPG.

Most proposed new building and facility construction would occur in the Laguna Region. Site preparation for construction of buildings would cause severe disturbances to soil. Additional impervious areas would be created through construction, with the potential for increased stormwater runoff. Scour from erosion as a result of increased runoff could result in severe soil loss along flow paths in some areas.

Proposed new facility construction occurring in areas with Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils would result in the most severe soil impacts. The Cristobal family-Gunsight family has high wind and moderate water hazards in disturbed areas. In the Laguna Region, approximately 55 ac of new construction is proposed in locations containing the Cristobal family-Gunsight family soils. The Superstition family-Rositas family complex also has high wind erosion hazards, particularly when disturbed. Approximately 25 ac of new construction is proposed in locations family-Rositas family complex family complex family complex soils.

During construction, BMPs would be used to stabilize disturbed soils, which would minimize the potential for soil erosion impacts from stormwater runoff and wind erosion. Construction BMPs would comply with the ADOT *Erosion and Pollution Control Manual* (2005). BMPs that could be used include, but would not be limited to, the following:

• Preservation of existing vegetation – existing vegetation provides natural protection against soil erosion and would be preserved if practicable.

- Mulching mulch would be applied to disturbed soil to prevent erosion during and following precipitation events.
- Slope Protection several measures could be used to minimize erosion from disturbed slopes, which could consist of geotextiles, vegetation, mulch, or a combination.
- Silt Fence a sediment barrier would be used where necessary to prevent the movement of sediment from disturbed areas.

Additional BMPs would be implemented to minimize the potential for increased wind erosion during construction and operation. BMPs that could be used to minimize the potential for wind erosion would include, but would not be limited to, the following (California Stormwater Quality Association [CASQA], 2003):

- Wet Suppression watering prevents dust and wind erosion only for a short period and should be applied at least daily to be effective. Overwatering may also cause surface water erosion.
- Chemical Dust Suppression chemicals would be chosen appropriately depending on the soil type, temperature, humidity, and wind velocity. The chemicals may also interfere with the soil's infiltration abilities, thus impacting re-vegetation on the site.
- Gravel or asphalt gravel could be applied to disturbed soils to prevent wind erosion.
- Covering construction stockpiles with tarps and canvases

The proposed long-term project at CDH (L103) would result in approximately 18 ac of construction impacts on highly erodible Cristobal family-Gunsight family soils. Two additional proposed CDH projects (L007 and L008) would occur in a location containing both Cristobal family-Gunsight family and Superstition family-Rositas family soils. These projects would result in 10 ac of construction disturbance. Soils would be most susceptible to erosion during construction activities and appropriate BMPs, as discussed above, would be implemented to minimize the potential for severe impacts.

There would be potential for increased runoff from the approximately 125 ac of new impervious area. Appropriate post-construction stormwater controls would be implemented to minimize the potential for increased runoff and erosion (see Section 3.20). Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could result in increased erosion, which could then remove native soils through scour. The potential loss of native soils through scour from erosive water flow could extend off-post and affect erodible soils on adjacent downstream properties. Appropriate construction BMPs, as discussed above and post-construction stormwater controls (see Section 3.20), would be enacted to minimize the potential for on-post and off-post impacts.

Electrical transmission and telecommunications lines would be installed at seven locations in the Laguna Region. The proposed runway extension (L002) would include the installation of power lines, which would occur on Superstition family-Rositas family erodible soils. In areas with erodible soils, all transmissions lines would be installed aboveground and impacts would be minor. There would be potential for minor soils impacts to occur at each of the seven sites along the entire length of utility line installation if these lines were installed belowground. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction, would be implemented and impacts to soils from utility line installation would be minor. One area (L014), encompassing approximately 162 ac, would be cleared for creation of UAS launch/recovery areas. The vegetation removal would result in increased potential for soil erosion, as discussed for TGPs. Approximately 6 ac are proposed in a location with highly erodible Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils. The proposed sites are on the relatively flat basin floor where water erosion would be minimal, but wind erosion hazards are likely. This acreage would not be managed through the ITAM program because it is not associated with training activities. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed under facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to minimize the potential for wind erosion. Impacts to soils from creation of UAS launch/recovery areas would be minor with implementation of the BMPs.

An increase in dismounted maneuver activity would occur in the Laguna Region (L019, L030, L032, and L033). The LTA at West LA would be expanded by approximately 6,520 ac to connect with K-9 Village. Battalion-level dismounted maneuvers simulating deployment in open desert to achieve an urban target in either the West LA or K-9 Village MOUT areas would be conducted. The LTA at Muggins/Middle Mountain would be expanded up to approximately 16,640 ac. Additional expanded dismounted maneuver areas would be established in the Laguna Region, which would cover approximately 1,970 ac. Approximately 1,480 ac of dismounted maneuver area is proposed in locations containing the Cristobal family-Gunsight family soils. Approximately 2,943 ac of dismounted maneuver area is proposed in locations family-Rositas family complex soils.

In addition, new vehicle test courses would be established within approximately 9,040 ac in the Laguna Region (L037, L038, and L039). Discernible trails would be established, minimizing the potential for soil compaction and for exposing soils outside the boundary of the vehicle test courses. However, when active vehicle testing is not ongoing, the area may be used to perform blended testing or dismounted maneuver training at the vehicle test courses. Approximately 1,430 ac of the vehicle test courses is proposed in locations containing the Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils. Approximately 157 ac of vehicle test courses is proposed in locations containing the Superstition family-Rositas family complex soils. The nature of dismounted maneuvers, with Soldiers moving in a diffuse pattern across the landscape rather than as a cluster, would reduce the potential for soils disturbance and erosion. Impacts to soils from these training activities would be expected to be long-term and minor with continued implementation of the ITAM program.

Creation of a DZ would involve activity-related land-disturbing activities on approximately 45 ac in the Laguna Region (L040). The vegetation would not be entirely cleared in this area, but would be disturbed and likely trampled during testing and training activities. Disturbances to vegetation and soils would generally be caused by objects falling directly onto the ground by parachute and vehicles retrieving dropped payloads. The proposed DZ is in Superstition family-Rositas family complex soils. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed above, would be implemented to minimize the potential for wind erosion. Impacts to soils from testing and training activities would be expected to be long-term and minor with use of appropriate BMPs and continued implementation of the ITAM program.

Wildfire adversely affects desert vegetation, and soil erosion is more likely to occur in areas following vegetation removal from a wildfire. Within the Laguna Region, wildfires are suppressed and do not substantially alter desert vegetation. Because no change to the

wildfire management program would occur under the Proposed Action, no impacts to vegetation and soils would be expected as a result of wildfire in the Laguna Region. This is discussed further in Section 3.7.

No munitions testing occurs in the Laguna Region and no TGPs would be established in this region. No new off-road vehicle testing in the Laguna Region would occur under the Proposed Action. These activities would not affect soils in the Laguna Region.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site, which is in the Laguna Region, would result in soil disturbance on up to 322 ac (USAEC, 2012). This could incrementally add to other projects on YPG that create soils disturbance and lead to minor cumulative impacts to soils.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would likely result in minor impacts to soils that are not susceptible to erosion and moderate impacts to highly erodible soils that are disturbed. There would also be potential for interaction of activities conducted in the Laguna Region with activities proposed in other areas of YPG. Use of appropriate BMPs in areas where soils are disturbed would reduce the potential for increased soil erosion. Continued implementation of the YPG INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for severe soil impacts and for incremental interaction with other on-post projects and no significant cumulative impacts would be expected.

Cibola Region. The amount of proposed new building/facility construction in the Cibola Region is much less than that proposed for the Laguna Region. Most of the proposed building/facility construction for the Cibola Region is new construction rather than replacement of existing structures and there would be potential for disturbance to soils from construction activities. Numerous airfields across the Cibola Region are proposed for runway expansion and new supporting infrastructure with the potential for impacts to soils at each site. Multiple areas are proposed for use as munitions impact areas, either new areas or expansions of existing munitions impact areas with potential for long-term impacts to soils in these areas. Utility infrastructure extensions would occur throughout the Cibola Region and could have minor impacts to soils. New dismounted maneuver areas and vehicle test courses are proposed for parts of the Cibola Region and the subsequent use of these areas could impact soils. New DZs are proposed for the Cibola Region and 23 TGPs would be established to support testing activities. Both of these activities would affect soils.

Proposed new construction activities occurring in areas with Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils would have the greatest potential for severe soil impacts. The Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex has high wind and moderate water hazards in disturbed areas. Approximately 28 ac of proposed new construction, including the creation of the North UAV complex and access roads, is proposed in locations containing the Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils (28 ac) and the Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex (<1 ac). Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to minimize the potential for erosion. Soils impacts from construction in this complex would be moderate with use of appropriate BMPs.

The Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex also has moderate to high water and wind erosion hazards in floodplains. The new construction and impact areas proposed on this soil type would occur on the basin floor where erosion hazards would be negligible. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to further minimize the potential for erosion. Soils impacts from construction in this complex would be minor with use of appropriate BMPs.

Soils would be most susceptible to erosion during construction activities and appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to minimize the potential for severe impacts. Following construction, cleared areas converted to impervious areas would have no potential for water or wind erosion. There would be potential for localized increased runoff from the approximately 130 ac of new impervious area, which could result in increased runoff and increased erosion. Depending on the location of the new impervious area, the scour from erosive water flow could extend offpost and affect soils on adjacent downstream properties. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, and post-construction stormwater controls would be enacted to minimize the potential for on-post and off-post impacts.

Expansion or creation of DZs would involve activity-related land-disturbing activities on approximately 980 ac in the Cibola Region. The vegetation would not be entirely cleared in these areas, but would be disturbed and likely trampled during testing and training activities. Disturbances to vegetation and soils would generally be caused by objects falling directly onto the ground by parachute and vehicles retrieving dropped payloads. The sites of all the existing and many of the proposed DZs (approximately 510 ac) are in areas with highly erosive Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex and Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family soils. The Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex soils are only erodible in floodplain areas. DZs would be located on the flat terrain of the basin floor where erosion impacts to this soil type would be negligible. Water erosion impacts in this area would also be negligible. Disturbed soils of the Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex would be susceptible to wind erosion. There would be no direct impacts to soils in these areas from the creation of the DZs, but indirect impacts could result from subsequent wind erosion. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed under facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to minimize the potential for wind erosion. Impacts to soils from testing and training activities would be expected to be long-term and minor with use of appropriate BMPs and continued implementation of the ITAM program.

New or expanded impact areas would have long-term disturbances to soils from testing and training activities. Approximately 9,100 ac of the proposed 16,300 ac of additional munitions impact areas are sited on highly erodible soils in the southern and northern portions of the Cibola Region. The proposed south Cibola Region munitions impact areas would be located on Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils. The proposed impact areas in the north would be located on Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex, Tucson family-Tremont family-Antho family complex, and Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex soils. The HE testing areas are proposed on the relatively flat basin floor and impacts to Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex soils would be negligible. The Tucson family-Tremont family-Antho family complex has a moderate to high water erosion hazard and high wind erosion hazard in disturbed areas. Water erosion would also be minimal on the basin floor. Disturbed soils would be susceptible to wind erosion. There would be no direct impacts to soils in these areas from the creation of munitions impact areas. Several existing munitions impact areas, including the Direct Fire Range, Site 10, Rocket and Gun Horizontal Impact Area (CRV-7), and Rocket Alley, are located in south Cibola Region on highly erodible Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils. Soils in existing munitions impact areas have not experienced severe impacts during use. Impacts to

soils from testing and training activities in new or expanded munitions impact areas would be expected to be comparable to past impacts in munitions impact areas. With continued implementation of the ITAM program, any impacts to soils in new or expanded munitions impact areas would be long-term but minor.

Approximately 250 ac of new munitions impact areas at JERC I, II, and III would be used for inert fire only. There would be no direct impacts to soils in these areas from creation of the munitions impact areas. Soils in inert fire munitions impact areas would be less impacted than soils in explosive fire munitions impact areas, and direct impacts to soils by inert munitions testing would be negligible. There would be potential for long-term indirect impacts should inert munitions degrade and release metals or other constituents of concern to the soil. Impacts associated with metals in soils are discussed in Section 3.9.

Twenty-three new TGPs would be established to meet identified testing and training needs in the Cibola Region. Each TGP would cover an area of up to 2.2 ac. Woody vegetation would be cleared at ground level with minimal soil disturbance to eliminate potential interference with proposed testing and observations. Soil impacts would likely be more severe in areas with highly erodible soils. The potential for increased soil erosion from clearing for TGPs could extend to approximately 50.6 ac in the Cibola Region. BMPs, as discussed for facility construction at the Laguna Region, would be implemented as appropriate to reduce the potential of soil erosion at TGPs. Impacts to soils from establishment of TGPs would be minor with implementation of BMPs. No regional cumulative impacts to soils beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected.

Six areas, encompassing approximately 530 ac, would be cleared for creation of UAS launch/recovery areas. The vegetation removal would result in increased potential for soil erosion, as discussed for TGPs. Three of the sites, namely C022 (approximately 16 ac), C023 (approximately 23 ac), C033 (approximately 90 ac), are proposed in a location with highly erodible Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils. One of the sites (C033 – approximately 55 ac) is proposed in a location with Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex soils. The proposed sites are on the relatively flat basin floor where water erosion would be minimal, but wind erosion hazards are likely. This acreage would not be managed through the ITAM program because it is not associated with training activities. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed under facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to minimize the potential for wind erosion. Impacts to soils from creation of UAS launch/recovery areas would be minor with implementation of the BMPs.

Electrical transmission and telecommunications lines would be installed at 20 locations in the Cibola Region. For analysis purposes, it is assumed that utility line extensions would be an equal mix of above-ground and below-ground infrastructure. In areas with highly erodible soils, utility infrastructure would be installed above-ground. Soil impacts from aerial lines would be limited to the footprint of the support poles and would be negligible to minor. Impacts to soils from utility line installation in other soils would be minor. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to further reduce the potential for impacts to soils.

New and expanded dismounted maneuver areas would be established in the Cibola Region, which would cover approximately 66,400 ac. In addition, a new vehicle test course would be established within an area up to 4,644 ac in the Cibola Region. Discernible trails would be established, minimizing the potential for soil compaction and for exposing soils outside the

boundary of the vehicle test course. However, when active vehicle testing is not ongoing, the area may be used to perform blended testing or dismounted maneuver training at the vehicle test course. Limited off-road vehicle operation may occur in conjunction with dismounted maneuver activities and associated with initial troop deployment.

Approximately 9,170 ac of the proposed maneuver areas and vehicle test courses would be located on the Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex and approximately 3,990 ac would be located on the Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex soils. The nature of dismounted maneuvers, with Soldiers moving in a diffuse pattern across the landscape rather than as a cluster, would reduce the potential for soils disturbance and erosion. Impacts to soils from dismounted maneuver training would be expected to be long-term and minor with continued implementation of the ITAM program.

Wildfire adversely affects desert vegetation, and soil erosion is more likely to occur in areas following vegetation removal from a wildfire. Within the Cibola Region, most wildfires are allowed to burn due to the risk of firefighters encountering UXO while working to control a fire. When wildfires occur in the Cibola Region, long-term damage to desert vegetation would result, which also could result in long-term increased soil erosion risk. Use of the new or expanded munitions impact areas could increase the potential for wildfire to start, which could result in increased risk to vegetation and subsequent soil loss. Clearing for TGPs and airfield/UAS support would create areas with little or no fuel load and would likely reduce the potential for wildfire to spread in the Cibola Region.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in soil disturbance on up to 1,000 ac (USAEC, 2012). This could incrementally add to other projects on YPG that create soils disturbance and lead to minor cumulative impacts to soils.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would likely result in minor impacts to soils that are not susceptible to erosion and moderate impacts to highly erodible soils that are disturbed. There would also be potential for interaction of activities conducted in the Cibola Region with activities proposed in other areas of YPG. Use of appropriate BMPs in areas where soils are disturbed would reduce the potential for increased soil erosion. Continued implementation of the YPG INRMP and ITAM program would reduce the potential for severe soil impacts and for incremental interaction with other on-post projects and no significant cumulative impacts would be expected.

Kofa Region. New building/facility construction in the Kofa Region would occur at fixed GPs, where previous clearing would limit the potential for additional impacts to soils, additional construction would occur at new training complexes. New dismounted maneuver areas and a DZ are proposed for parts of the Kofa Region and the subsequent use of these areas could impact soils. Utility infrastructure would be extended to six new locations in the Kofa Region and could impact vegetation. Multiple areas are proposed for use as munitions impact areas, either new areas or expansions of existing munitions impact areas with potential for long-term impacts to soils in these areas.

Proposed construction activities would result in clearing of approximately 240 ac of desert habitat in the Kofa Region, with all vegetation removed from this acreage as a result. New construction, including paving, creation of a 162 ac UAS launch/recovery area near SWTR, new maneuver areas, the East Kofa Operations Center, and the training complex in the

northern part of East Arm, would convert approximately 54 ac of the Kofa Region to impervious surfaces.

Approximately 220 ac of proposed new construction and paving, including the creation of a UAS launch/recovery area near SWTR and the East Kofa Operations Center, is proposed in locations containing the Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils (37 ac) and the Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex (184 ac). The Cristobal family-Gunsight family soil complex has high wind and moderate water hazards in disturbed areas and would be the most susceptible to potentially severe soil impacts during construction. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to minimize the potential for erosion. Soils impacts from construction in this complex would be moderate with use of appropriate BMPs.

The Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex also has medium to high water and wind erosion hazards in floodplains. The new construction and impact areas proposed on this soil complex would occur on basin floors where erosion hazards would be negligible. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to minimize the potential for erosion. Soils impacts from construction in this complex would be negligible to minor with use of appropriate BMPs.

Soils would be most susceptible to erosion during construction activities, and appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to minimize the potential for severe impacts. Following construction, cleared areas converted to impervious areas would have no potential for wind erosion. There would be potential for localized increased runoff from the approximately 16 ac of new impervious area, which could result in increased runoff and increased erosion. Depending on the location of the new impervious areas, the scour from erosive water flow could extend off-post and affect soils on adjacent downstream properties. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, and post-construction stormwater controls would be enacted to minimize the potential for on-post and off-post impacts.

Expansion or creation of DZs would involve activity-related land-disturbing activities on approximately 305 ac in the Kofa Region. The vegetation would not be entirely cleared in these areas, but would be disturbed and likely trampled during testing and training activities. Disturbances to vegetation and soils would generally be caused by objects falling directly onto the ground by parachute and vehicles retrieving dropped payloads. The sites of the two proposed DZs (approximately 245 ac) are in areas with highly erosive Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex soils. DZs are located on the flat terrain of the basin floor where water erosion impacts would be negligible. Disturbed soils of the Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex would be susceptible to wind erosion. There would be no direct impacts to soils in these areas from the creation of the DZs, but indirect impacts could result from subsequent wind erosion. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed under facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to minimize the potential for wind erosion. Impacts to soils from testing and training activities would be expected to be long-term and minor with use of appropriate BMPs and continued implementation of the ITAM program.

There are multiple locations in the Kofa Region where new munitions impact areas would be established or where existing munitions impact areas would be expanded. All of the new and expanded munitions impact areas (29,757 ac) in the Kofa Region would be used for inert and explosive fire. Approximately 8,311 ac of the proposed munitions impact areas would be located on the Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex and approximately 8,920 ac would be located on the Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex soils. There would be no direct impacts to soil in these areas from the creation of the munitions impact areas. After the munitions impact areas are established, there would be the potential for episodic disturbance to soils from munitions testing and operational testing or training activities that would fire into these areas. Soils in existing munitions impact areas have not experienced severe impact during use. Impacts to soils from testing and training activities in new or expanded munitions impact areas would be expected to be comparable to past impacts in munitions impact areas. With continued implementation of the ITAM program, any impacts to soils in new or expanded munitions impact areas would be long-term and minor. There would be potential for long-term indirect impacts should inert munitions degrade and release metals or other constituents of concern to the soil. With increased munitions testing, the activities associated with recovery of metal from munitions tests could increase, but any impacts would be expected to remain minor.

New dismounted maneuver areas would be established in the Kofa Region, which would cover approximately 53,180 ac. Limited off-road vehicle operation may occur in conjunction with dismounted maneuver activities and associated with initial troop deployment. Approximately 13,110 ac of the proposed maneuver areas would be located on the Cristobal family-Gunsight family complex and approximately 5,600 ac would be located on the Gilman family-Harqua family-Glenbar family complex soils. The nature of dismounted maneuvers, with Soldiers moving in a diffuse pattern across the landscape rather than as a cluster, would reduce the potential for soils disturbance and erosion. Impacts to soils from dismounted maneuver training would be expected to be long-term and minor with continued implementation of the ITAM program.

Up to 12 new TGPs would be established annually, depending on mission needs. The locations of any new TGPs and the soil types where they would be placed are unknown, but these sites would be within established munitions impact areas and adjacent to roads. Each TGP would cover an area of up to 2.2 ac. Woody vegetation would be cleared at ground level with minimal soil disturbance to eliminate potential interfere with proposed testing and observations. Soil impacts would likely be more severe in areas with highly erodible soils. Impacts from clearing could extend to approximately 26.4 ac annually in the Kofa Region. BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented as appropriate to reduce the potential of soil erosion at TGPs. Impacts to soils from establishment of TGPs would be minor with implementation of BMPs. There also could be a minor cumulative impact to soils on YPG from multiple TGPs established through time, but no regional cumulative impacts to soils beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected.

Electrical transmission and telecommunications lines would be installed at four locations in the Kofa Region. For analysis purposes, it is assumed that utility line extensions would be an equal mix of above-ground and below-ground infrastructure. In areas with highly erodible soils, utility infrastructure would be installed above-ground. Soil impacts from aerial lines would be limited to the footprint of the support poles and would be negligible to minor. Impacts to soils from utility line installation in other soils would be minor. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for facility construction in the Laguna Region, would be implemented to further reduce the potential for impacts to soils. Wildfire adversely affects desert vegetation, and soil erosion is more likely to occur in areas following vegetation removal from a wildfire. Within the Cibola Region, most wildfires are allowed to burn due to the risk of firefighters encountering UXO while working to control a fire. When wildfires occur in the Cibola Region, long-term damage to desert vegetation would result, which also could result in long-term increased soil erosion risk. Use of the new or expanded munitions impact areas could increase the potential for wildfire to start, which could result in increased risk to vegetation and subsequent soil loss. Clearing for TGPs and airfield/UAS support would create areas with little or no fuel load and would likely reduce the potential for wildfire to spread in the Kofa Region.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would likely result in minor impacts to soils that are not susceptible to erosion and moderate impacts to highly erodible soils that are disturbed. There would also be potential for interaction of activities conducted in the Kofa Region with activities proposed in other areas of YPG. Use of appropriate BMPs in areas where soils are disturbed would reduce the potential for increased soil erosion. Continued implementation of the YPG INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for severe soil impacts and for incremental interaction with other on-post projects and no significant cumulative impacts would be expected.

3.15.2.4 Impacts Summary

Impacts to soils on YPG would typically be short-term during construction, with the potential for long-term impacts as a result of increased erosion due to increased runoff rates or altered runoff flow patterns associated with land clearing, construction grading, and increased impervious area. The potential for impacts would be greatest in areas with highly erodible soils.

There would be unavoidable impacts to soils under the Proposed Action. Short-term impacts from construction and paving would occur on approximately 360 ac of soil (143 ac of highly erodible soils). Runoff from the newly created impervious areas (310 ac) could cause long-term soil impacts to the surrounding areas. Up to 161,560 ac of soil (62,000 ac of highly erodible soils) would be disturbed by maneuver areas and vehicle test courses. Approximately 1,330 ac (800 ac of highly erodible soils) would be disturbed by maneuver areas and vehicle test courses. Approximately 1,035 ac of soil (600 ac of highly erodible soils) would be cleared for UAS launch/recovery areas and TGPs. These areas would have long-term potential for increased erosion. Approximately 46,065 ac (26,330 ac of highly erodible soils) would be converted to munitions impact areas and could include localized areas with increased erosion potential from explosion cratering. The new munitions impact areas also would have the potential for long-term impacts to soils from contamination from metals and other potential contaminants following degradation of bullets and other munitions components.

Installation of utility infrastructure would result in disturbance to approximately 20 ac. The potential for increased erosion would be long-term because of the very slow recovery of desert vegetation following disturbance. Proposed telecommunications utility infrastructure would be installed above-ground in areas with highly erodible soils to minimize the potential for increased erosion. Soil impacts from aerial lines would be negligible and limited to the footprint of the support poles.

Wildfire could result in indirect impacts to soils as a result of increased erosion following removal of vegetation by fire. Exposed soils would experience greater impacts from

precipitation, and root systems of plants killed by fire would no longer bind soils. The potential for wildfire to impact soils would be greatest in the Cibola and Kofa Regions, where wildfires are allowed to burn due to the risk to firefighters from UXO. Wildfires in the Laguna Region are suppressed and do not substantially alter desert vegetation, so increased erosion potential would not be expected in the Laguna Region. Use of the new or expanded munitions impact areas could result in increased potential for wildfire ignition, which could result in increased risk to vegetation and a higher potential for soil erosion impacts. Clearing for TGPs and airfield/UAS support would create areas with little or no fuel load and would likely reduce the potential for wildfire to spread through these areas, which could result in a long-term benefit to soils.

Appropriate construction BMPs would be implemented to stabilize disturbed soils and minimize the potential for increased erosion. Construction BMPs also would reduce the potential for increased stormwater runoff. YPG would continue implementation of its ITAM to maintain vegetation and soils in proposed testing and training areas. Appropriate post-construction stormwater controls (see Section 3.20) would be implemented to minimize the potential for long-term increased erosion potential from increased stormwater runoff during operations. A mitigation summary is provided in Section 3.15.2.4.

There would be potential for interaction of activities conducted under the Proposed Action and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable activities, including the commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facilities, to create increased erosion on YPG with regard to soils. Impacts to soils from establishment of TGPs would be minor with implementation of BMPs. There also could be a minor cumulative impact to soils on YPG from multiple TGPs established through time, but no regional cumulative impacts to soils beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected. The YPG INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for incremental interaction with other on-post projects. Cumulative impacts would be expected to be minor.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Approximately 115 acres of the 1,675-acre project area would be completely cleared of vegetation. The project area is entirely within the Supersition-Rositas series, which exhibits a moderate to high susceptibility to water and wind erosion. Should the project be constructed, appropriate erosion control measures would be implemented. Any contribution to cumulative impacts to soils would be minor.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects would likely contribute to regional cumulative impacts to soils. While specific impacts are unknown at this time, it is likely that a substantial acreage would be cleared for each project, increasing the susceptibility of the soils to wind and run-off erosion. It is likely that BLM will require appropriate BMPs to minimize the potential for erosion. Therefore, any contribution to cumulative impacts to soils would be expected to be minor.

The potential for off-post past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions to interact with the activities of the Proposed Action with regard to impacts to soils would be limited to the potential for increased erosion off-post as a result of Proposed Action activities. Other soils impacts resulting from the Proposed Action would be confined within the boundaries of YPG. Appropriate construction BMPs and post-construction stormwater controls would be

implemented to minimize the potential for off-post impacts from increased runoff resulting from Proposed Action activities.

3.15.2.5 Mitigation

Mitigation measures, including measures implemented to avoid impacts, would address the potential for increased erosion from either wind or water. All disturbed soils would have a greater potential for erosion because the soils would be directly exposed to the effects of precipitation and wind. Mitigation measures would include, but would not be limited to, planning to avoid disturbance of highly erodible soils, construction BMPs to minimize the potential for onsite erosion, construction and post-construction stormwater controls, and continued implementation of the ITAM program and the INRMP. These measures are discussed below.

Yuma Proving Ground. During site selection and site design, soil erosion potential would be considered and activities that would cause loss of vegetation or soil disturbance or that would create new impervious areas would be identified; to the extent practical, such activities would be placed in areas where onsite and downslope soils are not susceptible to erosion. It is not possible to completely avoid highly erodible soils due to the sheer volume of activities proposed and the dispersed occurrence of such soils across the YPG landscape. TPG would minimize the location of activities that could lead to increased erosion potential on highly erodible soils. Further, efforts would be made in site designs to result in conditions where post-disturbance site hydrology is unchanged with respect to stormwater runoff velocities and volumes.

Construction BMPs to Minimize Onsite Erosion. During construction, BMPs would be used to stabilize disturbed soils, which would minimize the potential for soil erosion. Construction BMPs to minimize the potential for erosion from wind and water would comply with the ADOT *Erosion and Pollution Control Manual* (2005). BMPs that could be used include, but would not be limited to, the following:

- Preservation of existing vegetation existing vegetation provides natural protection against soil erosion and would be preserved if practicable.
- Mulching mulch would be applied to disturbed soil to prevent erosion during and following precipitation events.
- Slope Protection several measures could be used to minimize erosion from disturbed slopes, which could consist of geotextiles, vegetation, mulch, or a combination.
- Silt Fence a sediment barrier would be used where necessary to prevent the movement of sediment from disturbed areas.

Additional BMPs would be implemented to minimize the potential for increased wind erosion during construction and operation. BMPs that could be used to minimize the potential for wind erosion would include, but would not be limited to, the following (CASQA, 2003):

- Preservation of existing vegetation existing vegetation provides natural protection against soil erosion and would be preserved if practicable.
- Mulching mulch would be applied to disturbed soil to prevent erosion during and following precipitation events.

- Slope Protection several measures could be used to minimize erosion from disturbed slopes, which could consist of geotextiles, vegetation, mulch, or a combination.
- Wet Suppression watering prevents dust and wind erosion only for a short period and should be applied at least daily to be effective. Overwatering may also cause surface water erosion.
- Chemical Dust Suppression chemicals would be chosen appropriately depending on the soil type, temperature, humidity, and wind velocity. The chemicals may also interfere with the soil's infiltration abilities, thus impacting re-vegetation on the site.
- Gravel or Asphalt gravel could be applied to disturbed soils to prevent wind erosion.
- Covering construction stockpiles with tarps and canvases

Construction and Post-construction Stormwater Controls. There would be potential for localized increased runoff from new impervious areas. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could affect downstream areas, including off-post lands, by creating scour that could remove soils from uplands along washes. Stormwater controls would be implemented to facilitate infiltration and reduce the potential for scour. These controls could include, but would not be limited to:

- Use of temporary detention areas with controlled outflow
- Preservation of existing vegetation
- Mulching
- Site design to direct stormwater runoff away from washes
- Incorporation of constructed detention/infiltration areas into site designs
- Incorporation of designs to capture stormwater for subsequent use
- Use of pervious surfaces to the extent practicable
- Use of semi-pervious surfaces where appropriate

ITAM and INRMP. The YPG ITAM program is implemented to maintain conditions that realistically simulate conditions in other desert regions for operational testing and training activities. Range management and rehabilitation prevent deterioration of conditions that could adversely affect operational testing and training if allowed to proceed unchecked. Substantial soil erosion from ongoing and increased training can lead to a loss of realism. Continued implementation of the ITAM program would address soil erosion so that it would not negatively affect the mission.

The INRMP is implemented to maintain or restore the condition of natural resources on YPG. By promoting vegetation and soil health, continued implementation of the INRMP reduces the potential for erosion from exposed soils and also reduces the potential for wildfire from build-up of excessive fuel loads.

3.16 Threatened or Endangered Species and Species of Concern

3.16.1 Existing Conditions

Threatened, endangered, or sensitive (TES) species of concern include federally listed species protected by the ESA of 1973 (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), species listed as Wildlife of Special Concern by the AGFD, and other species with a conservation status of concern,

including species identified by USFWS and the BLM. In addition, wild horses and burros, which are protected under the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971 (Public Law 92-195) as amended, occur on YPG.

The ESA was established to provide a program for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and the habitats in which they occur, which is administered by the USFWS for non-marine species. The ESA requires federal agencies to ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or negative modification of designated critical habitat of listed species.

The bald eagle was delisted under the ESA in 2007 (50 CFR 17). Bald eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16. U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and also by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C. 703-712 as amended).

Because the only occurrences of federally-listed species within the boundaries of YPG are transient sightings incidental to movement of animals and because no federally-listed species use YPG for required life cycle needs, YPG has not needed to consult formally with USFWS for a Biological Opinion regarding ongoing activities on the installation. YPG has consulted and received Biological Opinions regarding activities conducted at off-post locations.

3.16.1.1 Species Listed or Proposed for Listing Under the Endangered Species Act

Species listed under the ESA that are known to occur in Yuma and La Paz Counties are listed in Table 3-22. The sections following the table describe federally protected species known to occur or with potential to occur on YPG.

	Osisutifis News	01-1	11-63-7
Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat
American Peregrine Falcon	Falco peregrinus anatum	Delisted, Monitor, WSC	Areas with rocky, steep cliffs, primarily near water, where prey (primarily shorebirds, songbirds, and waterfowl) concentrations are high. Nests are found on ledges of cliffs, and sometimes on man-made structures.
Bonytail Chub ^a	Gila elegans	Endangered, WSC	Warm, swift, turbid mainstem rivers of the Colorado River basin and reservoirs in lower basin. The Colorado River upstream of Imperial Dam has been designated as critical habitat for the bonytail chub (Bureau of Reclamation, 1996).No suitable habitat for this species occurs on YPG and this species would not be affected by the Proposed Action. The species is not discussed further.
California Brown Pelican	Pelicanus occidentalis californicus	Delisted. Monitor	Coastal land and islands; species found occasionally around Arizona's lakes and rivers. No suitable habitat for this species occurs on YPG and this species would not be affected by the Proposed Action. The species is not discussed further.
Desert Tortoise, Sonoran	<i>Gopherus morafkai</i> (formerly a distinct	Candidate, WSC	Primarily rocky (often steep) hillsides and bajadas of Sonoran desert scrub in Arizona,

TABLE 3-22

Federally Protected Species Known to Occur in Yuma and La Paz Counties, Arizona *Yuma Proving Ground*

TABLE 3-22

Federally Protected Species Known to Occur in Yuma and La Paz Counties, Arizona Yuma Proving Ground

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat
	population segment of <i>Gopherus</i> agassizii)		but may encroach into desert grassland, juniper woodland, interior chaparral habitats, and even pine communities. Washes and valley bottoms may be used in dispersal.
Lesser Long- nosed Bat ^b	Leptonycteris curasoae yerbabuenae	Endangered, WSC	Desert scrub habitat with agave and columnar cacti present as food plants.
Razorback Sucker	Xyrauchen texanus	Endangered, WSC	Riverine and lacustrine areas, including backwaters, generally not in fast-moving water. The Colorado River upstream of Imperial Dam has been designated as critical habitat for the razorback sucker (Bureau of Reclamation, 1996).No suitable habitat for this species occurs on YPG and this species would not be affected by the Proposed Action. The species is not discussed further.
Roundtail Chub ^a	Gila robusta	Candidate	Cool to warm waters of rivers and streams, often occupying the deepest pools and eddies of large streams. No suitable habitat for this species occurs on YPG and this species would not be affected by the Proposed Action. The species is not discussed further.
Sonoran Pronghorn ^b	Antelocapra americana sonoriensis	Endangered, WSC non-essential experimental population released onto KNWR	Broad intermountain alluvial valleys with creosote bush-bursage and paloverde-mixed cacti associations.
Southwestern Willow Flycatcher	Empidonax trallii eximus	Endangered, WSC	Cottonwood/willow and tamarisk vegetation communities along rivers and streams. No suitable habitat for this species occurs on YPG and this species would not be affected by the Proposed Action. The species is not discussed further.
Sprague's Pipit	Anthus spraguei	Candidate	Strong preference to native grasslands with vegetation of intermediate height and lacking woody shrubs. No suitable habitat for this species occurs on YPG and this species would not be affected by the Proposed Action. The species is not discussed further.
Yellow-billed Cuckoo	Coccyzus americanus	Candidate, WSC	Large blocks of riparian woodlands (cottonwood, willow, or tamarisk galleries). No suitable habitat for this species occurs on YPG and this species would not be affected by the Proposed Action. The yellow-billed cuckoo is not discussed further.
Yuma Clapper Rail	Rallus longirostruis yumaensis	Endangered, WSC	Fresh water and brackish marshes. No suitable habitat for this species occurs on YPG and this species would not be affected by the Proposed Action. The Yuma clapper

TABLE 3-22

Federally Protected Species Known to Occur in Yuma and La Paz Counties, Arizona *Yuma Proving Ground*

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat	
			rail is not discussed further.	

Sources: USFWS Arizona Ecological Services (USFWS AES), 2009b; USFWS AES, 2009c; USFWS AES, 2010a; USFWS AES, 2010b; USFWS AES, 2010c; USFWS, 2010d; USFWS AES, 2012, Johnson et al., 2006, USFWS, 2005, USFWS, 2009a, USFWS, 2009b.

Notes: ^a Only occurring in La Paz County; ^b Occurring in Yuma County but does not occur on YPG; WSC = Wildlife of Special Concern in Arizona

A plant identified as the endangered Nichol Turk's head cactus (*Echinocactus horizonthalonius* var. *nicholii*) was photographed on YPG in 1995, but voucher specimens were not collected or recorded and the plant has never been relocated. This report may have resulted from observation of an atypical small specimen of another barrel cactus. At present, USFWS does not recognize Nichol Turk's head cactus as occurring in Yuma or La Paz Counties (USFWS AES, 2010a, 2010b). The current species status identifies this species as restricted to three populations in Arizona: in the Vekol Mountains in Pinal County and the Waterman Mountains in north-central Pima County (AGFD, 2008; USFWS AES, 2009). Because USFWS considers this species not to occur on YPG and because the initial report has not been confirmed, the Nichol Turk's head cactus is not addressed further in this DPEIS.

The flat-tailed horned lizard (*Phrynosoma mcallii*) was proposed for listing under the ESA. On March 15, 2011, USFWS issued a determination that the listing of the flat-tailed horned lizard as a threatened species under the ESA was not warranted and withdrew its November 29, 1993, proposed rule to list the species under the ESA (USFWS, 2011b). As this species is no longer proposed for listing and because its known range does not extend onto YPG, the flat-tailed horned lizard is not discussed further in this PDEIS.

American Peregrine Falcon. The American peregrine falcon is a large falcon, slate-gray above and pale below, with a mottled appearance on the underside from thin black lines and spots. The peregrine falcon was delisted in 1999, but populations will be monitored by the USFWS until 2015 (USFWS, 2003). The species occurs from Alaska and extreme western Canada south to the western mountains and can be seen throughout Arizona. This falcon prefers cliffs and steep terrain that are near water. The steep terrain on YPG is not near water, but this habitat is found along the Colorado River. The American peregrine falcon occurs on YPG as an occasional migrant (YPG, 2012b).

Sonoran Desert Tortoise. The Sonoran desert tortoise (formerly a distinct population segment of the desert tortoise, but now recognized as a distinct species) is a candidate species for listing under the ESA. This species is also classified as a Tier 1b Species of Greatest Conservation Need by the AGFD. The Sonoran desert tortoise has a domed shell, typically 8 to 15 inches high, with a brownish upper shell, a yellowish plastron, stocky forelimbs with large conical scales, and a short tail. This diurnal, solitary species is strictly terrestrial and requires firm but not hard ground to construct burrows, adequate moisture for survival of eggs and young, and grass, cactus, or other low-growing vegetation for food. The tortoise hibernates in the burrow from late fall until spring. Breeding typically occurs in spring and early summer with a clutch size of 2 to 14 eggs and incubation ranging from 90

to 120 days. The Sonoran desert tortoise occurs in southwestern Arizona and Sonora, Mexico (USFWS AES, 2012; YPG, 2012b).

Sonoran desert tortoises live in small distinct groups typically on rocky bajadas and steep slopes. This species has been observed in the East Arm of the Kofa Region and in the Cibola Region of YPG (YPG, 2012b). The primary habitat for this species occurs in the northern area of the Cibola Region, where a low density population exists. Sonoran desert tortoises are considered susceptible to disease, collecting pressure from the pet trade, poaching, habitat destruction, and population fragmentation due to urbanization, mining, and off-road vehicle activity (USFWS AES, 2012; YPG, 2012b).

Lesser Long-nosed Bat. The lesser long-nosed bat is listed as an endangered species under the ESA. The lesser long-nosed bat prefers desert scrub habitat with agave and columnar cacti as food sources. This species roosts during the day in caves or abandoned mines and tunnels and comes out at night to forage for nectar, pollen, and fruit of paniculate agaves and columnar cacti. This bat is migratory and occurs in Arizona only from April through September (USFWS AES, 2010a). This species is not known to occur on YPG, and agave plants, an important food source for the species, are very rare on YPG, making the habitat generally unsuitable. It is very unlikely that the lesser long-nosed bat would occur on YPG.

Sonoran Pronghorn. The Sonoran pronghorn was originally listed as threatened with extinction under the Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966 on February 24, 1967. With the passage of the ESA, this subspecies was listed as endangered. The Sonoran pronghorn is smaller than mule deer, and has a yellowish tan color with white areas on the rump and sides of the face, two bands of white on the throat, and white underparts. The horns are black with a single prong. The Sonoran pronghorn is North America's fastest land animal and its speed and eyesight help the animals avoid predation. Flat to rolling topography is the preferred habitat for the species, which includes broad intermountain alluvial valleys with creosote bush-bursage and paloverde-mixed cacti associations (YPG, 2012b). Within its current range, the Sonoran pronghorn generally prefers creosote bushbursage, paloverde-mixed cacti, and ephemeral wash habitats. According to a model by USFWS, more than 55 percent of YPG (approximately 757 square miles) is potentially suitable habitat for this species (USFWS, 2009). Generally, bajadas are fawning areas and sandy dune areas provide food on a seasonal basis. Cacti, forbs, and shrubs are important food plants for the Sonoran pronghorns and the fruit of chain-fruit cholla (Opuntia fulgida) can be consumed to provide a water source (USFWS, 2009).

The species is known to inhabit the Barry M. Goldwater Range, Cabeza Prieta NWR, Organ Pipe National Monument and Mexico. The closest natural population of Sonoran pronghorn is on the Barry M. Goldwater Range, which is across I-8 and approximately 10 miles south of YPG. The interstate highway and the extensive farming along the Gila River Valley effectively prevent movement of this population onto YPG. The other populations are south and east of the Barry M. Goldwater Range.

This species is not known to occur on YPG, but YPG is within the historic range of the Sonoran pronghorn. A nonessential experimental population, as defined under section 10(j) of the ESA, was established through a captive breeding program with the animals initially contained in pens centrally located within the Kofa NWR. Some of the experimental population was released into the Kofa NWR by the USFWS in February 2013 in an attempt to establish additional Sonoran pronghorn populations within this portion of its historic range in southern Arizona. It is anticipated there will additional releases from the pens in subsequent years. The experimental range for these introduced Sonoran pronghorn covers approximately 4,791 square miles in Yuma, La Paz, and Maricopa Counties and includes areas of unsuitable habitat that the pronghorn could dispersed across. YPG makes up 27 percent of the experimental range.

Normal dispersal of the non-essential experimental population of Sonoran pronghorn will likely result in the animals occurring on YPG. This likelihood will increase as the population increases. Individuals from the experimental Sonoran pronghorn population may be taken when the take is incidental to, and not the purpose of, carrying out a lawful activity within the boundaries of YPG. Otherwise, a take of an individual from the experimental Sonoran pronghorn population is prohibited. YPG is required to report a take resulting from military operations to USFWS. For the purposes of ESA section 7 consultation, since the experimental population has been released under Section 10 (j) of the ESA, the pronghorn would be treated as a species proposed for listing. This status requires conferencing with USFWS on any projects likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the entire species.

3.16.1.2 Other Native Sensitive Species

The AGFD classifies some native wildlife as species of special concern. The USFS and BLM also classify some native species of plants and animals as sensitive species. In addition to these native species, non-native wild horses and burros, which are protected by federal law, occur on YPG.

There are 45 sensitive species of plants and animals known to occur in Yuma and La Paz Counties that are not listed under the ESA (AGFD, 2010c; Appendix G). Fifteen of these species are known to occur on near the boundaries of YPG: American peregrine falcon and Sonoran desert tortoise, discussed above, and the banded Gila monster (*Heloderma suspectum cinctum*), California leaf-nosed bat (*Macrotus californicus*), cave myotis (bat) (*Myotis velifer*), desert barrel cactus (*Ferocactus cylindraceus*), desert rosy boa (*Lichanura trivirgata gracia*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), Mohave fringe-toed lizard (*Uma scoparia*), osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*), Parish onion (*Allium parishii*), pocketed free-tailed bat (*Nyctinomops femorosaccus*), spotted bat (*Euderma maculatum*), straw-top cholla (*Cylindropuntia echinocarpa*), and western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*). The 16 species not previously discussed in this document are described below.

Kofa Mountain barberry (*Berberis harrisoniana*) is known from the region, but extensive surveys for this distinctive plant indicate it does not occur on YPG.

Banded Gila Monster. The banded Gila monster is a medium-sized venomous lizard with a robust body. It has a large head, narrow neck, and two black collar bands separated by a white band. In Arizona, the banded Gila monster occurs in deserts across the northwestern and western parts of the state, north of the Gila River. Both Yuma and La Paz Counties are within the range of the species. The banded Gila monster generally occurs on hillsides and slopes, in canyons, gullies, and washes with rock substrates, and occasionally in rock piles. Fallen logs or debris are often used for burrows and the species prefers highland rocky outcrops during winters (AGFD, 2011a). Suitable habitat for this species occurs among the various washes and along the rocky hillsides throughout YPG.

California Leaf-nosed Bat. The California leaf-nosed bat is a medium sized gray bat with large ears and a flattened, leaf-shaped nose. The species typically roosts in the ceilings of

caves and mines in groups of up to several hundred (AGFD, 2011b). The California leafnosed bat mostly inhabits Sonoran desert scrub habitat and feeds on insects and possibly cactus fruits. This species is known to roost in mines and caves on YPG and is one of the most commonly observed bats on the installation (YPG, 2012b).

Cave Myotis. The cave myotis (bat) is a relatively large myotis, with color ranging from light brown to nearly black, with a bald patch between the shoulder blades. The cave myotis roosts in caves, tunnels, and mineshafts and under bridges. It typically forages in desert scrub of creosote, brittlebush, paloverde, and cacti. In Arizona, winter roosts are typically wet mine tunnels above 6,000 ft (AGFD, 2011b). Marginal foraging habitat occurs on YPG, and the old mines on YPG could provide roosting habitat.

Desert Barrel Cactus. The desert barrel cactus typically exhibits a single stemmed, erect or slightly leaning growth form. This cactus can reach 10 ft tall, but averages around 5 ft. The flowers are maroon on the outside and yellow on the inside. The species typically occurs on gravelly or rocky hillsides, canyon walls, alluvial fans, and margins of washes in the Mohave and Sonoran Deserts derived from igneous or limestone substrates. This species occurs in Yuma County near the northwest end of the Gila Mountains and near the southern end of the Kofa Mountains. This species is classified as salvage restricted in Arizona, but is not otherwise threatened (AGFD, 2011c).

Desert Rosy Boa. The desert rosy boa is a heavy-bodied snake averaging 24 to 45 inches in length with a pale gray to dark bluish slate-gray color. This species is mainly nocturnal and spends most of the time deep in rock crevices or underground. The species typically occurs in rocky areas in desert ranges, especially canyons with permanent or intermittent streams and basalt- or granite-derived soils. The desert rosy boa is known to occur in the Kofa NWR near the border with YPG and could occur on YPG (AGFD, 2011a). Habitat for this species would be marginal on YPG, due to the lack of intermittent or permanent streams with riparian areas.

Loggerhead Shrike. The loggerhead shrike is slightly smaller than the American robin and grayish in color with a distinct black mask that extends above the eye and across the bill. This bird prefers open country with scattered trees and shrubs, savanna, and desert scrub. Shrikes are often seen perched on poles, wires, or fence posts (AGFD, 2011d). The loggerhead shrike is a resident species on YPG.

Mohave Fringe-toed Lizard. The Mohave fringe-toed lizard is distinguished by a black spot on each side of the belly, crescent-shaped black throat markings, and a greenish yellowtinged belly. This lizard prefers areas of fine, loose, windblown sand of dunes, flats, riverbanks, and washes in the Mojave Desert of California and in the extreme western part of Yuma County. The species is a BLM Sensitive species and is classified as Wildlife of Special Concern in Arizona. The Mohave fringe-toed lizard occurs in the northwest portion of the Cibola Region on YPG where an apparently stable population exists within a sand dune complex. The area where the Mohave fringe-toed lizard occurs in the Cibola Region is not within the area that would be affected by the Proposed Action. Potentially suitable habitat for this species also occurs within the Laguna Region (YPG, 2012b).

Osprey. The osprey is a large raptor that is brown above and white below, with a white head and dark line near the eye on each side. Osprey typically nest near waterbodies and in Arizona mainly occur at lakes in the White Mountains and across the Mogollon Plateau. A

few occurrences are known along the Salt and Gila Rivers (YPG, 2012b). There is no suitable foraging or roosting habitat for this species on YPG, but it is occasionally observed on YPG as an incidental. Because of its mobility, the osprey would not be affected by the Proposed Action and is not further discussed.

Parish Onion. The parish onion is an herbaceous perennial that occurs on open rocky and sandy slopes in the Mojave Desert and desert mountain ranges. The species occurs within the Kofa NWR. The parish onion is a BLM Sensitive species and is classified as salvage restricted by the State of Arizona (AGFD, 2011c). Salvage restricted includes species regulated by the Arizona Native Plant Law that can only be collected with a permit. This species may occur on YPG near the border with the Kofa NWR.

Pocketed Free-tailed Bat. The pocketed free-tailed bat is one of the smallest bat species, averaging 2.95 to 3.5 inches in total length. The upper fur is dull with a tawny, buffy, or brown color and paler, buffy to yellowish white underneath. The species occurs in a variety of upland and lowland habitats, which include riparian areas, desert scrub, moist woodlands, and forests. It appears to prefer cliffs and rocky walls near water. The pocketed free-tailed bat roosts in caves, mines, cliff crevices, and man-made structures. This species is known to occur in Yuma County and winters in the Lower Colorado River area (AGFD, 2011b). This species likely occurs on YPG and could roost on the installation.

Straw-top Cholla. Straw-top cholla occurs in the driest parts of the Sonoran and Mojave Deserts, generally in creosote bush scrub habitats. This species has been documented as occurring on YPG. Straw-top cholla is not threatened or considered sensitive to extinction, but is listed as salvage restricted in Arizona (AGFD, 2011c).

Spotted Bat. Spotted bats occur in varied habitats, but most often in riparian habitats or in dry, rough desert scrub, from low to high desert. This species occurs in Yuma County, but is known only from south of the Gila River. Spotted bats are a Federal Species of Concern, BLM Sensitive, USFS Sensitive, and a Wildlife of Special Concern in Arizona (AGFD, 2011b). This species may forage or occur as a transient on YPG but would not roost there. It is unlikely that this species would be affected by the Proposed Action.

Western Burrowing Owl. This medium sized ground-dwelling owl occurs in open, welldrained grasslands, steppes, deserts, prairies, and agricultural lands (AGFD, 2011d). Western burrowing owls occur on YPG and are known from much of the surrounding area, including the Lower Colorado and Gila River valleys and the City of Yuma area (AGFD, 2011d; YPG, 2012b).

Western Yellow Bat. Western yellow bats are medium-sized and usually pale, yellow-brown in color. Southern Arizona is considered the northern extent of its range and the species likely occurs there year-round. This species is usually found near thick vegetation while roosting and has been found in palm fronds. Western yellow bats also occur in riparian areas with thick, leafy vegetation (YPG, 2012b). Western yellow bats are BLM Sensitive, USFS Sensitive, and a Wildlife of Special Concern in Arizona (AGFD, 2011b). A western yellow bat was tentatively identified during mist net surveys in Vinegaroon Wash (YPG, 2012b). Suitable roosting habitat for this species is not present on YPG, but the species may forage on YPG or occur as a transient.

3.16.1.3 Wild Horses and Burros

Wild horses and burros (*Equus* spp.) are protected by the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971, which protects free-roaming horses and burros from capture, branding, harassment, or death. In spite of the non-native status of these animals, the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act states that these should be considered an integral part of the natural system of the public lands in areas where they occurred in 1971 (BLM, 2006). Wild horses and burros occur on YPG and are managed under the Cibola-Trigo Herd Management Area Plan, which includes all of YPG, and the public lands adjacent to the installation. Burros and wild horses could occur throughout YPG, but typically concentrate near water sources, including artificial tanks, Ivan's Well, and Lake Alex (YPG, 2012b).

3.16.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to threatened or endangered species:

- Permanent loss of habitat due to construction of impervious surfaces
- Temporary loss of habitat due to testing and training activities in the ranges, including areas of habitat that could be restored
- Disruption of the behavior of threatened and endangered species due to construction or training and testing activities on YPG
- Reduction in population and survival rates of threatened and endangered species due to construction or testing and training activities
- Reduction in population and survival rates of threatened and endangered species, particularly the Sonoran desert tortoise, due to a concentration of predators at the edges of human activities, powerlines, and roads.
- Taking of a threatened, endangered, or candidate species due to construction or testing and training activities

3.16.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to TES species include:

- Negligible (less than significant) Activities that would cause barely perceptible behavioral changes in TES species
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would cause behavioral changes in TES species but that would not cause mortality or adversely affect reproduction or productivity
- Severe (significant) Activities that would cause mortality of TES species
- Severe (significant) Activities that would cause behavioral changes in TES species that adversely affect reproduction or productivity

3.16.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, conditions on YPG would not change and testing and training activities would continue at current levels. Ongoing testing and training would occur

in specific areas within YPG (Figures 2-4 through 2-12). Tables identifying the testing and training activities that would occur under the No Action Alternative are provided in Appendix B (Tables B-1 through B-3), separated according to the three regions (Laguna, Cibola, and Kofa Regions). No test areas, munitions impact areas, or DZs would be expanded under the No Action Alternative. No construction or demolition would occur under the No Action Alternative. Continuing mission operations would not result in impacts to TES species with current species distributions, as testing and training activities continue in authorized areas at authorized levels. The evaluations and analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed in Section 2.3.2 provide an assessment of the potential impacts to TES species that would result from the No Action Alternative. The analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed above are incorporated into this DPEIS by reference.

Should TES species distributions change, impacts to TES species could result from on-road and off-road vehicle use, dismounted maneuvers, and test operations (including the set-up for test operations).

Under the No Action Alternative, YPG would continue to coordinate with AGFD to rehabilitate injured animals, including TES species, where recovery is practicable. YPG would continue to maintain movement corridors and migratory pathways that would allow seasonal movements of the experimental population of Sonoran pronghorn, should they begin utilizing YPG. YPG would coordinate law enforcement efforts with AGFD and USFWS to address illegal hunting and habitat degradation associated with unauthorized recreation and illegal hunting, and YPG would patrol remote areas and maintain boundary and access signs to deter illegal and unauthorized activities that could adversely affect TES species. These actions would benefit TES species.

The NRC-licensed DU impact area has a DU Catchment Structure, and spent DU rounds are regularly collected by Ammunition Recovery personnel and stored by YPG Radiation Protection until packaged and transported to a licensed disposal facility by the Army's Radioactive Waste Authority. There is an evaporative lagoon that collects runoff from the DU Catchment Structure and is sized to accommodate a 100-year storm event to minimize the potential for stormwater transport of DU off-post or to other areas on-post. Studies have shown (Obregon, 2013c, personal communication) that DU is contained within the DU licensed area and does not migrate. Because the DU is contained within the NRC-licensed DU impact area, DU would not directly affect any TES species. The greatest potential for impacts would be to small herbivores (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

3.16.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

This section addresses potential impacts to TES species on YPG; common wildlife species are addressed in Section 3.21. Impacts to TES species that could occur under the No Action Alternative, if species distributions change, also would occur under the Proposed Action. In addition, there would be potential for direct and indirect impacts from construction and increased testing and training activities. Direct impacts to TES species would result from displacement or incidental mortality. Indirect impacts to TES species could result from disturbance that leads to nest/den abandonment, loss of habitat, or disruption of migratory pathways. The majority of habitat for TES species on YPG would remain intact. Additional indirect impacts to TES species could result from disturbance that leads to TES species could result from for TES species on YPG would remain intact. Additional indirect impacts to TES species could result from introduction or spread of exotic invasive plant species, which would result in habitat degradation. Disruption of normal activity

patterns and loss of habitat would be the primary impacts to wildlife. Limited incidental mortality would likely occur, but would be less than significant at the population level. YPG would continue to maintain movement corridors and migratory pathways for wildlife.

Exotic invasive plant species can become established in areas where soils are disturbed, such as construction sites and areas used for testing and training. Exotic invasive plant species displace native vegetation and offer less habitat value than native plants. Encroachment by exotic invasive plants can eliminate food resources and structural habitat used by TES species. Native TES species are not adapted to these non-native plants and may not be capable of using them for food or habitat. Exotic invasive plant species consume more water than native vegetation and can reduce available surface water or shallow groundwater. The reduction in available water can lead to water stress in TES species and ultimately to mortality and reduction of population viability. Because exotic invasive plants can affect TES species through alteration of habitat, increased potential for wildfire, and loss of available water, it is desirable to control these species on YPG. A program to establish exclusion, monitoring, and eradication of exotic invasive plants on YPG is being developed as part of the ongoing INRMP implementation (YPG, 2012b). Control of exotic invasive plant species would be beneficial to TES species and their habitat.

Wildfire could impact TES species on YPG through direct mortality, disruption of reproduction, or loss of habitat. Desert plants are not adapted to fire, and wildfire impacts to TES plant species would be greater than those to TES animal species. Exotic invasive plant species have the greatest potential to affect wildfire size and intensity through creation of extensive stands with high fuel loads (see Sections 3.7 and 3.18). Areas where native vegetation is cleared or where soils are disturbed are more susceptible to colonization by exotic invasive plant species. Because desert vegetation recovers slowly, wildfire impacts to TES plant species and habitat for TES species are long-term. Depending on the size and intensity, impacts from a particular wildfire could range from minor to severe. Measures that would be implemented to minimize the potential for colonization and growth of exotic invasive plant species are discussed in Sections 3.7 and 3.18. Implementation of these measures would minimize the potential for severe impacts to TES species from wildfire. Control of exotic invasive plant species would reduce wildfire risk to TES species.

Noise and the physical activity associated with the presence of humans during construction and during testing and training events can cause TES animals to relocate. TES animals may abandon nests or dens in the immediate area of human activities, including abandonment of young. These types of impacts can be minimized during construction by conducting work outside of the reproductive period, but avoidance of this type would not be practicable for testing and training activities. The nearly constant level of testing and training conducted on YPG makes it unlikely that TES animals would nest or den in proximity to areas used for these purposes, unless the TES animals were already acclimated to increased human activity. Because most construction would occur in areas where high levels of human activity already occur and because testing and training are ongoing at or near most locations where increases are proposed, it is expected that the potential for nest/den abandonment would be minor. Where feasible, activities would be scheduled to minimize potential conflict with TES animal reproduction and rearing of young.

Incidental mortality of TES species could occur during construction or during testing and training activities. The potential for incidental mortality of TES plant and animal species

was minimized through site selection. Where practicable, proposed activities would be implemented in areas where TES species do not occur. No TES species would be expected to become locally extinct as a result of increased incidental mortality caused by the Proposed Action. Where practicable, TES animals or plants would be relocated from proposed activity areas in accordance with procedures established in the INRMP. Any impacts from incidental mortality associated with construction would be minor and short-term. Incidental mortality from testing and training activities would be minor and long-term.

The following sections provide a discussion of the potential for species-impacts to TES species that could occur on YPG.

Transient Species. One protected bird species, the delisted American peregrine falcon, may occur as a transient or migrant on YPG. Because these species would not be expected to roost on YPG and because they are highly mobile, these animals would be able to relocate from areas of disturbance. Impacts to these species would likely be limited to displacement. Any such impacts would be negligible to minor.

Federally Listed Species. This section addresses potential impact to the Sonoran desert tortoise and the experimental population of Sonoran pronghorn. No other species listed or candidate species for listing under the ESA have the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action on YPG.

Sonoran Desert Tortoise. Most components of the proposed action would be implemented in portions of YPG with low Sonoran desert tortoise populations or in areas unoccupied by Sonoran desert tortoise at present. Therefore, indirect impacts resulting from habitat alteration would be the most likely impacts to the species. There would be potential for direct mortality in areas where tortoises occur and the potential for direct impacts is discussed following the discussion of indirect impacts.

Habitat alteration, which could indirectly impact the Sonoran desert tortoise in the Cibola Region, would result from the construction/establishment of runways, DZs, UAS launch/recovery areas, utility lines, maneuver training areas, impact areas, and TGPs. Under the Proposed Action, approximately 740 ac of desert scrub habitat in the Cibola Region would be removed or cleared, approximately 980 ac would be converted to DZs, approximately 16,310 ac would be converted to munitions impact areas, approximately 4,645 ac would be converted to vehicle test courses, and approximately 66,400 ac would be converted to a dismounted maneuver area. No vegetation clearing would occur in proposed munitions impact areas, DZs, and proposed dismounted maneuver areas. Impacts would likely not be significant because the high quality habitat for this species is in northern Cibola and very limited actions are proposed for this area (C047-r and two ISR/EOs).

Habitat alteration, which could indirectly impact the Sonoran desert tortoise in the East Arm of the Kofa Region, would result from establishment and operation of a DZ (K001), East Kofa Ops Center (K030), testing/training complex in the northern portion of the East Arm (K030), and training activities at the East Arm LTA (K021). Under the Proposed Action, approximately 36.1 ac of desert scrub habitat in the Cibola Region would be removed or cleared for the training complexes, approximately 194 ac would be converted to a DZ, and approximately 28,233 ac would be converted to a dismounted maneuver area. No vegetation clearing would occur in the proposed DZs or the proposed dismounted maneuver area.
These proposed activities in the Kofa Region, particularly the K021 dismounted maneuver area, could impact a large area of potentially suitable Sonoran desert tortoise habitat.

Because Sonoran desert tortoise exhibit high site fidelity, it is unlikely the species would avoid areas of high human activity. In areas of high quality habitat for the Sonoran desert tortoise, surveys would be conducted to determine whether the species occurs and animals would be relocated to other suitable habitat to minimize impacts. If active nests are found in an area that would be disturbed, activities would be delayed until after the eggs have hatched and the young could be relocated into other suitable habitat. Any relocation of Sonoran desert tortoise would be done following procedures in the INRMP and in coordination with USFWS.

Should the Sonoran desert tortoise be listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA, either additional coordination or ESA Section 7 consultation with USFWS would be required prior to any land-disturbing activities in areas where Sonoran desert tortoise are known to occur on YPG. Depending on the activity, either a Biological Assessment or Biological Evaluation would be prepared to support consultation.

If adjacent habitats are likely to support the Sonoran desert tortoise, simple barriers, such as exclusion fencing, may be erected around construction areas to deter entry into the area. If denied access to the proposed work area, it is expected that the tortoise would shift activity to other nearby suitable habitat.

Incidental mortality of Sonoran desert tortoise could occur during clearing of vegetation and during testing and training activities, but such losses would likely be very rare as a result of relocation and exclusion measures that will be implemented in areas where the species is likely to occur and because most components of the Proposed Action would be implemented in areas where Sonoran desert tortoise are not known to occur. No local populations would likely be extirpated due to the Proposed Action (YPG DPW, 2010b). Impacts would be long-term and moderate.

No TGPs are proposed for areas where the Sonoran desert tortoise is known to occur. Each proposed TGP site would be assessed prior to implementation for presence of Sonoran desert tortoise or their nests. Should use of a proposed TGP site by Sonoran desert tortoise be documented, YPG could choose to relocate a proposed TGP, if practicable, to avoid potential impacts to this species or measures would be taken to relocate tortoises from an area prior to establishment of the TGP. If active nests are found in an area, activities could be delayed until after the eggs have hatched and the young could be relocated as discussed above or the nest could be sheltered in place using the appropriate protocols through coordination with AGFD, with the young relocated if hatching occurs prior to the end of the work. Impacts would be minor and long-term.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in the loss of up to 1,000 ac of Sonoran desert tortoise habitat (USAEC, 2012). This could incrementally add to other projects on YPG or in the region that adversely affect Sonoran desert tortoise habitat and contribute to minor cumulative impacts to the species.

Should the Sonoran desert tortoise be listed under the ESA, YPG would re-evaluate any projects proposed for implementation in portions of the installation where the Sonoran

desert tortoise might occur and would consult with USFWS, as necessary prior to any ground-disturbing activities.

Sonoran Pronghorn. The non-essential experimental population has been released on Kofa NWR and the animals disperse to suitable habitat that likely will result in animals moving onto portions of YPG prior to or concurrent with implementation of Proposed Action components. Expanded testing and training activities would be ongoing and the experimental population of Sonoran pronghorn would likely avoid areas where human activity is occurring. Explosions from munitions testing and training on YPG in the Castle Dome Mountains along the western boundary of Kofa NWR would be audible to pronghorn in portions of the area they may occupy but would likely not be heard in the vicinity of the breeding pens (USFWS, 2009). Because munitions testing and training is relatively constant in this area, the noise from these events would likely be perceived as part of the background noise and would not affect pronghorn except in immediate proximity to a detonation.

No incidental mortality of individuals of the experimental Sonoran pronghorn population would be expected. Any impacts would be expected to be long-term and minor. Additionally, the extent of these impacts would be confined to YPG and would have no affect on natural populations of pronghorn located on the Barry M. Goldwater Range, Cabeza Prieta NWR, Organ Pipe National Monument, or in Mexico. For these reasons, implementation of the Proposed Action on YPG would not jeopardize the continued existence of Sonoran pronghorn; therefore, conferencing is not required.

Should the Sonoran pronghorn experimental population in the Kofa NWR be reclassified under the ESA, YPG would re-evaluate any projects proposed for implementation in portions of the installation where the Sonoran pronghorn might occur and would consult appropriately with USFWS prior to any activities that could impact the species.

Other Native Species of Concern. This section discusses the potential for impacts to other species of concern that are not listed or candidate species for listing under the ESA. These species include USFS and BLM Sensitive species with potential to occur on YPG.

Banded Gila Monster. It is unlikely that construction in cantonment areas would have potential to impact the banded Gila monster, as the species would not be expected to occur in these areas. Down-range construction and vegetation clearing could adversely impact this species through loss of habitat. Because this species is slow-moving, and would tend to hide from rather than flee human disturbance, direct impacts also could result from earthmoving activities. In areas of high quality habitat for the banded Gila monster, surveys would be conducted to determine whether the species occurs and animals would be relocated to other suitable habitat to minimize impacts. If adjacent habitats are likely to support the banded Gila monster, simple barriers, such as silt fencing, may be erected around construction areas to deter entry into the area. Impacts would be minor and long-term.

It is possible that TGPs could be placed in areas where the banded Gila monster would occur. Each proposed TGP site would be assessed prior to implementation for presence of banded Gila monster or their nests. Should use of a proposed TGP site by banded Gila monster be documented, YPG could choose to relocate a proposed TGP, if practicable, to avoid potential impacts to this species or measures would be taken to relocate the lizards from an area prior to establishment of the TGP. Impacts would be minor and long-term.

Bat Species of Concern. The California leaf-nosed bat and cave myotis both forage and roost on YPG and it is likely that the pocketed free-tailed bat also forages and roosts on YPG. Caves and mines that provide roosting habitat for these bats would not be impacted by the Proposed Action. As a result, there would be no impacts to roosting habitat. Potential foraging habitat would be reduced through clearing associated with construction and establishment of TGP and UAS launch/recovery areas and land disturbances associated with DZs. Because these species forage primarily at night, no direct impacts would be expected from clearing activities. Night testing and training activities could cause direct impacts, but such occurrences would be rare. Impacts to these species would be negligible to minor and long-term.

The western yellow bat and the spotted bat may occur as transients or migrants on YPG. Because these species would not be expected to roost on YPG and because they are highly mobile, these animals would be able to relocate from areas of disturbance. Impacts to these species would likely be limited to displacement. Any such impacts would be negligible to minor.

Loggerhead Shrike. Potential foraging and nesting habitat for the loggerhead shrike would be reduced through clearing associated with construction and establishment of TGP and UAS launch/recovery areas and land disturbances associated with DZs. Due to the mobility of the species, incidental mortality would be unlikely if nests are avoided. Shrikes would likely relocate away from disturbance-causing activities unless already nesting in an area. In areas of high quality nesting habitat for the loggerhead shrike, surveys would be conducted to determine whether the species is nesting. If an activity could not be relocated from the nesting area, it would be long-term and moderate.

Western Burrowing Owl. Construction and expansion of testing and training could impact the western burrowing owl through loss of habitat. The grasslands around the lower Colorado and Gila Rivers provide large amounts of preferred habitat for this species and it is likely that the western burrowing owl would relocate away from areas of human use unless already nesting in an area. In areas of high quality nesting habitat for the western burrowing owl, surveys would be conducted to determine whether the species is nesting. If an activity could not be relocated from a nesting area, it would be delayed until after young have fledged to avoid impacts to the species. The Proposed Action would have a minor to moderate long-term negative impact on western burrowing owls.

It is possible that TGPs could be placed in areas where the western burrowing owl would occur. Each proposed TGP site would be assessed prior to implementation for presence of western burrowing owl or their nests. Should use of a proposed TGP site by western burrowing owl be documented, YPG could choose to relocate a proposed TGP, if practicable, to avoid potential impacts to this species or measures would be taken to relocate western burrowing owls from an area prior to establishment of the TGP. If a TGP could not be relocated from a nesting area, it would be delayed until after young have fledged to avoid impacts. Establishment of new TGPs would have a minor long-term negative impact on western burrowing owls.

Desert Rosy Boa. The areas on YPG where the Proposed Action would be implemented do not contain potentially suitable habitat for the desert rosy boa. No impacts to this species would be expected.

No TGPs are proposed for areas where the desert rosy boa could occur. Each proposed TGP site would be assessed prior to implementation for presence of desert rosy boa or their nests. Should use of a proposed TGP site by desert rosy boa be documented, YPG could choose to relocate a proposed TGP, if practicable, to avoid potential impacts to this species or relocate the desert rosy boa from an area proposed as a TGP.

Mohave Fringe-toed Lizard. The Mohave fringe-toed lizard is known to occur on YPG only in a sand dune area in the northern Cibola Region. This area would not be impacted by any activities under the Proposed Action, including placement of TGPs. While potentially suitable habitat for the species does occur in parts of the Laguna Region, the species has not been found in the Laguna Region. The Proposed Action would not affect the Mohave fringe-toed lizard or its habitat.

Because the species has not been observed in the Laguna Region, development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site would not be expected to contribute to cumulative impacts to this species. The Northeast Cibola Site does not include any suitable habitat for this species and development of such a facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would not contribute to cumulative impacts to this species.

Parish's Onion. Parish's onion occurs in the Kofa NWR near the boundary of YPG and could occur on YPG in areas near the refuge. No impacts from activities under the Proposed Action are likely to occur near the boundary with the Kofa NWR. No TGPs would be placed at or near the boundary. Expansion of munitions impact areas to or near the boundary with the Kofa NWR would not likely result in munitions being fired into these peripheral areas. Any impacts would likely be from overshoots or errant rounds, which would be infrequent. While incidental mortality could occur, such events would be rare and would not be expected to have population-level effects. Any impacts would be negligible to minor, but individual impacts would be long-term due to the slow growth rate of these species.

Other Plant Species of Concern. The desert barrel cactus, and straw-top cholla, saguaro cactus, and ocotillo occur scattered throughout YPG and these species would likely be impacted by vegetation clearing associated with creation of TGPs and UAS launch/recovery areas and land disturbances associated with DZs. These other plant species of concern also could be impacted by other construction activities. Plants would be salvaged where practicable and relocated to other suitable habitat on YPG. There would be minor long-term impacts to these species as a result of the Proposed Action.

It is possible that TGPs could be placed in areas where these plant species occur. Each proposed TGP site would be assessed for the presence of sensitive plant species prior to implementation. Should sensitive plant species be documented at a proposed TGP site, YPG could choose to relocate a proposed TGP, if practicable, to avoid potential impacts or YPG could salvage plants that would be affected and relocate them to other suitable habitat to minimize impacts.

Wild Horses and Burros. Past and ongoing testing and training on YPG do not appear to have adversely impacted wild horse and burro populations. These animals are very mobile and able to relocate from areas where disturbance occurs. These animals would be expected to leave areas where construction is occurring and resume use of any suitable habitat in proximity to construction sites once construction is complete. Any impacts from construction would be temporary and minor. These species use habitat throughout YPG and it is unlikely that increased testing and training would have other than minor impacts to wild horses and burros. Testing and training impacts would be long-term.

No TGP sites are proposed at locations where wild horses or burros are known to congregate. It is possible that wild horses and burros could be transient visitors at proposed TGP sites. Vegetation clearing to establish a TGP would not be done if wild horses or burros were present. Work would be delayed until the animals had left the area. Any impacts would be minor and temporary.

Proposed Action Impacts Summary. TES animal species would be temporarily disturbed by construction activities and associated noise. It is likely that mobile TES species would relocate to similar habitat nearby. After construction is complete, TES animal species could resume use of areas adjacent to the construction or acclimate to the new habitat occupied at the time of displacement. Most proposed construction would occur in cantonment areas or other previously developed locations where potential TES animal species habitat is limited and human activity is common. Impacts from construction of the Proposed Action would likely be minor and short-term.

Wildfire could impact TES species on YPG through direct mortality, disruption of reproduction, or loss of habitat. Wildfire would likely have a greater impact on TES plant species than on animal species. Exotic invasive plant species can affect wildfire size and intensity in areas where native vegetation is cleared or where soils are disturbed during activities. Depending on size and intensity, impacts from a particular wildfire could range from minor to severe. Measures that would be implemented to minimize the potential for colonization and growth of exotic invasive plant species are discussed in Sections 3.7 and 3.18.

New TGPs could result in disturbance, including clearing, of up to 50.6 ac of desert scrub habitat in the Cibola Region and up to 26.4 ac of desert scrub vegetation annually in the Kofa Region, but only within isolated areas of up to 2.2 ac each. Clearing would be spread through both space and time, but the slow recovery of desert vegetation would result in vegetation and habitat impacts being long-term. Each proposed TGP site would be assessed for the presence of TES species prior to implementation. Should TES species be documented at a proposed TGP site, YPG could choose to relocate a proposed TGP, if practicable, to avoid potential impacts or YPG could choose to relocate TES species from the area of disturbance. TES plant species would be salvaged and relocated to other suitable habitat to minimize impacts. TES animal species that are not very mobile could be relocated from these areas. If nests or dens are present in a proposed TGP area and the TGP could not be relocated, it would be delayed until after young have fledged/departed to avoid impacts.

The cumulative effect of incremental vegetation and habitat loss within YPG from all proposed activities would be moderate. No significant incremental impacts to TES from vegetation clearing or habitat loss would be expected. Past and reasonably foreseeable future activities also could interact with the effects of the Proposed Action concerning impacts to TES species. Because all impacts to TES species resulting from the Proposed Action would be confined within the boundary of YPG and because there would be no loss of species, it is not expected that TES species impacts of the Proposed Action would interact with off-post actions to affect regional TES species populations.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Should the project be constructed approximately 51.5 acres of moderately suitable habitat for the Mojave fringe-toed lizard would be lost, but no other impacts to TES species or their habitats would result. There could be minor contributions to cumulative impacts on TES species and their habitats.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to TES species and their habitats through land clearing and site preparation activities associated with construction. The magnitude of disturbance, the occurrence of particular TES species, and the occurrence of potentially suitable habitats for TES species within and near the proposed projects is not known at this time and the potential for cumulative impacts cannot be assessed accurately. However, It is likely that BLM will require appropriate coordination or consultation with USFWS and AGFD with regard to the potential to impact TYES species. Through this process and subsequent implementation of any conservation measures identified by the regulatory agencies, it is expected that any contribution to cumulative impacts to TES species and their habitats would be minimal.

At present, white-nose syndrome is not known to affect bat populations in the Yuma area (USFWS, 2011c). Should this disease spread to the Southwest, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to cave-dwelling or cave-hibernating bats in the region. Because of the uncertainty associated with the potential spread of this disease, the potential for cumulative impacts associated with white-nose syndrome cannot be evaluated at this time.

3.16.2.4 Mitigation

YPG considered potential impacts to TES species in selecting locations for proposed activities. By avoiding known TES species locations, YPG minimized the potential for impacts to TES species. When implementing construction projects in areas where TES animal species are likely to nest or den, YPG would schedule construction to occur outside the nesting or denning period where practicable.

To minimize the potential for impacts from activities proposed within or adjacent to high quality TES species habitat, surveys would be conducted. If TES species are found in the proposed construction/testing/training area, YPG would first determine whether the proposed activity could be relocated. If relocation of the activity is not practicable, YPG would relocate TES species to nearby suitable habitat if practicable.

If proposed work or activities could not be done outside the nesting/denning periods for TES species, work could be delayed until after young had fledged or departed the area when practicable, or the nest could be sheltered in place using the appropriate protocols through coordination with AGFD.

Where earth moving or vegetation clearing would occur adjacent to suitable habitat for the banded Gila monster or Sonoran desert tortoise, simple barriers, such as silt fencing, would be placed to deter entry by these species.

To minimize the potential for impacts to TES species YPG would limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable and would avoid vegetation where feasible.

The INRMP (YPG, 2012b) directs the management of natural resources, including TES species, within YPG. Through continued implementation of the INRMP, YPG uses the best available scientific knowledge and techniques to manage its resources. YPG would update its INRMP, as appropriate, and continue to implement the INRMP, which would benefit TES species.

In addition, YPG is developing an exotic invasive plant management program (see Section 3.18) that would benefit wildlife through improved habitat conditions. Measures that would be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to soils (see Section 3.15), vegetation (see Section 3.18), and water resources (see Section 3.20) would provide indirect benefits to wildlife through improved habitat conditions.

Should the Sonoran desert tortoise be listed under the ESA or should the Sonoran pronghorn experimental population be reclassified under the ESA, then additional consultation with USFWS regarding potential impacts to these species may result in additional mitigation measures that would be implemented to meet requirements established through the ESA Section 7 consultation process. Any such mitigation measures are unknowable at this time, but YPG would comply with requirements established through the ESA consultation process.

3.17 Traffic/Transportation

3.17.1 Existing Conditions

YPG contains approximately 180 miles of paved roads, 820 miles of improved roads (gravel/graded), and numerous unimproved roads (dirt only). There are six airfields and the installation has approximately 2,000 square miles of designated restricted airspace. Installation airspace management is discussed in Section 3.3. This section discusses the YPG transportation system, including a description of routes to the installation, the internal road system, air services, rail transport, and transportation of ordnance.

3.17.1.1 External Transportation Network

YPG is located near the Arizona-California border, 25 miles north of Yuma. It is approximately 180 miles east of San Diego and approximately 185 miles southwest of Phoenix. U.S. Interstate 10 (I-10), which extends between Los Angeles and Phoenix, is just north of the northern boundary of the Cibola Region. I-8, another east/west travel route south of YPG, passes through Yuma and connects San Diego with Tucson.

US 95 is a two-lane paved road designated as a rural principal arterial (Yuma Metropolitan Planning Office [YMPO], 2010). US 95 is the principal access route to YPG and runs generally north/south between I-8 and I-10, and US 95 bisects the Laguna Region of YPG and generally lies between the Cibola Region and the Kofa NWR.

Another paved road, County Highway S24/Imperial Dam Road, provides access to the installation from the California Imperial Valley area.

General traffic volume in the region typically is greater during the winter months, coinciding with the influx of a high seasonal visitor population. The Yuma County population typically increases by 80,000 to 100,000 residents during the winter. Traffic volume decreased by about 1 percent during the 2007-2008 time period (YMPO, 2010).

3.17.1.2 Installation Road System

Facilities on YPG are linked by an internal network of maintained paved and gravel roads. Numerous unimproved roads and trails occur throughout more remote areas of the installation. YPG maintains approximately 180 miles of paved roads, 820 miles of improved roads (gravel/graded), and numerous unimproved roads (dirt only). Road access within YPG is limited because of security constraints and potentially hazardous conditions resulting from the test mission. Personnel access is controlled using security registration, checkpoints, Range Control monitoring, guard posting, signs, and fences. Public access restriction signs are placed along public thoroughfares (YPG, 2012b).

The majority of paved roads are in the Laguna Region, serving the MAA, the Yuma Test Area, and LAAF. Roads in the Cibola and Kofa Regions are mostly gravel or unimproved. In 1984, the gravel road system was upgraded with a 6-inch subsurface layer of compacted clay/gravel. The main roadways and well-traveled secondary roads are maintained by private contractors, and maintenance includes grading, watering, and repair from storm damage (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). The description of the road system that follows is organized by geographic region.

Kofa Region. Aberdeen Road, Third Avenue, and Firing Front Road are the primary roads in the Kofa cantonment. All other roads in the Kofa Region are considered secondary. The ACP is on Aberdeen Road, which serves the main cantonment and continues to Firing Front Road. Third Avenue and Firing Front Road provide access to most facilities within the developed part of the Kofa Region.

There are six major gravel roads and two major paved roads within the Kofa Firing Range. All are closed to public access due to the nature of the test area. Gravel roads in this region include Growl, Kofa-Mohawk, Kofa-Wellton, Mortar Range, and Firing Front/Extension Roads. Pole Line Road is paved for approximately 20 miles extending from the Kofa cantonment and is gravel surfaced beyond that. The gravel portion of Pole Line Road is Growl Road and is maintained as necessary, generally following heavy storms that damage the surface. Secondary roads are routinely maintained (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

East Arm is mostly undeveloped and lacks an extensive road system. Some roads near the eastern portion of KFR provide access to munitions impact areas and other installation sites. East Arm is closed to public access.

YPG maintains a designated area, referred to as Safe Haven, for after-hours deliveries of sensitive cargo. Semi-trailers that arrive on YPG outside of normal business hours park at Safe Haven until they can enter YPG and make their delivery.

Cibola Region. The north and south Cibola Ranges consist of large plains surrounded by mountains and are used predominantly for aircraft armament firing and UAS testing. An extensive network of gravel and unimproved roads allows personnel to reach testing and sensor locations. These roads also are used for range maintenance and to retrieve cargo from DZs. The main roads, all of which are gravel and maintained as required, consist of Middle Mountain, West Cibola Access, Water Tank, Cibola Front, Cheyenne Base, CM 1, Redhill, East Target, West Target, Rocket Alley, MTI (Moving Target Indicator), Target Boundary, Hogan's Highway, Rick Douglas Trail, and Bob Davis Highway. Several other small connecting roads also are maintained according to their use. Cibola Lake Road and Corral

Road cross the north Cibola Region in a generally east-west direction. Cibola Lake Road is open to public access, but surrounding land is closed. The remainder of the Cibola Region road system is closed to public access (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

Laguna Region. The Laguna Region includes the MAA, the Yuma Test Area, LAAF, CDH, and the Air Cargo Complex. The eastern edge of the Laguna Region is Firing Front Road, which also defines the western boundary of the Kofa Region. Imperial Dam Road, which transects the Laguna Region, is a public road and provides the primary access to the MAA. Martinez Lake Road is a public road maintained by Yuma County that crosses YPG between Cibola and Laguna Regions (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

After entering the Main Gate ACP at the Laguna Region from Imperial Dam Road, Third Street provides access to most Garrison offices. B Street and Halo Street are the primary access roads to the residential areas, and F Street runs through the center of the support function facilities (such as the Commissary and Gymnasium). First Street, Second Street, and Zavala Avenue provide additional connections to F Street and the support function facilities. Barranca Road connects the MAA with YTC and LAAF and is access-controlled with a card reader gate.

Most of the vehicle mobility courses are in the Laguna Region. Mobility courses are not maintained as part of the transportation system, but are maintained as test areas. Unpaved roads in the Laguna Region are used to transport vehicles to mobility courses for testing (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

3.17.1.3 Air Transportation

The Yuma International Airport is approximately 26 miles south of YPG and offers air service via commercial carriers. This airport, which shares facilities with MCAS Yuma, is capable of accommodating most commercial and military aircraft. Air access into YPG is restricted to military and government use. Airspace over YPG and surrounding areas is restricted, as discussed in Section 3.3.1.

Within the installation, YPG operates LAAF and the CDH in support of military flight operations and aircraft test projects. LAAF has two 6,000-ft runways (150-ft wide N-S runway and adjacent 100-ft wide E-W runway) serving rotary-wing and fixed-wing aircraft, including C-130, C-5, and C-17 cargo aircraft. LAAF provides 24-hour mission support on an as-needed basis. During peak summer temperatures, aircraft are restricted to 40 percent of their gross maximum weight. LAAF also would support UAS testing once the Federal Aviation Administration finalizes the request for restricted airspace for R-2306-F.

The CDH, located in the Laguna Region, has a 4,400-ft runway and supports rotary-wing aircraft and UAS testing. CDH has four helipads to accommodate aircraft parking. The facility also includes a taxiway and support facilities. Unmanned aerial vehicles also are supported at several test runways located in the Cibola Region.

There are no helipads within the Yuma Test Area or KFR. There is a helipad at CDA, two within the Indian Wash Test Area, one near DET/REC targets, one at CM-1, three at IRCC, three at Comanche Flats, one at 4K pad, and one at Cobra Flats Aviation Test Facility. There

are three steel-mat helipads within the Cibola Range Complex. In addition, there is one serviceable emergency helipad at the MAA.

3.17.1.4 Railroads

Union Pacific Railroad operates a primary east-west freight corridor known as the Sunset Route just south of YPG. The Sunset Route links the Ports of Los Angeles and Houston and accommodates up to 70 freight trains per day. Passenger rail service is provided by Amtrak (the Sunset Limited combined with the Texas Eagle), with service offered three days each week in each direction. YPG utilizes an off-post location, Blaisdell Siding, for railway transport and evaluation of equipment loads under various railway transport conditions.

3.17.1.5 Transportation of Ordnance and Hazardous Substances

On YPG, industrial processes, routine maintenance activities, testing, and support activities are the primary operations using hazardous substances and generating wastes. Additional hazardous substances present on YPG are lead and asbestos. Munitions and explosive components are transported and stored on YPG and used in testing and training activities.

In accordance with the Hazardous Material Transportation Act (HMTA), tests that require transport and storage of hazardous materials are coordinated with Materiel Test Directorate, Range Safety, and environmental programs prior to transport. YPG has a Hazardous Waste Tracking System for all hazardous wastes generated through industrial activities. Hazardous wastes generated on YPG are managed using the Less Than 90 Day Hazardous Waste Storage Yard, located in the YTC area. Hazardous wastes and expired hazardous substances accumulate at this location until disposal. No wastes from outside YPG are accepted and no treatment or hazardous wastes disposal occurs on YPG (YPG, 2012b).

3.17.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to traffic and transportation:

- Disruption or improvement of current road, air, and rail transportation patterns and systems.
- Change in the volume or timing of use of road, air, and rail transportation systems.
- Change in the type of vehicles and aircraft utilizing transportation systems.

Traffic impacts could result in indirect impacts to airspace when the use of airspace increases or decreases, and to hazardous materials when transportation of these substances to and on YPG changes. See Section 3.3 for a discussion of potential airspace impacts and Section 3.9 for a discussion of hazardous materials.

3.17.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation include:

• Minor to Moderate (less than significant) – Activities that would cause short-term interruptions to traffic flow (e.g., closing, rerouting, or constructing roads, changes in daily or peak-hour traffic volume), but would not substantially negatively affect the YPG mission.

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would permanently alter or increase use of roads or other transportation system(s) within their current capacity or temporarily exceed the capacity of a transportation system.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would permanently alter traffic or transportation network(s) and activities that would exceed the capacity of a transportation system long-term. Activities that would substantially negatively affect the YPG mission.

3.17.2.2 Impacts of the Proposed Action

External Roads and Installation Roads. Construction projects would generate additional construction-related vehicle use during working hours on roads on and leading to YPG. Temporary road closures and short-term minor increases in traffic on roads leading to or adjacent to project locations could occur.

Implementation of multiple projects would result in additional direct impacts to roads on YPG.

- Realignment of Barranca Road in LAAF would result in the temporary disruption of onpost traffic on this road during the realignment.
- Installation of new security gates along Campo Avion Road would result in temporary disruption of on-post traffic during gate installation.
- Construction of ACP improvements would cause temporary disruptions to traffic at CDH, YTC, MAA, and the Kofa cantonment. Upon completion, traffic flow into these areas would be improved.
- Construction of Aberdeen Road flood upgrades would result in temporary disruptions to traffic entering or leaving the Kofa Region. Safety and accessibility of the road during high flow events would be improved following completion of the upgrades.
- Relocation of Safe Haven would involve temporary disruptions from construction of a new road from Aberdeen Road near the ACP. Upon completion, this road would provide access to the relocated Safe Haven. This project would improve traffic flow into the Kofa Region by improving the process for overnight holding of trucks/cargo that arrive after hours.
- Conversion of Street D near Cox Field into a pedestrian walkway would permanently alter traffic flow in the vicinity. Pedestrian safety would be enhanced by the removal of traffic from the road.
- Improvements to the truck ACP at the Kofa cantonment would cause a temporary disruption of truck traffic during construction and would improve truck traffic flow following construction.

Sections of roads within the YPG cantonment and range areas may have to be temporarily closed during construction and as part of road and ACP improvement activities. During road closures traffic control procedures, including flaggers and posted detours, would minimize any impact on traffic flow. Any impacts would be temporary and minor.

The East Kofa Operations Center (K025) would be staffed and there would be an increase in vehicle traffic on KFR roads. All movement to and from the East Kofa Operations Center

would be coordinated through Range Control. This increase in traffic would be minor and would not be expected to adversely affect traffic flow within KFR.

Testing at the DZ that would be created by Project K001, operation of the testing/training complex in the northern portion of the East Arm (K030), and training activities at the East Arm LTA (K021) would result in personnel operating in very remote areas. All movement to and from these locations would be coordinated through Range Control. This increase in traffic would be minor and would not be expected to adversely affect traffic flow within KFR.

Similarly, traffic flow along Aberdeen Road would be disrupted by construction of the flood upgrades. Appropriate traffic control measures would be implemented during construction to minimize the disruption of traffic flow, and may include detours, a temporary crossing of Castle Dome Wash, timing construction to avoid peak traffic volume times, and flaggers. Any impacts would be temporary and minor.

Construction-related traffic associated with development of a solar renewable energy facility at either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site would travel on US 95. If construction were to coincide with other construction projects in the area, there could be incremental increases in traffic that would create minor temporary cumulative impacts to civilian and military traffic on US 95. No potential for cumulative impacts to traffic would be expected from operation of a solar facility at either site.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. If construction were to coincide with other construction projects in the area, there could be incremental increases in traffic that would create minor temporary cumulative impacts to regional traffic on US 95. No potential for cumulative impacts to traffic would be expected from operation of the project.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to regional traffic. Three of the proposed projects are located on the US 95 corridor and would cause increases in traffic along this corridor during construction, which would negatively contribute to cumulative traffic impacts during the construction period. Because of the interface with a major US highway (US 95), contractors for these projects would be required to use appropriate traffic control procedures to minimize traffic impacts. However, even brief delays associated with construction traffic could incrementally interact with military traffic to create more substantial traffic impediments. However, any such incremental impacts would be temporary and would end when construction was complete.

ADOT has five current or reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity of YPG. ADOT would widen and improve the Avenue 3E Bridge in Yuma. In addition, repave a section of Business Route 8 (4th Avenue) from near the California state line to Catalina Drive in Yuma. There are also plans with the Federal Highway Administration, to implement transportation improvements on US 95 from approximately mile marker 42 to mile marker 66, an area that is within or adjacent to the eastern side of the Cibola Region as well as a traffic interchange improvement project at I-8/Araby Road (ADOT, 2013). In addition, a bridge on US 95 over Fortuna Wash is scheduled to be constructed in 2015-2016. No other transportation projects are known or planned that would have potential to interact with the Proposed Action.

The Business Route 8 repaving, Avenue 3E Bridge improvements, I-8/Araby Road traffic interchange improvements, and improvements to SR 195 and US 95 could interact with traffic associated with the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action activities would not affect the overall capacity of the road system to accommodate traffic. Short-term construction projects would result in an increase in traffic volume on off-post roads or YPG roads, but would not generate traffic beyond the capacities of those roads. The impacts would cease upon completion. Road improvements are expected to reduce congestion and improve flow; therefore, they would result in beneficial cumulative impacts once construction is complete.

Air Transportation. Implementation of components of the Proposed Action would result in more efficient air operations on YPG. Expanding the size and location of runways, aircraft parking and shelters, hangars, taxiways, and similar facilities would reduce travel times and allow for greater use of both the diversity and volume of air assets tested.

During construction, activities could be restricted or curtailed and temporary impacts from congestion and delays could occur at locations associated with aircraft launching, landing, fueling, and storage. Upon completion, this work would facilitate the use of aircraft, resulting in a beneficial impact to the testing mission. Impacts would primarily be associated with the following components of the Proposed Action:

- Construct Runway 18/36 extension at LAAF (L002-a).
- Construct helicopter and UAS parking, UAS storage facility, and UAS maintenance hangar, and relocate C-130 CALA at CDH (L007-a-d).
- Construct an aircraft shelter and other infrastructure. Clear a UAS launch/recovery area at Comanche Flats (L014-a).
- Repair landing pad at K-9 Village (L015-a).
- Construct buildings, including two FCS Rotary Class IV hangars, large transient UAS hangar with pad access, and FCS large Class IV hangar and aviation growth hangar to the west of LAAF (L100-b-e).
- Construct USASOC Tactical Hangar at LAAR (L100-f)
- Construct new UAV airfield and hangars, taxiways, UAS flight test area, and other supporting infrastructure at LAAF/MAA (L102-c).
- Construct CASA hangar (L102-d)Construct C-130 parking, hot cargo refueling area, and airship hangar at CDH (L103-c-d, L103-f).
- Construct crosswind runway at CDH (L105).
- Construct runway extension, aircraft shelter, and POL storage area, and install hard power/fiber, and communication service, at Phoenix UAS site (C007-a).
- Construct aircraft shelter, aircraft pad, taxiway, graded parking lot, and POL storage area at North UAV complex (C010 and C046).
- Construct landing pad at CM 1 (C018).
- Construct landing pad at Site 10 Missile Test Facility (C026-b).

- Construct aircraft shelter and infrastructure, including secure building with a ramp, additional buildings, and POL storage area, and clear a launch/recovery area, centered at (-114.356, 33.077) (C021-a-d).
- Construct runway expansion, taxiway, aircraft shelter, building, concrete slab, and infrastructure, and relocate meteorological tower centered at (-114.36, 33.074) (C022-a-e).
- Construct aircraft shelter and infrastructure, including a POL storage area, and clear a launch/recovery area, centered at (-114.363, 33.051) (C023-a-d).
- Construct runway, taxiway, aircraft shelter, and building, and install hard power/fiber, adjacent to existing helicopter pad at IRCC (C025-a-b).
- Construct aircraft shelter and infrastructure, including a POL storage area, and clear a launch/recovery area east of Rocket Alley (C030-a).
- Construct aircraft shelter and infrastructure, including a POL storage area, and clear a launch/recovery area at C-17 (C033-a).
- Construct aircraft shelter and infrastructure, including a POL storage area, and clear a launch/recovery area at SWTR (K004-a).
- Install launch/recovery systems and a GCS trailer at Tower 48 (K006).
- Construct runway and infrastructure west of S-15 Command and Control Shelter (K007-a-b).
- Construct runway, taxiway, aircraft shelter, multiple buildings, POL storage area, and infrastructure, and clear a launch/recovery area at the East Arm (K030).

The Proposed Action includes an increase in the use of restricted airspace throughout the Cibola Region for manned and unmanned flight operations. Airspace management is discussed in Section 3.3. The amount of restricted airspace would not increase. No changes to airspace management, beyond those previously analyzed under NEPA, would occur under the Proposed Action. There would be no potential for direct or indirect impacts to private air transportation.

No significant cumulative impacts would be expected from construction and repair of aircraft facilities on YPG. Expansion of testing would result in a greater use of airspace, which could limit the timing and availability of airspace for future use.

Railroads. The Proposed Action does not involve railroads. No direct or indirect impacts would occur.

Ordnance and Hazardous Substances. The Proposed Action would result in increased use and transport of ordnance and hazardous substances to and within YPG. Impacts associated with the transport, storage, and use of ordnance and hazardous substances are discussed in Section 3.9.

3.17.2.3 Mitigation

YPG would implement mitigation to minimize the potential adverse impacts to traffic from temporary road closures. During road closures in the Cibola Region, traffic control procedures, including flaggers and posted detours, would be implemented. During construction of the Aberdeen Road flood upgrades, appropriate traffic control measures would be implemented during construction to minimize the disruption of traffic flow, and may include detours, a temporary crossing of Castle Dome Wash, timing construction to avoid peak traffic volume times, and flaggers.

3.18 Vegetation

3.18.1 Existing Conditions

North of Mexico, the Sonoran Desert consists of two subregions: the Arizona Upland and the Lower Colorado River Valley (Colorado Desert). Each of these subregions extends southward into Mexico, where four additional subregions of the Sonoran Desert occur. The Sonoran Desert is characterized by two wet seasons, with most precipitation typically occurring in winter (December and January) and a second wet period in the summer monsoon period (July through mid-September). Rainfall in the Sonoran Desert typically ranges from 3 to 15 inches per year, but there can be drier years or localities. The Arizona Upland is the eastern part of the U.S. Sonoran Desert and it receives more precipitation than the Colorado Desert subregion. In the Arizona Upland, precipitation totals are nearly equal between winter and summer. The Colorado Desert is the western part of the Sonoran Desert in the U.S. and typically is drier and hotter than the Arizona Upland, with a greater disparity between summer and winter precipitation (Spellenberg, 2003; Phillips and Comus, 2000). YPG is in the Colorado Desert.

In the Colorado Desert of Arizona, trees are uncommon and limited to areas where water flows. Columnar cacti, such as saguaro, are less common than in the Arizona Upland due to less moisture availability, and grow more widely scattered and smaller than in the Arizona Upland subregion. Ironwood (*Olneya tesota*), smoketree (*Psorothamnus spinosus*), paloverdes (*Parkinsonia spp.*), and desert willow (*Chilopsis linearis*) are relatively common along washes (Spellenberg, 2003). Bajadas are dominated by creosote bush (*Larrea tridentata*), which also may occur in washes, and white bursage (*Ambrosia dumosa*) or big galleta (*Pleuraphis rigida*) where grasses are a dominant component. Ocotillo (*Fouquieria splendens*), cholla (*Cylindropuntia* spp.), prickly pear (*Opuntia* spp.), and barrel cacti (*Ferrocactus* spp.) also are obvious components of the vegetation (Spellenberg, 2003).

Mesquite bosques, or woodlands, consist of mainly mesquite trees and a diverse understory, which provides habitat for many species. Bosques in the Southwest typically occur as narrow strips along riparian zones, however on YPG they occur in isolated patches varying in size and are mostly not associated with defined drainages. A survey of bosques on YPG was completed in 2009 (AGFD, 2011e) and determined that bosques may vary in size from 0.5 ac to over 40 ac in size on YPG.

Vegetation on YPG is adapted to the hot, arid environment, where summer daytime temperatures can exceed 120 degrees Fahrenheit (Spellenberg, 2003). Open plains are sparsely covered with drought-tolerant shrubs, grasses, and cacti. The most common plant species on YPG is creosote bush, which occurs over large areas or mixed with combinations of ocotillo, bursage (*Ambrosia deltoidea*), teddy bear cholla cactus (*Cylindropuntia bigelovii*), and foothills paloverde trees (*Parkinsonia microphylla*) depending on landscape position.

Areas of sandy soil support big galleta communities that include foothills paloverde, honey mesquite (*Prosopis glandulosa*), or bursage. The hillsides of YPG typically support brittlebush (*Encelia farinosa*) and other plants including various cacti (such as saguaro, cholla, and

prickly pear). Saguaro cacti on YPG are less numerous and more scattered than in the eastern Sonoran Desert. The foothills and mountainous areas typically support a mixed shrub community. The desert washes typically support a variety of woody plants, including paloverde, ironwood, smoketree, mesquite, and catclaw acacia (*Senegalia greggii*). Larger washes support bosques of smoketree, mesquite, ironwood, and paloverde. The vegetation characteristics of the highest mountain slopes of YPG are similar to those of the Arizona Upland Subdivision of the Sonoran Desert; these YPG slopes sustain sparse populations of saguaro and other cacti, agaves (*Agave deserti*), beargrass (*Nolina microcarpa*), and paloverde (YPG, 2012b).

At YPG, vegetation density noticeably decreases downstream of bajadas heavily impacted by military training, testing, and infrastructure. Bajadas are typically covered with welldeveloped desert pavement (see Section 3.15 for a discussion of desert pavement). Vegetation densities on YPG are also decreasing in first order rills downstream from unimpacted areas, indicating that natural desert conditions may be changing. Therefore, changes in desert vegetation are likely due to natural and anthropogenic forces (McDonald et al., 2004).

On YPG precipitation rarely exceeds the amount required to infiltrate below surface horizons, and runoff from adjacent piedmonts, especially along channels, is needed to augment the moisture plants receive from other sources. The Av horizon of desert pavement is fine-textured with high clay content, which results in surface water runoff rather than infiltration. However, the underlying Bw horizon is gravel-rich and, when the Av horizon is disturbed, surface water infiltrates through the lower horizons. Therefore, military land use activities that disrupt the Av horizon of desert pavement can change the frequency or amount of surface flow along low-order channels and directly impact the ecological condition of vegetation along channels (McDonald et al., 2004).

Non-native and invasive species occur on YPG. The main non-native plants of concern are considered exotic invasive plants and include buffelgrass, Athel tamarisk (*Tamarix aphylla*), salt cedar (*Tamarix* spp. and hybrids), Mediterranean and Arabian grass (*Schismus arabicus*), Mediterranean grass, Sahara mustard, and puncturevine (*Tribulus terrestris*). Although buffelgrass only occurs in a few scattered locations, its potential for spread in favorable rainfall years and for carrying ecosystem-changing fires make it YPG's current weed of greatest concern (Merrill, 2012, personal communication). These invasive grasses and Sahara mustard increase fuel loads and carry fire well, resulting in larger and more intense wildfires. Sahara mustard skeletons blow in the wind and may pile up along fence lines in masses up to 10 ft high. Sahara mustard is considered the most detrimental non-native species on YPG due to its impact on wildlife, native plants, and potentially the mission of YPG (YPG, 2012b). Many native vegetation species are poorly adapted to fire and the intense wildfires can result in drastic changes to the vegetation.

At present, YPG implements an invasive species management program. A Draft Invasive Species Management Plan has been developed and is expected to be finalized in 2013. A program to establish exclusion, monitoring, and eradication of all exotic invasive plants on YPG is in the beginning stages by the Environmental Sciences/Natural Resource Management Department as part of the ongoing INRMP implementation (YPG, 2012b).

3.18.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to vegetation:

- Permanent loss of vegetation cover due to direct impacts from construction clearing and creation of impervious surfaces such as buildings, roads, or parking areas.
- Temporary direct disturbance to vegetation such as removal of vegetation to accommodate construction staging areas where vegetation is capable of becoming restored to a natural community.
- Direct disturbance of vegetation for testing or test support actions.
- Direct disturbance of vegetation as a result of trampling during dismounted maneuvers, off-road vehicle operation, or operation of test equipment.
- Indirect displacement of native vegetation through invasion by exotic invasive plant species following soil or vegetation-disturbing activities.
- Indirect impacts from accelerated soil erosion as a result of exposed or compacted soils.
- Beneficial impacts that control exotic species or eliminate or reduce the potential for vegetation disturbance during test operations.

Indirect impacts to GHGs (Section 3.2), fire management (Section 3.7), soils (Section 3.15), surface water quality (Section 3.20), and wildlife (Section 3.21) can result when vegetation is disturbed. These are discussed in their respective sections.

3.18.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to vegetation include:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would alter the local or regional vegetation patterns; includes consideration of vegetation as wildlife habitat.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would allow the propagation of non-native plant species.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would eliminate regional native plant species.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would segment vegetation such that regional wildlife species are jeopardized.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would eliminate a vegetation type from YPG or the region.

3.18.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, continuing mission operations would result in impacts to vegetation, as testing and training activities continue in currently authorized areas at currently authorized levels. Vegetation impacts could result from off-road vehicle and equipment activity and maneuvers, dismounted maneuvers, set-up for test operations, and live-fire exercises. Impacts of these activities have been previously evaluated under NEPA in the assessments listed in Section 2.3.2.

The evaluations and analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed in Section 2.3.2 provide an assessment of the potential impacts to vegetation that would result from the No Action Alternative, with testing and training continued at current levels and no new construction. The analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed above are incorporated into this DPEIS by reference.

Range sustainability on YPG is managed through the ITAM program, which is implemented to maintain conditions that realistically simulate conditions in other desert regions for operational testing and training activities. Range management and rehabilitation prevent deterioration of conditions that could adversely affect operational testing and training if allowed to proceed unchecked.

Beneficial impacts associated with replacement of turf with xeriscaping would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

3.18.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

The analysis of potential impacts to vegetation as a result of implementing the Proposed Action is based on the difference in impacts that would occur under the Proposed Action compared to those that would occur under the No Action Alternative. Potential impacts to vegetation could occur from the following activities:

- Building/facility construction
- Utility infrastructure installation (electrical transmission/telecommunications lines)
- Off-road vehicle and equipment testing
- Dismounted maneuver activities
- Munitions testing
- Live-fire training and operational testing
- DZ establishment
- TGPs establishment
- Wildfire

Exotic invasive plant species typically consume more water than native species. The potential for exotic invasive plant species to depress shallow groundwater tables is discussed in Section 3.20. The following sections discuss the potential impacts to vegetation that may result in each of the three areas on YPG.

Laguna Region. Within the Laguna Region, new building/facility construction, airfield runway/taxiway construction/improvement, roadway improvements, and ACP improvements would be the primary activities that would cause impacts to vegetation. Limited additions to utility infrastructure would occur in the Laguna Region and these would have minor impacts to vegetation. Expanded dismounted maneuver areas and new vehicle test courses are proposed for parts of the Laguna Region, and the subsequent use of these areas could impact vegetation. A new DZ is proposed for the Laguna Region and would result in vegetation clearing.

Most proposed new building and facility construction would occur in the Laguna Region. Site preparation for construction of buildings would eliminate all vegetation from the area of construction. Additional impervious areas would be created through construction, with the potential for increased stormwater runoff. Scour from erosion as a result of increased runoff could result in loss of vegetation along flow paths. Proposed construction activities would result in clearing of approximately 350 ac of desert habitat in the Laguna Region, with all vegetation removed from this acreage as a result. These activities would not eliminate any native species from YPG, though the impacts would be permanent and moderate. Approximately 125 ac of new impervious area would be created. Cleared areas converted to impervious area would have no potential for contributing to the spread of exotic invasive plants on YPG. The remaining approximately 225 ac of cleared desert would have the potential for colonization by exotic invasive species. Most of this area would be within a proposed UAS launch/recovery area (approximately 160 ac) and the remainder would be primarily associated with various range road improvements. This acreage would not be managed through the ITAM program because it is not associated with training areas. Cleared areas converted to impervious area would have no potential for contributing to the spread of exotic invasive plants of exotic invasive plants on YPG. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas.

There would be potential for increased runoff from the approximately 125 ac of new impervious area. Stormwater controls are discussed in Section 3.20. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could result in increased erosion, which could then remove native vegetation through scour. The potential loss of vegetation through scour from erosive water flow could extend off-post and affect vegetation on adjacent downstream properties. During construction, BMPs would be used to stabilize disturbed soils, which would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to vegetation as a result of erosion of exposed disturbed soils from stormwater runoff. See Section 3.15 for a detailed discussion of construction BMPs for soil stability.

Electrical transmission/telecommunications lines would be installed at seven locations in the Laguna Region, with the potential for minor vegetation impacts along the length of new utility line at each of the sites. For analysis purposes, it is assumed that utility line extensions would be an equal mix of above-ground and below-ground infrastructure, with vegetation impacts primarily limited to areas where below-ground installation would occur. Vegetation impacts from aerial lines would be limited to the footprint of the support poles. Below-ground infrastructure would result in complete disturbance to vegetation within the utility corridor. Approximately 0.6 ac would be disturbed from installation of utility lines in the Laguna Region. While the disturbed area would be stabilized to minimize the potential for erosion or spread of exotic invasive plant species, the impacts would be long-term because desert vegetation recovers slowly following disturbance, due to the harsh environment and the limited availability of water. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas. Installation of utility lines would not result in any species being eliminated from YPG and no identified habitat types would be lost. Impacts from installation of utility lines would be minor.

An increase in dismounted maneuver activity would occur near West LA and K-9 Village. The LTA at West LA would be expanded by 6,520 ac to connect with K-9 Village. Battalionlevel dismounted maneuvers simulating deployment in open desert to achieve an urban target in either the West LA or K-9 Village MOUT areas would be conducted. The LTA at Muggins/Middle Mountain would be expanded up to approximately 16,640 ac. Additional expanded dismounted maneuver areas would be established in the Laguna Region, which would cover approximately 1,970 ac. No direct impacts to vegetation would result from this activity. Subsequent use of the area for dismounted maneuvers during operational testing and training activities would have the potential to impact vegetation from trampling by Soldiers. In addition, new vehicle test courses would be established within approximately 9,040 ac in the Laguna Region. Discernible trails would be established, minimizing the potential for soil compaction and for exposing soils outside the boundary of the vehicle test courses. However, when active vehicle testing is not ongoing, the area may be used to perform blended testing or dismounted maneuver training at the vehicle test courses. Trampling of vegetation could occur, but most troop movement would be dispersed to avoid inadvertent creation of discernible trails and would avoid woody desert plants. This would minimize soil compaction and the potential for damage to vegetation. Limited offroad vehicle operation may occur in conjunction with dismounted maneuver activities and initial troop deployment. Any impact from off-road vehicle operation would be localized and minor. Impacts to vegetation from dismounted maneuver training activities would be expected to be negligible with continued implementation of the ITAM program.

Wildfire adversely affects desert vegetation. Within the Laguna Region, wildfires are suppressed and do not substantially alter desert vegetation. Because no change to the wildfire management program would occur under the Proposed Action, no impacts to vegetation would be expected as a result of wildfire in the Laguna Region. There is potential for increased colonization by exotic invasive plant species if disturbed areas are not managed, which could result in increased fuel loads and greater potential for severe wildfire. This is discussed further in Section 3.7.

Creation of a DZ would result in disturbances to approximately 45 ac in the Laguna Region. The DZ would not be entirely cleared of vegetation, but disturbances would occur during testing and training activities. Disturbances to vegetation would generally be caused from the dropping of objects directly onto the ground by parachute and from payload retrieval by vehicles. Due to the slow growth of desert vegetation, impacts would be long-term. No species would be lost from YPG and no specific habitat type would be eliminated. The long-term impacts to vegetation from testing and training activities in the DZ would be moderate. There would be increased potential for invasion by herbaceous exotic invasive species as a result of repeated testing and training activities. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas.

No munitions testing occurs in the Laguna Region and no TGPs would be established in this region. No new off-road vehicle testing in the Laguna Region would occur under the Proposed Action. These activities would not affect vegetation in the Laguna Region.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site, which is in the Laguna Region, would result in vegetation clearing on up to 322 ac (USAEC, 2012). This could incrementally add to other projects on YPG that remove vegetation and lead to minor cumulative impacts to vegetation.

There would be potential for interaction of activities conducted in the Laguna Region under the Proposed Action and activities proposed in other areas of YPG with regard to vegetation. Because no loss of species or habitat types would result, any incremental contribution to loss of native desert vegetation that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action in the Laguna Region would not be significant. The YPG INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for incremental interaction with other on-post projects.

The proposed Cox Field improvements would have a minor beneficial impact on native vegetation. Approximately 8 ac of irrigated turf grass would be replaced with xeriscaping, which would feature native desert vegetation.

Cibola Region. The amount of proposed new building/facility construction in the Cibola Region is much less than that proposed for the Laguna Region. Most of the proposed building/facility construction for the Cibola Region is new construction rather than replacement of existing structures and there would be potential for disturbance to vegetation from construction activities. Numerous airfields across the Cibola Region are proposed for runway expansion and new supporting infrastructure, with the potential for impacts to vegetation at each site. Multiple areas are proposed for use as munitions impact areas, either new areas or expansions of existing munitions impact areas with potential for long-term impacts to vegetation in these areas. Utility infrastructure extensions would occur throughout the Cibola Region and could have moderate impacts to vegetation. New dismounted maneuver areas are proposed for parts of the Cibola Region, and the subsequent use of these areas could impact vegetation. New DZs are proposed for the Cibola Region, and 23 new TGPs would be established in the Cibola Region to support testing activities. Both of these activities would affect vegetation.

Proposed construction activities would result in clearing of approximately 740 ac of desert habitat in the Cibola Region, with all vegetation removed from this acreage as a result. These activities would not eliminate any native species nor specific habitat type from YPG, though the impacts would be permanent and moderate. New construction, including paving for runways and airfield support pads, would convert approximately 130 ac of the Cibola Region to impervious surfaces. The remaining approximately 610 ac of cleared desert would have the potential for colonization by exotic invasive species. Most of this area would be within a proposed UAS launch/recovery area (approximately 530 ac) and the remainder would be primarily associated with TGPs and construction of the forward staging area. The permanent impacts to vegetation from construction and paving in the Cibola Region would be moderate. Once construction is complete, no further impacts to vegetation in the Cibola Region would result from operations (testing and training) that would use the new facilities. Cleared areas converted to impervious area would have no potential for contributing to the spread of exotic invasive plants on YPG. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas.

There would be potential for localized increased runoff from the approximately 130 ac of new impervious area. Stormwater controls are discussed in Section 3.20. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could result in increased erosion, which could then remove native vegetation through scour. Depending on the location of the new impervious area, the potential loss of vegetation through scour from erosive water flow could extend off-post and affect vegetation on adjacent downstream properties. During construction, BMPs would be used to stabilize disturbed soils, which would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to vegetation as a result of erosion of exposed disturbed soils from stormwater runoff. See Section 3.15 for a detailed discussion of impacts to soils and construction BMPs for soil stability.

Expansion or creation of DZs would result in disturbances to approximately 980 ac in the Cibola Region. DZs would not be entirely cleared of vegetation, but disturbances would occur during testing and training activities. Disturbances to vegetation would generally be caused by dropping of objects directly on the ground by parachute and from payload retrieval by vehicles. Due to the slow growth of desert vegetation impacts would be long-term. No species would be lost from YPG and no specific habitat type would be eliminated. The long-term impacts to vegetation from testing and training activities in DZs would be moderate. There would be increased potential for invasion by herbaceous exotic invasive species as a result of repeated testing and training activities. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas.

Electrical transmission and telecommunications lines would be installed to 20 locations in the Cibola Region. For analysis purposes, it is assumed that utility line extensions would be an equal mix of above-ground and below-ground infrastructure, with vegetation impacts primarily limited to areas where below-ground installation would occur. Vegetation impacts from aerial lines would be limited to the footprint of the support poles. Approximately 16 ac of vegetation would be disturbed from installation of new utility lines in the Cibola Region. Because desert vegetation recovers slowly, due to the harsh environment and the limited availability of water, any impacts from construction of utility lines would be long-term. Installation of utility lines would not result in elimination of any species from YPG and no identified habitat types would be lost. Impacts from installation of utility lines would be subject to colonization by exotic invasive plant species. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas.

New and expanded dismounted maneuver areas would be established in the Cibola Region, which would cover approximately 66,400 ac. No direct impacts to vegetation would result from this activity. Subsequent use of the area for dismounted maneuver during operational testing and training activities would have potential to impact vegetation from trampling by Soldiers. Most troop movement would be dispersed to avoid inadvertent creation of discernible trails and would avoid woody desert plants. This would minimize soil compaction and potential for damage to vegetation. Limited off-road vehicle operation may occur in conjunction with dismounted maneuver activities and initial troop deployment. Any impacts from off-road vehicle operation would be localized and minor. Impacts to vegetation from dismounted maneuver training activities would be expected to be negligible with continued implementation of the ITAM program.

In addition, new vehicle test courses would be established within an area up to 4,644 ac in the Cibola Region. Discernible trails would be established, minimizing the potential for soil compaction and impacts to vegetation outside the boundary of the vehicle test courses. However, when active vehicle testing is not ongoing, the area may be used to perform blended testing or dismounted maneuver training at the vehicle test courses.

Twenty-three new TGPs would be established to meet identified testing and training needs in the Cibola Region. Each TGP would cover an area of up to 2.2 ac. Shrubs and other woody vegetation would be cleared at ground level with minimal soil disturbance to eliminate potential interfere with proposed testing and observations. Up to 50.6 ac of vegetation in the Cibola Region would be cleared. No species loss would be expected from clearing for TGPs. If a TGP would be in an area of native vegetation, the impact could range from minor (limited woody vegetation) to moderate (area predominantly desert shrub vegetation). Because desert vegetation recovers slowly, due to the harsh environment and the limited availability of water, any impacts from establishment of TGPs would be longterm. No regional cumulative impacts to vegetation beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected. There could be increased potential for invasion by herbaceous exotic invasive species as a result of clearing vegetation for TGPs. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas. Clearing for TGPs also could be beneficial, if a selected TGP would be within an area dominated by exotic invasive vegetation. Clearing of such an area would be a minor benefit to desert vegetation. Depending on the number of TGPs needed in the Kofa Region (up to 12 per year), impacts from vegetation clearing could reach approximately 150 ac across YPG within the timeframe for vegetative recovery of a given TGP site. This would constitute a minor cumulative impact to desert vegetation on YPG, but no regional cumulative impacts to vegetation beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected.

There are multiple locations within the Cibola Region where new munitions impact areas would be established or where existing munitions impact areas would be expanded. Approximately 16,310 ac would be converted to munitions impact areas. Of this total, approximately 16,050 ac would receive both inert and explosive fire and approximately 250 ac at JERC I, II, and III would be for inert fire only. There would be no direct impacts to vegetation in these areas from creation of the munitions impact areas. After munitions impact areas are established, there would be the potential for episodic disturbance to vegetation from munitions testing and operational testing or training activities that would fire into these areas. Munitions impact areas that receive only inert fire would be less impacted, as direct impacts to vegetation as a result of altered growing conditions should inert munitions degrade and release metals or other constituents of concern to the soil.

Wildfire adversely affects desert vegetation. Within the Cibola Region, most wildfires are allowed to burn due to the risk of firefighters encountering UXO while working to control a fire. When wildfires occur in the Cibola Region, long-term damage to desert vegetation results. Because no change to the wildfire management program would occur under the Proposed Action, no direct change in the potential for vegetation damage from wildfire in the Cibola Region would result. The potential exists for increased colonization by exotic invasive plant species if disturbed areas are not managed, which could result in increased fuel loads and greater potential for severe wildfire. This is discussed further in Section 3.7. Use of the new or expanded munitions impact areas could result in increased potential for wildfire to start, which could result in increased risk to vegetation. Clearing for TGPs and airfield/UAS support would create areas with little or no fuel load and would likely reduce the potential for wildfire to spread in the Cibola Region and could result in a long-term benefit to vegetation.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in vegetation clearing on up to 1,000 ac (USAEC, 2012). This could incrementally add to other projects on YPG that remove vegetation and lead to minor cumulative impacts to vegetation.

There would be potential for interaction of activities conducted in the Cibola Region under the Proposed Action and activities proposed in other areas of YPG with regard to vegetation. Because no loss of species or habitat types would result, any incremental contribution to loss of native desert vegetation that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action in the Cibola Region would not be significant. The YPG INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for incremental interaction with other on-post projects.

Kofa Region. New building/facility construction in the Kofa Region is primarily limited to new or replacement structures at fixed GPs, where previous clearing would limit the potential for impacts to vegetation, and at new training complexes. Utility infrastructure would be extended to six new locations in the Kofa Region and could impact vegetation.

Proposed construction activities would result in clearing of approximately 240 ac of desert habitat in the Kofa Region, with all vegetation removed from this acreage as a result. These activities would not eliminate any native species nor specific habitat type from YPG, though the impacts would be permanent and moderate. New construction, including paving, creation of a UAS launch/recovery area near SWTR, the East Kofa Operations Center, and the training complex in the northern part of East Arm, would convert approximately 54 ac of the Kofa Region to impervious surfaces. Cleared areas converted to impervious area would have no potential for contributing to the spread of exotic invasive plants on YPG. The remaining approximately 186 ac cleared in the Kofa Region would have potential for colonization by exotic invasive species. Most of this area would be within a proposed UAS launch/recovery area (approximately 156 ac) and the remainder would be primarily associated with TGPs. This acreage would not be managed through the ITAM program because it is not associated with training areas. YPG would modify its INRMP to address invasive plant species control in the newly disturbed areas. Absent future management to control exotic invasive plant species, the impacts to vegetation from displacement of native species could be significant. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas.

Approximately 54 ac of new impervious area would be created in the Kofa Region. All vegetation would be removed from these areas. No species would be lost from YPG and no specific habitat type would be eliminated. The permanent impacts to vegetation from construction and paving in the Cibola Region would be moderate. Because these sites would be covered with impervious surfaces, there would be no potential for exotic invasive plants to colonize the new impervious areas. Once construction is complete, no further impacts to vegetation in the Cibola Region would result from operations (testing and training) that would use the new facilities.

There would be potential for localized increased runoff from the approximately 54 ac of new impervious area in the Kofa Region. Stormwater controls are discussed in Section 3.20. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could result in increased erosion, which could then remove native vegetation through scour. Depending on the location of the

new impervious area, the potential loss of vegetation through scour from erosive water flow could extend off-post and affect vegetation on adjacent downstream properties. During construction, BMPs would be used to stabilize disturbed soils, which would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to vegetation as a result of erosion of exposed disturbed soils from stormwater runoff. See Section 3.15 for a detailed discussion of construction BMPs for soil stability.

Electrical transmission and telecommunications lines would be installed to four locations in the Kofa Region. For analysis purposes, it is assumed that utility line extensions would be an equal mix of above-ground and below-ground infrastructure, with vegetation impacts primarily limited to areas where below-ground installation would occur. Vegetation impacts from aerial lines would be limited to the footprint of the support poles. Approximately 2.7 ac of vegetation would be disturbed from installation of new utility lines in the Kofa Region. Because desert vegetation recovers slowly, due to the harsh environment and the limited availability of water, any impacts from construction of utility lines would be long-term. Installation of utility lines would not result in elimination of any species from YPG and no identified habitat types would be lost. Impacts from installation of utility lines would be moderate and, should any utility lines be installed as aerial lines, the impacts to vegetation would be reduced. Areas disturbed during installation of new utility lines would be subject to colonization by exotic invasive plant species. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas.

New dismounted maneuver areas would be established in the Kofa Region, which would cover approximately 53,180 ac. No direct impacts to vegetation would result from this activity. Subsequent use of the area for dismounted maneuvers during operational testing and training activities would have the potential to impact vegetation from trampling by Soldiers. Most troop movement would be dispersed to avoid inadvertent creation of discernible trails and would avoid woody desert plants. This would minimize soil compaction and potential for damage to vegetation. Limited off-road vehicle operation may occur in conjunction with dismounted maneuver activities and initial troop deployment. Any impacts from off-road vehicle operation would be localized and minor. Impacts to vegetation from dismounted maneuver training activities would be expected to be negligible with continued implementation of the ITAM program.

Expansion or creation of DZs would result in disturbances to approximately 305 ac in the Kofa Region. DZs would not be entirely cleared of vegetation, but disturbances would occur during testing and training activities. Disturbances to vegetation would generally be caused by dropping of objects directly on the ground by parachute and from payload retrieval by vehicles. Due to the slow growth of desert vegetation impacts would be long-term. No species would be lost from YPG and no specific habitat type would be eliminated. The long-term impacts to vegetation from testing and training activities would be moderate. There would be increased potential for invasion by herbaceous exotic invasive species as a result of repeated testing and training activities. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas.

Up to 12 new TGPs would be established annually, depending on mission needs. The locations of any new TGPs are unknown, but these sites would be within established munitions impact areas and adjacent to roads. Each TGP would cover an area of up to 2.2 ac. Shrubs and other woody vegetation would be cleared at ground level with minimal soil disturbance to eliminate potential interfere with proposed testing and observations. Up to 26.4 ac of vegetation in the Kofa Region would be cleared annually, but there would be reuse of sites among years and the actually annual clearing would likely be much less. No species loss would be expected from clearing for TGPs. If a TGP would be in an area of native vegetation, the impact could range from minor (limited woody vegetation) to moderate (area predominantly desert shrub vegetation). Because desert vegetation recovers slowly, due to the harsh environment and the limited availability of water, any impacts from establishment of TGPs would be long-term. No regional cumulative impacts to vegetation beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected. There could be increased potential for invasion by herbaceous exotic invasive species as a result of clearing vegetation for TGPs. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas. Clearing for TGPs also could be beneficial if a selected TGP would be within an area dominated by exotic invasive vegetation. Clearing of such an area would be a minor benefit to desert vegetation. Depending on the number of TGPs needed in the Kofa Region, impacts from vegetation clearing could reach approximately 150 ac across YPG within the timeframe for vegetative recovery of a given TGP site. This would constitute a minor cumulative impact to desert vegetation on YPG, but no regional cumulative impacts to vegetation beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected.

There are multiple locations within the Kofa Region where new munitions impact areas would be established or where existing munitions impact areas would be expanded. All of the new and expanded munitions impact areas (29,757 ac) in the Kofa Region would be used for inert and explosive fire. There would be no direct impacts to vegetation in these areas from the creation of the munitions impact areas. After munitions impact areas are established, there would be the potential for episodic disturbance to vegetation from munitions testing and operational testing or training activities that would fire into these areas. Munitions impact areas that receive only inert fire would be less impacted, as direct impacts to vegetation as a result of altered growing conditions should inert munitions degrade and release metals or other constituents of concern to the soil.

Under the Proposed Action, there would be no change to off-road vehicle operation in the Kofa Region. No impacts to vegetation in the Kofa Region, beyond those already authorized and occurring under the No Action Alternative, would result from these activities.

Wildfire adversely affects desert vegetation. Within the Kofa Region, most wildfires are allowed to burn due to the risk of firefighters encountering UXO while working to control a fire. When wildfires occur in the Kofa Region, long-term damage to desert vegetation results. Because no change to the wildfire management program would occur under the Proposed Action, no direct change in the potential for vegetation damage from wildfire in the Kofa Region would result. The potential exists for increased colonization by exotic invasive plant species if disturbed areas are not managed, which could result in increased fuel loads and greater potential for severe wildfire. This is discussed further in Section 3.7.

Use of the new or expanded munitions impact areas could result in increased potential for wildfire to start, which could result in increased risk to vegetation. Clearing for TGPs and airfield/UAS support would create areas with little or no fuel load and would likely reduce the potential for wildfire to spread in these areas, which could result in a long-term benefit to vegetation from reduced wildfire spread.

There would be potential for interaction of activities conducted in the Kofa Region under the Proposed Action and activities proposed in other areas of YPG with regard to vegetation. Because no loss of species or habitat types would result, any incremental contribution to loss of native desert vegetation that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action in the Kofa Region would not be significant. The YPG INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for incremental interaction with other on-post projects.

Impacts Summary. Impacts to vegetation on YPG typically either are permanent, such as where construction or paving eliminates vegetation from an area, or long-term because the harsh environment and the limited availability of water in the desert result in very slow recovery of vegetation following disturbance. There would be unavoidable impacts to vegetation under the Proposed Action. Approximately 2,175 ac of desert vegetation would experience long-term impacts from clearing of desert scrub vegetation for UAS launch/recovery areas and disturbances to vegetation from DZ activities. Another approximately 310 ac would be lost to construction and paving, and up to approximately 204,470 ac would experience intermittent long-term impacts from use as munitions impact areas, vehicle test courses, or dismounted maneuver areas.

Installation of utility infrastructure would affect approximately 20 ac of vegetation. These impacts would be long-term because of the very slow recovery of desert vegetation following disturbance.

All areas of exposed, disturbed soils would be subject to invasion by exotic invasive plant species. Construction BMPs would be used to stabilize disturbed soils, which would minimize the potential for invasion by exotic invasive species. Further, the development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas. Construction BMPs also would reduce the potential for indirect impacts to vegetation as a result of erosion of exposed disturbed soils from stormwater runoff.

Within the Laguna Region, wildfires are suppressed and do not substantially alter desert vegetation. Because no change to the wildfire management program would occur under the Proposed Action, no impacts to vegetation would be expected as a result of wildfire in the Laguna Region. Within the Cibola and Kofa Regions, most wildfires are allowed to burn due to the risk of firefighters encountering UXO. Wildfires in the Cibola and Kofa Regions typically would result in long-term damage to desert vegetation because most native desert species are poorly adapted to fire. Because no change to the wildfire management program would occur under the Proposed Action, no direct change in the potential for vegetation damage from wildfire in the Cibola and Kofa Regions would result. There is potential for increased colonization by exotic invasive plant species in any areas where soils would be disturbed under the Proposed Action, if disturbed areas are not managed. This could result in increased fuel loads and greater potential for severe wildfire. This is discussed further in Section 3.7. Use of the new or expanded munitions impact areas could result in increased

potential for wildfire ignition, which could result in increased risk to vegetation. Clearing for TGPs and airfield/UAS support would create areas with little or no fuel load and would likely reduce the potential for wildfire to spread in these areas, which could result in a long-term benefit to vegetation from reduced wildfire spread.

There would be no loss of plant species from YPG and no loss of any identified habitat type on the installation as a result of implementation of the Proposed Action. Impacts to vegetation on YPG as a result of the Proposed Action would be moderate and long-term because of the very slow recovery of desert vegetation following disturbance.

There would be a minor beneficial impact on native vegetation from replacement of approximately 8 ac of irrigated turf grass at Cox Field with xeriscaping that would feature native desert vegetation.

There would be potential for interaction of activities conducted under the Proposed Action and other current activities being conducted in other areas on YPG with regard to vegetation. Because no loss of species or habitat types would result, any incremental contribution to loss of native desert vegetation that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action would not be significant. The YPG INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for incremental interaction with other on-post projects.

The cumulative effect of incremental loss of vegetation from clearing within YPG from all proposed activities would be moderate. Past and reasonably foreseeable future activities also could interact with the effects of the Proposed Action concerning impacts to vegetation. Because all impacts to vegetation resulting from the Proposed Action would be confined within the boundary of YPG and because there would be no loss of species or specific habitat types, it is not expected that vegetation impacts of the Proposed Action would interact with off-post actions to affect regional vegetation.

Should a renewable energy facility be placed in the Cibola Region, there would be impacts to desert vegetation. No loss of species or habitat types would be expected, but the incremental impact of additional adverse impacts to vegetation cannot be determined at this time. A separate, programmatic or site-specific NEPA analysis would be required prior to implementation of a renewable energy project. The site-specific analysis would address the potential for impacts to vegetation and would assess the potential for cumulative effects with regard to the activities in this Proposed Action.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Approximately 115 acres of the 1,675-acre project area would be completely cleared of vegetation and it is likely that there would be additional vegetation loss during construction. No loss of species or habitat types would be expected and it is anticipated that any contribution to cumulative impacts to vegetation would be insignificant.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to vegetation. While specific impacts are unknown at this time, it is likely that a substantial acreage would be cleared of native vegetation for each project. It is likely that BLM will require appropriate measures, possibly including modifications to site designs to prevent loss of any vegetation type or species from the region. Therefore, any contribution to cumulative impacts to vegetation would be expected to be minor.

3.18.2.4 Mitigation

There would be potential for localized increased runoff from new impervious areas. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could result in increased erosion, which could then remove native vegetation through scour. Construction and postconstruction stormwater controls would be implemented to facilitate infiltration and reduce the potential for scour. See Sections 3.15 and 3.20 for discussions of stormwater controls. Depending on the location of the new impervious areas, the potential loss of vegetation through scour from erosive water flow could extend off-post and affect vegetation on adjacent downstream properties. During construction, BMPs would be used to stabilize disturbed soils, which would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to vegetation as a result of erosion of exposed disturbed soils from stormwater runoff. See Section 3.15 for a discussion of construction BMPs for soil stability.

To minimize the potential for impacts to vegetation, YPG would limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable and would avoid vegetation where feasible.

YPG would modify its INRMP to address invasive plant species control in the new disturbed areas. Without future management to control exotic invasive plant species, the impacts to vegetation from displacement of native species could be significant.

The YPG ITAM program would help to maintain desert vegetation in areas used for training activities.

3.19 Visual Resources

Visual resources include natural and man-made components of the environment perceived by human receptors. "Aesthetics" refers to beauty in both form and appearance. Perceptions and aesthetic values may vary among individuals depending upon personal preferences.

3.19.1 Existing Conditions

Areas of aesthetic and visual value on YPG and the surrounding area include the Muggins Mountains Wilderness Area, Kofa NWR, Imperial NWR, Trigo Mountains Wilderness Area, including the Needles Eye pinnacle on the Trigo Mountains, Red Bluff Mountain, La Posa Dunes, Mohave Peak, the White Tanks Management Area in East Arm, and Camp Laguna. Some washes that flow into the Colorado River, including Mohave, Gould, Yuma, McAllister, and Indian washes, are also considered areas of special interest, and may provide aesthetic and visual resources to some viewers (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). Wilderness and refuge areas provide the public recreational activities such as picnicking, camping, hiking, and sight-seeing.

Due to the rugged mountains and varying topography, the public viewshed on YPG is primarily limited to the views available from US 95, Imperial Dam Road, Cibola Lake Road, and Martinez Lake Road. The southern part of the Kofa Region, which is largely unused, can be seen by persons traveling by train. Development on YPG is mainly concentrated in the cantonments, while testing and training areas typically remain open and undeveloped. Most facilities and training and testing areas on YPG are not visible from public roads.

The design and appearance of facilities on YPG are guided by the YPG Installation Design Guide. The guide promotes enhancement of the natural and man-made environments by using consistent architectural themes and standards and aims to improve functionality of the installation. Most development occurs within the valleys of YPG, and development along hillsides and in washes is generally discouraged (AECOM et al., 2011).

3.19.2 Environmental Consequences

This section evaluates the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that could alter the associated visual setting of a portion of YPG, as viewed from off-post, by altering the visual landscape associated with that area. The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to visual resources:

- Permanently alter a site so that a public viewing point or vista is obstructed or otherwise adversely affected.
- Prevent or substantially impair views from a public viewpoint during construction activities.
- Introduce physical features that are substantially out of character with adjacent developed areas.

3.19.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to visual resources include:

- No Impact Activities that would not be viewable by the general public or that would not create visually observable effects.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that may temporarily affect views to the public from US 95, Imperial Dam Road, Cibola Lake Road, and Martinez Lake Road resulting from construction, primarily dust, but would be mitigated by construction BMPs.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that may permanently change the landscape as viewed by the public from US 95, Imperial Dam Road, Cibola Lake Road, and Martinez Lake Road resulting from new development, but would be mitigated by proper building design that mimics the landscape.
- Severe (significant) Activities that may permanently change the landscape as viewed by the public from US 95, Imperial Dam Road, Cibola Lake Road, and Martinez Lake Road resulting from testing and training activities.
- Severe (significant) Activities that may permanently impact areas of aesthetic and visual value as seen from public viewing points.

3.19.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Impacts to visual resources associated with the No Action Alternative are indirectly attributable to testing and training activities currently being conducted on YPG. Training and testing activities that may cause airborne dust or use smoke obscurant are known to create a temporary visual obstruction in the form of haze in areas of aesthetic and visual value. The airborne dust is typically caused by ground-based maneuvers, including vehicle testing and training on unpaved tracks or off-road, dismounted maneuvers, and certain smoke obscurant testing. Any impacts to public views would be limited to testing and training activities in proximity to US 95, Imperial Dam Road, Cibola Lake Road, and Martinez Lake Road. Most testing and training locations are not visible to the public. Many

tests conducted on YPG involve either proprietary equipment or procedures or are otherwise sensitive. Selection of sites to conduct testing typically avoids areas that may be routinely viewed by the public. This approach minimizes the potential for ongoing activities on YPG to create visual impacts.

The use of lighter-than-air UASs is also part of the current testing and training mission on YPG, and UASs are sometimes visible to the public. When visible to the public, a lighterthan-air UAS appears as a tethered balloon. Depending upon the perception of the viewer, the quality of the viewshed or of areas of aesthetic and visual value may lower. Lighterthan-air UASs typically are deployed at high altitudes and would not obscure views of areas of aesthetic and visual value. Current testing and training activities on YPG, included within the No Action Alternative, have a temporary negative minor impact on visual resources.

Areas of aesthetic and visual value that could be impacted by testing and training activities in the Cibola Region include La Posa Dunes, Needles Eye, Mohave Peak, Cibola NWR, Trigo Wilderness Area, Imperial NWR, Kofa NWR, and the Mohave, Gould, Yuma, McAllister, and Indian washes. Activities in the Laguna Region could impact areas of aesthetic and visual value, which include Camp Laguna, Muggins Mountains, Red Bluff Mountain, and Kofa NWR. Activities in the Kofa Region are generally not visible to the public and would be unlikely to impact areas of aesthetic and visual value such as Kofa NWR, Red Bluff Mountain, and the White Tanks Management Area.

3.19.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

Activities included within the No Action Alternative would continue under the Proposed Action.

Potential temporary minor negative impacts to areas of aesthetic and visual value may occur during construction as a result of airborne dust from the use of heavy equipment and site preparation. Airborne dust may contribute to haze that would partially obscure public views from some view points along US 95, Imperial Dam Road, Cibola Lake Road, and Martinez Lake Road. Construction contractors would be required to implement dust suppression practices to limit the amount of airborne dust from construction activities. The view from along these major roads has already been impacted by the presence of overhead transmission lines. The occasional small airborne dust from construction areas would not greatly alter the viewing experience. Airborne dust is further discussed in Section 3.2.

Construction and associated equipment would likely not be visible to the public or would be largely unnoticed due to the operation of military equipment and vehicles in the vicinity. The presence and operation of construction equipment is not expected to alter the public viewing experience from areas near YPG.

Permanent minor negative impacts to the publicly visible landscape could occur as a result of new buildings. New development would generally occur in cantonments in the Laguna and Kofa Regions, which are currently developed and not readily visible to the public during travel along US 95, Imperial Dam Road, Cibola Lake Road, and Martinez Lake Road. New buildings would be designed to blend with the existing visual landscape by using consistent architectural themes in accordance with the YPG Installation Design Guide. New development would also occur in several isolated areas in the Cibola and Kofa Regions. The construction of the complex in the East Arm, at SWTR, the East Kofa Operations Center, and the proposed aerial cable drop in either Cibola Region or Kofa Region would be in remote areas with very little public access. There would be permanent minor negative impacts to the visible landscape.

While testing and training activities typically are located to avoid casual observation by the public, temporary minor negative impacts to areas of aesthetic and visual value may occur as a result of increased training and testing activities. Any visual impacts would typically be limited to testing and training in proximity to US 95, Imperial Dam Road, Cibola Lake Road, and Martinez Lake Road, as other testing and training locations would not be visible to the public (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). Testing and training activities that include off-road vehicle operation, testing on unpaved tracks, dismounted maneuvers, and certain smoke obscurant testing can create temporary obstruction to public views.

The YPG Environmental Awareness program developed instructions for units training on YPG that include proper procedures and avoidance measures to be implemented during ground-based training activities to minimize potential impacts to areas of aesthetic and visual value. Continued implementation of the ITAM program would maintain or rehabilitate testing and training areas to maintain conditions that realistically simulate conditions in other desert regions. Terrain impacts to washes could also be repaired to reduce negative visual impacts.

Under the Proposed Action, there would be an increase in use of lighter-than-air UASs and the size of these craft also may increase. It is likely that multiple lighter-than-air UAS would be deployed simultaneously across the installation if testing needs warrant. These would likely appear to the public as a tethered balloon and could be used long-term. These lighterthan-air UASs may lower the quality of public views of areas of aesthetic and visual value depending on the perception of the viewer. This incremental increase in lighter-than-air UAS testing could be considered a minor negative cumulative impact.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site would change the visual characteristics of the US 95 corridor and incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts to visual resources in combination with other development projects along US 95.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. The 1,675-acre project area would change the visual characteristics of the area and incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts to visual resources.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to visual resources. At this time specific details on the project areas are unknown but it is likely the project areas would change the visual character of the area and would create a negative viewing experience for some observers.

3.19.2.4 Mitigation

The use of dust suppression practices during construction would minimize the amount of airborne dust.

New buildings would be designed using consistent architectural themes and standards in accordance with the YPG Installation Design Guide to blend with the existing visual landscape.

The YPG Environmental Awareness program developed instructions for units training on YPG that include proper procedures and avoidance measures to be implemented during ground-based training activities to minimize potential impacts to areas of aesthetic and visual value.

Continued implementation of the ITAM program would maintain or rehabilitate testing and training areas to maintain conditions that realistically simulate conditions in other desert regions. Terrain impacts to washes could also be repaired to reduce negative visual impacts.

3.20 Water Resources

3.20.1 Existing Conditions

YPG is located in the Lower Colorado Planning Area (LCPA), as defined in the Arizona Water Atlas (Arizona Department of Water Resources [ADWR], 2009). Planning Areas are an organizational concept developed by ADWR to provide a regional perspective on supply, demand, and other water resource issues. Water resources in the Yuma area are intensely managed to meet water delivery requirements of U.S. users, to manage high ground-water levels in the valleys, and to manage treaty-mandated water quality and quantity requirements of Mexico (USGS, 2006). The LCPA encompasses some 17,200 square miles, including all or part of four watersheds. The LCPA is within the Basin and Range physiographic province characterized by northwest-southeast trending mountain ranges separated by broad alluvial valleys with elevations generally less than 3,500 ft. With the exception of the Colorado River, there are no perennial streams in the planning area. Historically, the Gila River was considered perennial for most of its length, but during the 20th century farming practices and dams upstream and within the planning area eliminated perennial flows in this river. Broad sandy washes that flow only in response to major precipitation events are the main surface water features in the planning area (ADWR, 2009).

3.20.1.1 Surface Water

There are no wetlands and few permanent surface water sources within the boundaries of YPG. Surface water resources in the area include rivers and impoundments, desert washes, and water tanks. West of YPG, the Colorado River forms the border with California and flows in a southerly direction into Mexico and the Gulf of California. Surface drainage from the western part of YPG flows into the Colorado River. The Gila River flows in a westerly direction and joins the Colorado south of YPG. Surface drainage from the central and eastern parts of YPG flows into the Gila River.

Colorado and Gila Rivers. The Colorado River basin provides a major renewable water supply in the southwestern United States. Most of the water in the Colorado River and its tributaries is used for irrigation, and additional water uses include municipal and industrial supplies and regional environmental systems maintenance. The USGS has more than 50 years of data on the Lower Colorado River for use in understanding the hydrologic system and developing methods to apportion consumptive use of water from the river. The USEPA approved salinity control standards proposed by the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Forum for three locations in Arizona, including the segment below Imperial Dam. The salinity control standards establish a flow-weighted average annual salinity standard that must be maintained on the Lower Colorado River. At Imperial Dam, the salinity standard is 879 milligrams per liter (mg/L) of sodium (ADWR, 2009). The USGS regularly collects

Colorado River water samples at Imperial Dam, and the water is consistently high in sodium. Other water quality issues in the Lower Colorado River include excessive levels of nutrients, metals, endocrine disrupting compounds, perchlorate, bacteria and pathogens, and sediment. Imperial Dam and Laguna Dam create impoundments along the Colorado River in the vicinity of YPG (ADWR, 2009).

Senator Wash is an off-stream storage facility approximately 2 miles upstream from Imperial Dam. It was constructed to supplement limited storage behind Imperial Dam and Laguna Dam. When sufficient storage is not available at Imperial and Laguna Dams, water is pumped to Senator Wash and used to regulate releases from Imperial Dam. Use of Senator Wash prevents over-deliveries to Mexico during times of high flow and ensures that demands can be met under low flow conditions. Senator Wash Reservoir has a capacity of 13,836 acre-feet at a pool elevation of 251 ft mean sea level (msl). Typically, the pool elevation varies between 210 ft msl and 240 ft msl, fluctuating according to water flow and user demand (Bureau of Reclamation, 1996).

Water in the Gila River is impounded by a series of dams well upstream of the YPG area and flow does not reach the Colorado River under normal conditions. Water quality of the Gila River fluctuates according to water flow rates. During flooding, the river has very good quality, with lower sodium, calcium, and conductivity levels. During low flow conditions, drainage ditches add water from surrounding farmlands to the river, raising the conductivity levels and adding fertilizer and pesticide residues to the water (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

The Lower Colorado and Lower Gila Rivers are listed on the Arizona 2006/2008 303(d) List of Impaired Waters (ADEQ, 2010; USEPA, 2009a). Approximately 32 miles of the Lower Colorado River above the Mexican border are listed as impaired due to low dissolved oxygen levels and elevated selenium levels (ADEQ, 2010). Approximately 28 miles of the Lower Gila River are listed as impaired due to elevated selenium and boron levels (ADEQ, 2010). An additional water in the Lower Gila River watershed, Painted Rocks Borrow Pit Lake, is listed as impaired due to low dissolved oxygen levels and elevated levels of Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) metabolites, toxaphene, and chlordane in fish (ADEQ, 2010; USEPA, 2009a).

Water from YPG arrives at both rivers during flood events when the river water is of better quality. The runoff from YPG typically is of good quality, but the volume is minimal compared to the total river flow during flooding episodes and any contribution from YPG is barely perceptible (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

Desert Washes. Low rates of precipitation and high evapotranspiration rates cause ephemeral streams (desert washes) on YPG to remain dry most of the year. Heavy rains can produce flash flood situations as these washes drain surface water. Washes vary in size, from less than 3 ft in width and depth, to more than a 3,200 ft in width and 33 ft in depth. Many washes contain numerous small channels that change course during major flood events. Desert washes are regulated as waters of the U.S. under Section 404 of the CWA (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001). Figures 2-4 through 2-15 depict the major desert washes at YPG and in the surrounding area.

There are several wash systems located in the Cibola Region that drain toward the Colorado River:

- Gould and Mohave washes, in the northern part of the Cibola Region, drain northnorthwest.
- Yuma Wash drains to the south in the southwestern portion of the Cibola Region.
- McAllister Wash drains south through the south Cibola Region.
- Indian Wash, fed by numerous smaller washes, drains south-southwest through the Cibola Region.
- Los Angeles Wash, fed by numerous smaller washes, drains south-southwest through the southernmost portion of the Cibola Region.

There are two main washes in the Laguna Region that drain toward the Gila River:

- Vinegaroon Wash is located in the southeast corner of the Laguna Region. The wash is fed by several smaller washes, and drains south and west.
- Castle Dome Wash originates from the Castle Dome Mountains and crosses the Laguna Region, roughly paralleling US 95. The wash also receives runoff from several smaller washes originating in the Kofa Mountains, and drains to the south-southwest.

Runoff in the Kofa Region generally tends to have characteristics of sheet flow rather than confined flood events. The few large washes in the Kofa Region are fed by sheet flow and smaller washes and drain south toward the Gila River:

- Hoodoo Wash originates in the Kofa NWR, traverses the extreme northern section of the Kofa Region, and drains to the southeast.
- King Valley Wash is in the east-central portion of the Kofa Region. It originates in the Kofa NWR and drains to the south-southeast.
- Big Eye Wash is in the central portion of the Kofa Region. It is fed by several smaller washes originating in the Kofa Mountains and drains south-southwest.

Natural and Artificial Water Tanks. YPG has few natural, year-round sources of water. YPG works with AGFD to construct and maintain 30 man-made, self-sustaining watering holes, which are called water tanks. Some artificial water tanks were constructed specifically to direct wildlife to or away from certain areas on YPG (USAEC, 2005). The natural and artificial water sources used by wildlife are described below:

- Tinajas are naturally occurring, bowl-shaped cavities scoured from bedrock. Tinajas are usually located in the mountain canyons and occur at the base of waterfalls where the bedrock formation changes to softer rock. Rocks trapped in the cavity increase the rate of scouring.
- Enhanced tinajas are tinajas that have been artificially improved to increase water storage capacity and prolong availability. Most retain water throughout the year under normal precipitation conditions.
- Water catchments are artificial storage tanks ranging from 1,500 to 34,500 gallons. AGFD constructed water catchments in the Cibola and Kofa Regions for wildlife use on YPG.
- Other artificial water sources have developed as a result of leaking landscape irrigation pipes, excess water released from standpipes, or pumping well-water into

impoundments. Impoundments on YPG include Lake Alex, near Pole Line Road and north of Red Bluff Mountain in the central portion of the Kofa Region, and Ivan's Well, near Growl Road and Kofa Mohawk Road in the eastern portion of the Kofa Region (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

Wetlands. The Federal Register defines wetlands at 40 CFR 328.3(b) as "...those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas."

Further, wetlands that are determined to be waters of the United States are subject to regulation under the CWA and classified as jurisdictional wetlands. Less than 1 percent of Arizona is wetland habitat. Streams and wetlands throughout Arizona were modified or drained, resulting in the historical loss of more than one-third of its original wetlands. The largest and most extensive wetlands in Arizona are along riparian zones and include oxbow lakes, marshes, cienegas, and bosques. Nonriparian areas, such as tinajas, playas, and caldera lakes may support wetlands (USGS, 1999).

There are no wetlands on YPG. Desert washes and natural tinajas on YPG do not support wetland vegetation (Parsons, 2011). The nearest wetlands are located along the Colorado River.

Surface Water Quality. Surface water quality on YPG is protected and maintained through implementation of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 133), the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f), and the CWA.

The CWA protects surface waters by establishing effluent guidelines and water quality standards and by controlling discharges of oil and hazardous substances into surface water. Section 404 of the CWA prohibits dredging or discharges of fill material into waters of the United States without a permit from USACE. On YPG, Section 404 applies to desert washes, and a permit is required for any activity discharging fill material in a desert wash, including road crossings, bank protection, channelization, and new construction (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

The Army Pollution Prevention Program focuses on implementing changes in chemicals, equipment, and processes to achieve a meaningful, cost-effective reduction in the generation of pollution without adverse impacts to mission readiness (U.S. Army, 2011). To minimize the potential for contamination of surface water, containment basins trap discharges of fuel and prevent discharges to surface water. Two aboveground fuel storage tank areas at the Kofa Firing Front have concrete secondary containment basins. The Laguna Region has eight aboveground fuel storage areas, most of which have concrete secondary containment basins. All fuel storage areas and tanks are monitored and visually inspected for leakage by the Environmental Programs and Logistics offices. The number of fuel storage tanks on YPG may increase or decrease depending on mission requirements. Any tank additions or removals would be subjected to site-specific NEPA analysis prior to being implemented.

Stormwater runoff from the majority of the NRC-licensed DU area is through natural ephemeral washes. The NRC-licensed DU impact area has a DU Catchment Structure, and spent DU rounds are regularly collected by Ammunition Recovery personnel and stored by YPG Radiation Protection until packaged and transported to a licensed disposal facility by
the Army's Radioactive Waste Authority. There is an evaporative lagoon that collects runoff from the DU Catchment Structure and is sized to accommodate a 100-year storm event to minimize the potential for stormwater transport of DU off-post or to other areas on-post. Studies have shown (Obregon, 2013c, personal communication) that DU is contained within the DU licensed area and does not migrate. There is no reasonable potential for off-post migration of DU as the NRC-licensed DU impact area is more than 10 miles from the boundary. The low annual rainfall, generally level gradient of desert pavement, and high specific gravity of DU limit the transport of DU to washes. Insufficient rainfall also limits the flow in washes, thereby limiting the probability of DU transport (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

3.20.1.2 Groundwater

Regional Setting. Basin and Range aquifers underlie the southern half of Arizona. Basin and Range aquifers in southern Arizona generally occur as unconsolidated gravel, sand, silt, and clay, or partly consolidated sedimentary or volcanic materials that have filled deep faultblock valleys formed by large vertical displacement across faults. Mountain ranges that generally consist of impermeable rocks separate adjacent valleys. When mountains encircle a valley, the aquifer in the valley is isolated, and groundwater is contained within the valley. Most valleys are interconnected, and groundwater typically moves among valleys through the interconnected network of aquifers (Robson and Banta, 1995).

Basin and Range aquifers are the principal sources of groundwater in southern Arizona. The aquifers occur in approximately 120 alluvium-filled basins interspersed between mountain ranges. About 150,000,000 acre-feet of recoverable groundwater is in storage in the upper 100 ft of the saturated sediments of these basins. The groundwater in some basins is extensively utilized, and large water level declines have occurred; in other basins, population is sparse, groundwater is not extensively utilized, and water levels are stable (Robson and Banta, 1995).

Recharge to the Basin and Range aguifers occurs primarily from precipitation in mountains surrounding the basins. Average annual precipitation averages 4 to 8 inches in basins and more than 16 inches in most mountain ranges. The arid climate, with high summer temperatures and large rates of evaporation and transpiration, results in almost all precipitation in basins and most precipitation in mountains being lost to evapotranspiration. Only about 5 percent of the precipitation that falls recharges the basin-fill aquifers. Water not lost to evapotranspiration may infiltrate the soil and upper zones of fractured bedrock, where it may flow to springs or through fractures and discharge into the basin fill at the base of the mountains. Larger streams in the basins often flow on alluvium that is unconsolidated and highly permeable, enabling rapid infiltration where streams may recharge basin-fill aquifers at considerable distance from the mountains. Small ephemeral streams and water flowing through fractured bedrock generally recharge the aquifers near the mountain fronts. When the stream and aquifer are in direct hydraulic connection, as is the case along the Colorado River in Arizona, surface water and groundwater may function as an interdependent stream-aquifer system. Precipitation supplies about 2,500,000 acre-feet per year of recharge to the Arizona part of the Basin and Range aquifers. Underflow can be a significant component of recharge or discharge in connected basins of Arizona. Groundwater flows through these valleys from high elevation basins to lower elevation basins. Underflow commonly ranges from a few hundred to a few thousand acre-feet per

year, with a few larger valleys between basins exhibiting underflow in excess of 30,000 acrefeet per year (Robson and Banta, 1995).

Surface infiltration of water is an important component of recharge to the Basin and Range aquifers. In extensively developed areas, additional recharge may result from human intervention in the hydrologic cycle. Part of the water used to irrigate commercial crops, golf courses, and other vegetation percolates into the basin fill and ultimately recharges the aquifers. Water in reservoirs, canals, and wastewater outfalls also can percolate downward and recharge the aquifers. Up to half of the irrigation water applied to fields in Arizona may ultimately recharge aquifers (Robson and Banta, 1995).

Discharge from the Basin and Range aquifers in Arizona is by evapotranspiration, streams and spring flow, underflow, and well withdrawal. Evapotranspiration is the largest natural component of groundwater discharge. Groundwater can be directly lost to evaporation in areas of shallow water table such as wet playas, marshes, and salt flats. In areas where vegetation obtains most of its water from the water table, such as thick groves of salt cedar or cottonwood, plants transpire large volumes of water. Prior to groundwater development, evapotranspiration was about 1,300,000 acre-feet per year along the Lower Colorado River in Arizona, and about 700,000 acre-feet per year along the Gila River. Natural evapotranspiration can decrease when groundwater withdrawal lowers the water table (Robson and Banta, 1995).

Groundwater discharges to streams or lakes where the water level in the aquifer is above the level of the stream or lake bed. This situation can occur where a constriction in the width or thickness of the aquifer forces groundwater to the surface, or where groundwater flows toward a stream from aquifers of higher elevation on either side of the stream. In arid climates, perennial flows that cross many miles of basin fill are usually maintained by groundwater discharge from underlying aquifers. Prior to groundwater development, the Gila River and its principal tributaries, the Salt, Verde, and San Pedro Rivers, were perennial. These rivers and the Colorado River, which is still perennial, received groundwater discharge from aquifers in most of the basins they crossed (Robson and Banta, 1995).

Yuma. Historically, the Colorado and Gila Rivers were the source of nearly all groundwater in the Yuma basin through direct infiltration from the river channels and from annual flooding when high flows overtopped the river banks (ADWR, 2009; Dickinson et al., 2006). Impoundment of water in upstream reservoirs on the Colorado River has resulted in loss of sedimentation and scouring of the river channel, lowering the river profile in the Yuma area and causing the Colorado River to act as a drain to the groundwater system (Dickinson et al., 2006). Due to upstream impoundments and consumptive use, the Gila River now flows intermittently, causing it to act as a drain to the groundwater system. Groundwater from YPG flows in a general southerly direction to the two rivers.

The major aquifers of the Lower Gila basin are in recent stream alluvium and basin fill. The thickness of the Tertiary and Quaternary basin fill in the Yuma basin may exceed 16,000 ft in some areas, but only the upper 2,000 ft to 2,500 ft is considered hydrologically important because of its transmissive properties. This aquifer is divided into three zones, with the middle, coarse-gravel zone forming the principal water-producing unit. Depths to the coarse-gravel zone begin at about 100 ft in the Colorado and Gila River valleys (ADWR, 2009).

The Yuma basin is the driest region in Arizona, averaging 0 to 4 inches of precipitation per year (ADWR, 2009). Most of the precipitation that falls quickly evaporates in the arid environment, and there is little groundwater recharge from precipitation. The difference between precipitation in the area and potential evapotranspiration rates is estimated at -63 to 0 inches per year (Reilly et al., 2008).

Groundwater quality varies across the Yuma basin, with elevated concentrations of total dissolved solids (TDS), arsenic, lead, agricultural pesticides, nitrate, and VOCs in some areas. Historically, the chemical composition of groundwater was similar to that of water in the Colorado and Gila Rivers. Groundwater quality has been altered as a result of agricultural practices (ADWR, 2009).

YPG uses well water for its domestic and industrial operations, drawing from groundwater in two aquifers beneath YPG: a shallow unconfined aquifer in alluvial deposits, and a deep aquifer in consolidated volcanic rocks. The depth to groundwater ranges from 30 ft below ground surface (bgs) in Well X to 750 ft bgs in Well M (ADEQ, 2009). While many groundwater areas in the Desert Southwest have experienced long-term declines in groundwater elevation, groundwater depression has not been observed at YPG. This probably results from the lack of development on YPG (YPG, 2012b). Groundwater basin data indicate that groundwater return flow during years of low flow on the Colorado River remained steady at 79,000 acre-ft per year and did not indicate declines in groundwater elevations (Dickinson et al., 2006). Groundwater quality and consumptive use is discussed in Section 3.5.

3.20.2 Environmental Consequences

There are no wetlands or designated floodplains on YPG. No activities that would disturb water tanks are proposed. The analysis of potential impacts to water resources focuses on desert washes and groundwater. The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to water resources:

- Construction or other ground disturbance within or in proximity to washes
- Construction site preparation that would extend into the shallow groundwater table
- Deterioration of water quality through increased sedimentation as a result of construction or testing and training activities
- Deterioration of water quality from contaminants such as POLs reaching water courses
- Alteration of morphology of desert washes due to channelization
- Loss of streambed within a desert wash through placement of structures such as culverts
- Increased potential for turbidity as a result of sedimentation from construction site runoff
- Increased potential for sedimentation from testing or training activities in areas adjacent to desert washes
- Alteration of stream flow direction through placement of structures such as surface water crossings

- Alteration of stream flow velocity through channelization or placement of culverts and other types of stream crossings
- Groundwater subsidence from withdrawal by humans or growth of invasive plants
- Changes in groundwater quality as a result of proposed activities

Potential impacts to groundwater may result from contamination by hazardous materials or hazardous waste and are discussed in Section 3.9. Potential impacts from consumptive use also are addressed in Section 3.5. Contamination of water resources from hazardous materials, including POLs and explosives also would represent an impact to water resources; these impacts are discussed in Section 3.9.

3.20.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to water resources include:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would result in the introduction of pollutants that directly or cumulatively would not degrade water quality to below federal or state standards.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would result in loss of channel through placement of road crossings but would not otherwise alter streamflow characteristics.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would result in increased groundwater consumption but that would not deplete groundwater resources.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would alter patterns of or increase the intensity of flood water movement.
- Severe (significant) –Activities that would result in the introduction of pollutants that directly or cumulatively would degrade water quality to below federal or state standards.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would result in the introduction of pollutants that further contribute to impairment of a waterbody on the 303(d) List of Impaired Waters.
- Severe (significant) Groundwater is depleted to the degree that subsidence causes fissures to form.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would place fill within desert washes other than minimum necessary for a transportation crossing.
- Severe (significant) Activities resulting in the introduction of pollutants degrading water beyond what is allowed by CWA Section 404 permitting or NPDES permitting.

3.20.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, testing and training would continue at the current levels and utilize existing facilities and infrastructure with no new construction. Ongoing testing and training occur in specific areas within YPG (Figures 2-4 through 2-12). Tables B-1 through B-3 (Appendix B) identify the testing and training activities that would occur under the No Action Alternative, separated according to the three regions (Laguna, Cibola, and Kofa Regions). No test areas, munitions impact areas, or DZs would be expanded under the No

Action Alternative. No construction or demolition would occur under the No Action Alternative. Mission operations would result in minor impacts to water resources, as testing and training activities continue in currently authorized areas at currently authorized levels. Water resources impacts could result from on-road and off-road vehicle use, dismounted maneuvers, set-up for test operations, POL spills, chemical decomposition of military constituents from live-fire exercises, and activities that involve consumptive use of groundwater. Impacts of these activities have been previously evaluated under NEPA as follows in the assessments listed in Section 2.3.2.

The evaluations and analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed in Section 2.3.2 provide an assessment of the potential impacts to water resources that would result from the No Action Alternative, with testing and training continued at current levels and no new construction. The analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed above are incorporated into this DPEIS by reference.

Beneficial impacts resulting from a reduction in irrigation water used at Cox Field would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

3.20.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

Impacts to water resources that would occur under the No Action Alternative also would occur under the Proposed Action. This section discusses the potential for additional impacts to water resources as a result of implementing the Proposed Action.

There would be no further degradation of waters listed as impaired on the 303(d) List of Impaired Waters as a result of activities conducted under the Proposed Action.

Exotic invasive plant species grow more rapidly and produce greater biomass in a given time than native Sonoran Desert vegetation. To achieve these accelerated growth rates, exotic invasive plant species consume more water than native vegetation. The local shallow groundwater table could be depressed or depleted, depending on the degree to which exotic invasive plant species occur. At present, YPG implements a invasive species management program. A Draft Invasive Species Management Plan has been developed and is expected to be finalized in 2013. A program to establish exclusion, monitoring, and eradication of all invasive plants on YPG is in the early stages by the Environmental Sciences/Natural Resource Management Department as part of continued INRMP implementation (YPG, 2012b). Control of exotic invasive plant species would be beneficial to local groundwater resources.

There would be no change in personnel assigned to YPG, but the construction of a new WTP at CDH would result in a minor increase in consumptive use of groundwater on the installation as the use of bottled water would be reduced. The impacts of increased consumptive use of groundwater are discussed further in Section 3.5.

The Proposed Action would be compliant with Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA) and the *DoD Policy on Implementing Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA)* (Office of the Undersecretary of Defense, 2010). Under EISA, Section 438 (Title 42, U.S.C., Section 17094) requires that a federal facility with a footprint that exceeds 5,000 ft² use site planning, design, construction, and maintenance strategies for the property to "maintain or restore, to the maximum extent technically feasible, the predevelopment hydrology of the property with regard to the temperature, rate, volume, and duration of flow" (DoD, 2010).

These maintenance strategies may include green infrastructure and low-impact development (LID) practices such as reducing impervious surfaces and using appropriate vegetative practices, porous pavements, and cisterns. USEPA *Technical Guidance on Implementing the Stormwater Runoff Requirements for Federal Projects under Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act* (USEPA, 2009b) provides guidance on complying with EISA, through the use of LID techniques. EISA Section 438 requirements are separate from and independent of stormwater control requirements under the CWA and are not appropriate for inclusion in stormwater permits unless a State or the USEPA has promulgated regulations for EISA Section 438 requirements that are applicable to all regulated entities under its CWA authority (DoD, 2010). At this time, Arizona has not adopted such a policy. The DoD Unified Facilities Criteria on LID (UFC 3-210-10) mandate stormwater management to maintain hydrologic functions of a site and to mitigate potential adverse impacts of stormwater from buildings to alter downstream water resources.

The following sections discuss the potential impacts to water resources that may result in each of the three areas on YPG.

Laguna Region. Impacts to water resources and water quality that could occur under the Proposed Action as a result of construction or improvements of buildings and facilities, airfield runways and taxiways, roadways and ACPs, and utility infrastructure would be temporary and localized. Individual project designs would minimize the potential for negative impacts to the extent practicable. Expanded dismounted maneuver areas and new vehicle test courses are proposed for parts of the Laguna Region, and the subsequent use of these areas could impact soils. A new DZ is proposed for the Laguna Region. Appropriate site-specific BMPs would be implemented during and following construction to further reduce the potential for impacts. Most activities that would be implemented in the Laguna Region would have no potential for direct impacts to water resources, but there would be potential for indirect impacts to these resources.

No munitions testing occurs in the Laguna Region and no TGPs would be established in this region. No new off-road vehicle testing in the Laguna Region would occur under the Proposed Action. These activities would not affect water resources in the Laguna Region.

Direct impacts to water resources would result from the Aberdeen Road flood improvements, which would replace or improve the existing low water crossing (LWC) of Castle Dome Wash between US 95 and the Kofa cantonment. A portion of Castle Dome Wash would be disturbed during construction, with the possibility of both short- and longterm impacts. Short-term impacts would result if a temporary crossing is needed to maintain traffic flow during construction. Aberdeen Road is the main access route for the Kofa cantonment and KFR, and the road must remain passable during construction. Impacts from a temporary crossing would be localized and would end once construction was complete. Long-term impacts would result from construction of improvements to the LWC. It is likely that a small portion of the wash would be lost or converted to artificial substrate as a result of the improvements. Construction of the Aberdeen Road flood improvements would require a CWA Section 404 permit from USACE and a CWA Section 401 Water Quality certification from ADEQ. YPG would obtain these authorizations once the design is complete prior to construction. YPG and its construction contractor would be required to comply with all conditions of the CWA Section 404 permit and Section 401 Water Quality certification, including implementation of any mitigation that may be specified as a condition of the CWA Section 404 permit.

Proposed construction activities in the Laguna Region would result in clearing approximately 350 ac of desert habitat, with 125 ac being converted to new impervious area. Construction impacts could include erosion and sedimentation following vegetation and soil disturbance. The Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (AZPDES) program, administered by ADEQ, requires that stormwater be treated to the maximum extent practicable to minimize the potential for impacts to water resources. An AZPDES construction general stormwater permit for stormwater discharges from construction activities would be required for each individual and unrelated construction activity. Individual and unrelated construction activities that would disturb less than 5 ac, that would be more than 0.25 mile from an impaired or outstanding Arizona water, and that would have an erosivity value of less than 5 as calculated by the Smart Notice of Intent (NOI) System may qualify for waiver options (ADEQ, 2008; 2011b). If a project meets the waiver requirements, the contractor would be required to comply with the conditions of the AZPDES permit. Proposed activities that are interrelated and dependent would be considered as components of a common plan of development, and these interrelated construction activities would be grouped into one single AZPDES Construction General Permit, which would address all construction impacts of the interrelated construction activities, including specific component construction activities that would result in less than 1 ac of ground disturbance (ADEQ, 2008; 2011b).

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site, which is in the Laguna Region, would create new impervious surface area over much of the 322-ac site. Depending on post-construction stormwater controls that would be implemented with development of the facility, there could be increased stormwater runoff from a West Kofa Site that could contribute to cumulative impacts to surface water and groundwater resources. In addition, operation of the facility would result in consumptive use of water. The amount of operational water depends on the technology chosen during the separate NEPA analysis. However, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to groundwater from long-term consumptive use. The potential for cumulative impacts to water resources would be minor to moderate depending on the technology chosen (minor for a solar PV or Dish Stirling system and minor to moderate for a concentrating solar facility).

Standard construction BMPs would be coupled with the development and implementation of a Construction SWPPP, which is required by the AZPDES Construction General Permit, to stabilize disturbed soils and minimize the potential for indirect impacts to water resources. The construction contractor would be responsible for developing and implementing a project specific Construction SWPPP. Following the completion of construction, a site would be stabilized and BMPs implemented to minimize the potential for sediments and contaminants to enter nearby washes. BMPs that could be implemented include, but are not limited to, using infiltration or detention areas during construction to prevent scour from stormwater runoff, installing and maintaining silt fencing around disturbed soils, and mulching disturbed soils to reduce the impact energy of precipitation. Because appropriate BMPs would be implemented, the potential adverse impacts to water quality resulting from construction would be minor. There would be potential for increased runoff from the approximately 180 ac of new impervious area. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could result in increased erosion, which could increase the introduction of sediments and other pollutants to water resources. Appropriate post-construction stormwater controls would minimize the potential for adverse impacts to water resources. Because the decrease in the amount of pervious surface area would be relatively small compared to the size of the aquifer, the negative impact to groundwater recharge would be minor. The volume and rate of stormwater runoff from new impervious areas would likely increase. Post-construction stormwater BMPs, including detention/infiltration areas, would be compliant with Section 438 of EISA, as applicable, and would minimize the potential for impacts to surface hydrology or groundwater. Impacts would be permanent and moderate.

Utility lines would be installed at seven locations in the Laguna Region, with approximately 0.6 ac of land disturbed during installation. While the disturbed area would be stabilized to minimize the potential for erosion, there would be a minor potential for indirect sedimentation impacts to nearby washes. No direct impacts to water resources would be expected. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for new construction, would be implemented to minimize the potential for erosion. Any indirect impacts to water resources from installation of utility lines would be minor.

An increase in dismounted maneuver activity would occur near West LA and K-9 Village. The LTA at West LA would be expanded to connect with K-9 Village (approximately 6,520 ac). Battalion-level dismounted maneuvers simulating deployment in open desert to achieve an urban target in either the West LA or K-9 Village MOUT areas would be conducted. The LTA at Muggins/Middle Mountain would be expanded up to approximately 16,640 ac. Additional expanded dismounted maneuver areas would be established in the Laguna Region, which would cover approximately 1,970 ac. In addition, new vehicle test courses would be established within approximately 9,040 ac in the Laguna Region. Discernible trails would be established minimizing soil compaction and the potential for exposing soils outside the boundary of the vehicle test courses. However, when active vehicle testing is not ongoing the area may be used to perform blended testing or dismounted maneuver training at the vehicle test courses. Soil disturbance would occur during the establishment of the vehicle test course and soil disturbance could occur during the other activities, but most troop movement would be dispersed to avoid inadvertent creation of discernible trails, which would minimize soil compaction and rutting. This would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to water quality from increased erosion/sedimentation. Limited off-road vehicle operation may occur in conjunction with dismounted maneuver activities and initial troop deployment. Vehicles would not be operated in washes, except for direct crossings. Any direct impact from off-road vehicle operation would be localized and minor. Indirect impacts to water resources from dismounted maneuver training activities and associated off-road vehicle use would be expected to be negligible with continued implementation of the ITAM program.

Creation of a DZ would result in disturbances to approximately 45 ac in the Laguna Region. The DZ would not be entirely cleared of vegetation, but localized soil disturbance would occur during testing and training activities. Disturbances to vegetation would generally be caused by dropping of objects directly on the ground by parachute and from payload retrieval by vehicles. Due to the slow growth of desert vegetation impacts would be longterm. Indirect impacts to surface water resources could occur should excessive sediments be carried to washes. DZs would be established in level areas, so the potential for increased erosion is slight. Continued implementation of the INRMP and ITAM program would minimize the potential for increased erosion from DZs. Any impacts would be expected to be minor.

A new WWTP has been constructed in the Laguna Region. See Section 3.5 for a discussion of the new Laguna Region WWTP. This new Laguna Region WWTP provides minor indirect benefits to groundwater resources through more efficient treatment of wastewater.

Wildfire destroys desert vegetation and creates conditions favorable for accelerated erosion, which can lead to increased sedimentation in washes. Within the Laguna Region, wildfires are suppressed and do not substantially alter precipitation runoff rates or volumes. Because no change to the wildfire management program would occur under the Proposed Action, no indirect impacts to water resources would be expected as a result of wildfire in the Laguna Region. There is potential for increased colonization by exotic invasive plant species if disturbed areas are not managed, which could result in increased fuel loads and greater potential for severe wildfire. This is discussed further in Section 3.7.

There would be little potential for interaction of activities conducted in the Laguna Region under the Proposed Action with activities proposed in other areas of YPG with regard to water resources. Any incremental contribution to degradation or loss of water resources that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action in the Laguna Region would not be significant. Continued implementation of the INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for incremental interaction with other on-post projects.

The proposed Cox Field improvements would have a minor beneficial impact on water resources. Approximately 8 ac of irrigated turf grass would be replaced with xeriscaping, which would feature native desert vegetation. This would result in a slight reduction of consumptive water use in maintaining Cox Field.

Cibola Region. Most of the proposed building/facility construction for the Cibola Region is new construction rather than replacement of existing structures. Numerous airfields across the Cibola Region are proposed for runway expansion and additional supporting infrastructure. Munitions impact area expansion, new dismounted maneuver areas, and a new vehicle test course are proposed for parts of the Cibola Region, and the subsequent use of these areas could cause soil disturbance. Utility infrastructure extensions would occur throughout the Cibola Region. Twenty-three TGPs would be established in the Cibola Region and there would be soil disturbance associated with establishment of these sites.

Proposed construction activities would result in clearing of approximately 740 ac of desert habitat in the Cibola Region, with all vegetation removed from this acreage as a result. New construction, including paving for runways and airfield support pads, would convert approximately 130 ac of the Cibola Region to impervious surfaces, with soil disturbance occurring during vegetation removal from these areas. Construction impacts could include erosion and sedimentation following vegetation and soil disturbance. An AZPDES construction general stormwater permit for stormwater discharges from construction activities would be required for each individual and unrelated construction activity. Individual and unrelated construction activities that would disturb less than 5 ac, that would be more than 0.25 mile from an impaired or outstanding Arizona water, and that would have an erosivity value of less than 5 as calculated by the Smart NOI System may

qualify for waiver options (ADEQ, 2008; 2011b). If a project meets the waiver requirements, the contractor would be required to comply with the conditions of the AZPDES permit. Proposed activities that are interrelated and dependent would be considered as components of a common plan of development, and these interrelated construction activities would be grouped into one single AZPDES Construction General Permit, which would address all construction impacts of the interrelated construction activities, including specific component construction activities that would result in less than 1 ac of ground disturbance (ADEQ, 2008; 2011b).

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would create new impervious surface area over much of the 1,000-ac site. Depending on post-construction stormwater controls that would be implemented with development of the facility, there could be increased stormwater runoff from a Northeast Cibola Site that could contribute to cumulative impacts to surface water and groundwater resources. In addition, operation of the facility would result in consumptive use of water. The amount of operational water depends on the technology chosen during the separate NEPA analysis. However, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to groundwater from long-term consumptive use. The potential for cumulative impacts to water resources would be minor to moderate depending on the technology chosen (minor for a solar PV or Dish Stirling system and minor to moderate for a concentrating solar facility).

Standard construction BMPs would be coupled with the implementation of a Construction SWPPP to stabilize disturbed soils and minimize the potential for indirect impacts to water resources. Following the completion of construction, a site would be stabilized and BMPs implemented to minimize the potential for sediments and contaminants to enter nearby washes. BMPs that could be implemented include, but are not limited to, using infiltration or detention areas during construction to prevent scour from stormwater runoff, installing and maintaining silt fencing around disturbed soils, and mulching disturbed soils to reduce the impact energy of precipitation. Because appropriate BMPs would be implemented, the potential adverse impacts to water quality resulting from construction would be minor.

There would be potential for increased runoff from the approximately 130 ac of new impervious area. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could result in increased erosion, which could increase the introduction of sediments and other pollutants to water resources, including groundwater. Appropriate post-construction stormwater controls would minimize the potential for adverse impacts to water resources. Because the decrease in the amount of pervious surface area would be relatively small compared to the size of the aquifer, the negative impact to groundwater recharge would be minor. The volume and rate of stormwater runoff from new impervious areas would likely increase. Post-construction stormwater BMPs, including detention/infiltration areas, would be compliant with Section 438 of EISA, as applicable, and would minimize the potential for impacts to surface hydrology or groundwater. Impacts would be permanent and moderate.

Utility lines would be installed at 20 locations in the Cibola Region, with approximately 16 ac of land disturbed during installation. While the disturbed area would be stabilized to minimize the potential for erosion, there would be a minor potential for indirect sedimentation impacts to nearby washes. No direct impacts to water resources would be expected. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for new construction, would be implemented to

minimize the potential for erosion. Any indirect impacts to water resources from installation of utility lines would be minor.

Approximately 530 ac, included in the construction activities discussed above, in the Cibola Region, would be cleared for creation of UAS launch/recovery areas. These UAS launch/recovery areas would have the potential for increased stormwater runoff and sedimentation. Appropriate stormwater controls would minimize the potential for adverse impacts to water resources. Stormwater controls could include but are not limited to, pollution prevention, minimizing exposure, and maximizing infiltration.

Six new or expanded LTAs are proposed in Cibola totaling 66,399 ac (Table 3-23). Use of the areas for dismounted maneuvers during operational testing and training activities would have potential to impact and disturb soils, but most troop movement would be dispersed to avoid inadvertent creation of discernible trails, which would minimize soil compaction and

TABLE 3-23

Proposed LTAs in Cibola		
Yuma Proving Ground		
LTA	Acreage	
C041 Expand LTA at Middle Mountain	11,230 ac	
C060 Create LTA at TOW Town	29,010 ac	
C061 Create LTA at JERC I/Saderville	8,437 ac	
C062 Create LTA at JERC II	3,503 ac	
C063 Create LTA at JERC III	4,312 ac	
C064 Create LTA at Yuma Wash	9,907 ac	

rutting. This also would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to water quality from increased erosion/sedimentation. Limited off-road vehicle operation could occur in conjunction with dismounted maneuver activities and initial troop deployment. Vehicles would not be operated in washes, except for direct crossings. Any direct impact from off-road vehicle operation would be localized and minor. Indirect impacts to water resources from dismounted maneuver training activities and associated off-road vehicle use would be expected to be negligible with continued implementation of the ITAM program.

In addition, a new vehicle test course would be established within an area up to 4,644 ac in the Cibola Region. Discernible trails would be established minimizing soil compaction and the potential for exposing soils outside the boundary of the vehicle test course. However, when active vehicle testing is not ongoing the area may be used to perform blended testing or dismounted maneuver training at the vehicle test course.

There are multiple locations within the Cibola Region where new munitions impact areas would be established or where existing munitions impact areas would be expanded. Approximately 16,310 ac would be converted to munitions impact areas. Of this total, approximately 16,060 ac would receive both inert and explosive fire and approximately 250 ac at JERC I, II, and III would be for inert fire only. There would be no direct impacts to water resources from the creation of the munitions impact areas. Use of explosive fire in

munitions impact areas would create localized soil disturbances that would have the potential for soil erosion and subsequent sedimentation in washes. Inert fire impact areas would experience less soil disturbance, but there would be potential for long-term indirect impacts to surface water resources or shallow groundwater resources should the munitions degrade and release MCOCs to the soil.

Expansion or creation of DZs would result in disturbances to approximately 978 ac in the Cibola Region. DZs would not be entirely cleared of vegetation, but disturbances would occur during testing and training activities. Disturbances to vegetation would generally be caused by dropping of objects directly onto the ground by parachute and from payload retrieval by vehicles, which could increase erosion potential in these areas. Due to the slow growth of desert vegetation, impacts would be long-term. Indirect impacts to surface water resources could occur should excessive sediments be carried to washes. DZs would be established in level areas, so the potential for increased erosion is slight. Continued implementation of the INRMP and ITAM program would minimize the potential for increased erosion from DZs. Any impacts would be expected to be minor.

TGPs would be established at 23 locations in the Cibola Region. TGPs would not be located within washes, so no direct impacts to water resources would result. Each TGP would cover an area of up to 2.2 ac, which would be cleared of vegetation that could interfere with proposed testing and observations. Minor soil disturbance could occur and there would be increased potential for erosion. The potential for indirect impacts to water resources would vary depending on testing needs and the type of vegetation at a proposed TGP. Impacts could range from minor (limited exposed soils from vegetation clearing and not in proximity to a wash) to moderate (extensive soil exposure and in proximity to a wash). Up to 50.6 ac of vegetation would be cleared for TGPs within the Cibola Region, which would create the potential for minor cumulative impacts to surface waters on YPG, but no regional cumulative impacts to surface waters beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected.

The CDH WTP would result in an increase in groundwater consumption, but any subsidence associated with the increased withdrawal of water to supply the CDH WTP would be minor to moderate and no surface fissures would result.

There would be little potential for interaction of activities conducted in the Cibola Region under the Proposed Action with activities proposed in other areas of YPG with regard to water resources. Any incremental contribution to degradation or loss of water resources that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action in the Cibola Region would not be significant. Continued implementation of the INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for incremental interaction with other on-post projects.

Kofa Region. New building/facility construction in the Kofa Region is primarily limited to new or replacement structures at fixed GPs, where previous clearing and grading have already disturbed soils, and at new training complexes. Utility infrastructure would be extended to six locations and would impact soils. TGPs could be established at multiple locations in the Kofa Region and there would be soil disturbance associated with establishment of these sites.

Approximately 240 ac of soils would be disturbed to accommodate new construction and utility infrastructure. Construction impacts could include erosion and sedimentation following vegetation and soil disturbance. An AZPDES construction general stormwater

permit for stormwater discharges from construction activities would be required for each individual and unrelated construction activity. Individual and unrelated construction activities that would disturb less than 5 ac, that would be more than 0.25 mile from an impaired or outstanding Arizona water, and that would have an erosivity value of less than 5 as calculated by the Smart NOI System may qualify for waiver options (ADEQ, 2008; 2011b). If a project meets the waiver requirements, the contractor would be required to comply with the conditions of the AZPDES permit. Proposed activities that are interrelated and dependent would be considered as components of a common plan of development, and these interrelated construction activities would be grouped into one single AZPDES Construction General Permit, which would address all construction impacts of the interrelated construction activities, including specific component construction activities that would result in less than 1 ac of ground disturbance (ADEQ, 2008; 2011b).

Standard construction BMPs would be coupled with the implementation of a Construction SWPPP to stabilize disturbed soils and minimize the potential for indirect impacts to water resources. Following the completion of construction, a site would be stabilized and BMPs implemented to minimize the potential for sediments and contaminants to enter nearby washes. BMPs that could be implemented include, but are not limited to, using infiltration or detention areas during construction to prevent scour from stormwater runoff, installing and maintaining silt fencing around disturbed soils, and mulching disturbed soils to reduce the impact energy of precipitation. Because appropriate BMPs would be implemented, the potential adverse impacts to water quality resulting from construction would be minor.

New construction, including paving, creation of a UAS launch/recovery area near SWTR, East Kofa Operations Center, and the training complex in the northern part of East Arm, would convert approximately 54 ac of the Kofa Region to impervious surfaces. There would be potential for increased runoff from the approximately 54 ac of new impervious area. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could result in increased erosion, which could increase the introduction of sediments and other pollutants to water resources, including groundwater. Appropriate post-construction stormwater controls would minimize the potential for adverse impacts to water resources. Because the decrease in the anount of pervious surface area would be relatively small compared to the size of the aquifer, the negative impact to groundwater recharge would be minor. The volume and rate of stormwater runoff from new impervious areas would likely increase. Post-construction stormwater BMPs, including detention/infiltration areas, would be compliant with Section 438 of EISA, as applicable, and would minimize the potential for impacts to surface hydrology or groundwater. Impacts would be permanent and moderate.

Utility lines would be installed at nine locations in the Kofa Region, with approximately 2.7 ac of land disturbed during installation. While the disturbed area would be stabilized to minimize the potential for erosion, there would be a minor potential for indirect sedimentation impacts to nearby washes. The construction East Kofa Operations Center would include a new water well for use and this is the only direct impact to water resources expected. No other direct impacts to water resources would be expected. Appropriate BMPs, as discussed for new construction, would be implemented to minimize the potential for erosion. Any indirect impacts to water resources from installation of utility lines would be minor.

Approximately 156 ac in the Kofa Region would be cleared for creation of a UAS launch/recovery area near SWTR. Vegetation clearing would expose soils and could create conditions favorable for increased runoff and erosion, which can lead to increased sedimentation in washes. Appropriate stormwater controls would minimize the potential for adverse impacts to water resources. Stormwater controls could include, but are not limited to, pollution prevention, minimizing exposure of disturbed soils, and enhancing infiltration.

New dismounted maneuver areas would be established in the Kofa Region, which would cover approximately 53,180 ac. No direct impacts to vegetation would result from this activity. Subsequent use of the area for dismounted maneuver during operational testing and training activities would have potential to impact vegetation from trampling by Soldiers. Most troop movement would be dispersed to avoid inadvertent creation of discernible trails and would avoid woody desert plants. This would minimize soil compaction and potential for damage to vegetation and subsequent soil exposure. Limited off-road vehicle operation may occur in conjunction with dismounted maneuver activities and initial troop deployment. Any impacts from off-road vehicle operation would be localized and minor. Impacts to vegetation from dismounted maneuver training activities would be expected to be negligible with continued implementation of the ITAM program.

There are multiple locations within the Kofa Region where new munitions impact areas would be established or where existing munitions impact areas would be expanded. All of the proposed new and expanded munitions impact areas (29,757 ac) in the Kofa Region would be used for inert and explosive fire. There would be no direct impacts to water resources from the creation of the munitions impact areas. Use of explosive fire in munitions impact areas would have the potential for soil erosion and subsequent sedimentation in washes. Inert fire impact areas would experience less soil disturbance, but there would be potential for long-term indirect impacts to surface water resources or shallow groundwater resources should the munitions degrade and release MCOCs to the soil.

Expansion or creation of DZs would result in disturbances to approximately 305 ac in the Kofa Region. DZs would not be entirely cleared of vegetation, but disturbances would occur during testing and training activities. Disturbances to vegetation would generally be caused by dropping of objects directly onto the ground by parachute and from payload retrieval by vehicles, which could increase erosion potential in these areas. Due to the slow growth of desert vegetation, impacts would be long-term. Indirect impacts to surface water resources could occur should excessive sediments be carried to washes. DZs are established in level areas, so the potential for increased erosion is slight. Continued implementation of the INRMP and ITAM program would minimize the potential for increased erosion from DZs. Any impacts would be expected to be minor.

TGPs would be established at up to 12 locations in the Kofa Region annually, depending on mission needs. The locations of TGPs are not known, but they would be within existing munitions impact areas, near roads, and not within washes. No direct impacts to water resources would result from establishment of TGPs in the Kofa Region. Each TGP would cover an area of up to 2.2 ac, which would be cleared of vegetation that could interfere with proposed testing and observations. Minor soil disturbance could occur and there would be increased potential for erosion. The potential for indirect impacts to water resources would

vary depending on testing needs and the type of vegetation at a proposed TGP. Impacts could range from minor (limited exposed soils from vegetation clearing and not in proximity to a wash) to moderate (extensive soil exposure and in proximity to a wash). Up to 26.4 ac of vegetation would be cleared annually for TGPs within the Kofa Region, which would create the potential for minor cumulative impacts to surface waters on YPG, but no regional cumulative impacts to surface waters beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected.

There would be little potential for interaction of activities conducted in the Kofa Region under the Proposed Action with activities proposed in other areas of YPG with regard to water resources. Any incremental contribution to degradation or loss of water resources that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action in the Kofa Region would not be significant. Continued implementation of the INRMP and the ITAM program would reduce the potential for incremental interaction with other on-post projects.

Cumulative Impacts Summary. Because potential direct effects to water resources would be confined within the boundaries of YPG and because BMPs and design features would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to offsite waters, there is little potential for interaction of the Proposed Action with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. As discussed above, no cumulative impacts would be expected on YPG.

Incremental impacts to water quality and groundwater depletion would be the potential routes of interaction with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable off-post actions. Because activities under the Proposed Action would not affect water quality, no cumulative impacts to water quality would be expected as a result of implementation of the Proposed Action. Consumptive use of groundwater would occur under the Proposed Action, but the anticipated use would be small relative to the aquifer capacity. It is expected that minor cumulative impacts to groundwater would result in conjunction with other actions that also consumptively use groundwater.

YPG has begun investigating the possibility of developing a solar renewable energy resource on the installation to increase YPG's energy security and meet federal mandates and legislative requirements to increase production and consumption of renewable energy resources. This development would be through an EUL with a private company. Solar technologies under consideration by the Army include solar PV, Dish Stirling, and dry-cooled concentrating solar thermal technologies. Two proposed locations have been identified: a Northeast Cibola Site and a West Kofa Site. There would be only minor consumptive use during construction of any of the technologies that would not contribute to cumulative impacts to water resources. Solar PV and Dish Stirling convert sunlight directly into electricity using PV panels and the only operational water demands would be approximately 20 gallons per megawatt-hour (MW-h) of electricity generated to wash solar PV panels to maintain optimum operating efficiency (Tribal Energy and Environmental Information Clearinghouse, 2012; U.S. Department of Energy, undated).

Solar thermal plants produce electric power by concentrating solar energy using a mirror or lens configuration to generate electricity with steam turbines. Dry-cooled solar thermal plants use up to 80 gallons of water per MW-h generated for mirror washing and operations (U.S. Department of Energy, undated). The water consumption of a Dish Stirling system is comparable to that of a solar PV system (U.S. Department of Energy, undated).

Operation of the solar facility would result in consumptive use of water. The amount of operational water depends on the technology chosen during the separate NEPA analysis. However, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to groundwater from long-term consumptive use. The Northeast Cibola Site would support a 200-MW facility that would require approximately three times the water of a 60-MW facility at the West Kofa Site. The potential for cumulative impacts to water resources would be minor to moderate depending on the technology chosen (minor for a solar PV or Dish Stirling system and minor to moderate for a concentrating solar facility). The potential for cumulative impacts to water resources would be minor to moderate for a solar PV or Dish Stirling system and minor for a solar PV or Dish Stirling system (minor for a solar PV or Dish Stirling system (minor for a solar PV or Dish Stirling system (minor for a solar PV or Dish Stirling solar facility).

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. The project would require over 1,150 acre-feet of water for construction and would require 200 acre-feet of water annually for operation of the dry-cooled facility. Water for the Quartzite facility would be obtained from the regional aquifers or from the Colorado River. If groundwater is the source, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to groundwater from long-term consumptive use. If water is obtained from the Colorado River, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to surface water from long-term consumptive use. The potential for cumulative impacts to water resources would be minor for a dry-cooled system.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to water resources. These proposed projects would be expected to result in increased demand for water for construction, cleaning, and operation, which could cause cumulative impacts on regional water resources from incremental increased consumption.

3.20.2.4 Mitigation

There would be potential for localized increased runoff from new impervious areas. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could affect downstream areas, including off-post lands by creating scour that could remove soils from uplands along washes. Stormwater controls would be implemented to facilitate infiltration and reduce the potential for scour. These controls could include, but would not be limited to:

- Use of temporary detention areas with controlled outflow to contain stormwater during construction
- Preservation of existing vegetation –intercepts and retains precipitation and reduces the potential for increased runoff
- Mulching intercepts and retains precipitation and reduces the potential for increased runoff
- Site design to direct stormwater runoff away from washes and into natural areas where infiltration can occur
- Incorporation of constructed detention/infiltration areas into site designs
- Incorporation of designs to capture stormwater for subsequent use
- Use of pervious surfaces to the extent practicable

• Use of semi-pervious surfaces where appropriate

Facilities would be designed to be compliant with Section 438 of EISA, as applicable, to minimize potential impacts from stormwater runoff. YPG would obtain a CWA Section 404 permit from USACE and a CWA Section 401 Water Quality certification from ADEQ prior to construction of the Aberdeen Road flood improvements. YPG and its construction contractor would be required to comply with all conditions of the CWA Section 404 permit and Section 401 Water Quality certification, including implementation of any mitigation that may be specified as a condition of the CWA Section 404 permit.

The INRMP directs YPG to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, including CWA Section 404 permits, CWA Section 401 water quality certifications, and ADWR Water Rights. As appropriate, the INRMP would be revised to address new activities during subsequent scheduled interagency review.

3.21 Wildlife and Fisheries

3.21.1 Existing Conditions

Wildlife on YPG is typical of the Colorado Desert subregion. Common wildlife species usually have physical and behavioral adaptations to survive the extreme hot and dry conditions that may include light coloration, body armoring, and increased surface area of heat dissipating body parts. Many species also demonstrate nocturnal behavior to avoid the hot daytime temperatures. Mammal, reptile, and bird species are well-represented, while fish and amphibians are limited to perennial waterbodies such as the Colorado and Gila Rivers. The following sections discuss each of these groups within the region and on YPG.

3.21.1.1 Mammals

YPG supports a variety of large and small mammal species. Common large mammals include the desert bighorn sheep, mule deer, coyote, kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis*), gray fox, badger (*Taxidea taxus*), bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), ringtail (*Bassariscus astutus*), and occasional mountain lion. Wild burros and horses also occur on the installation and are managed under the Cibola-Trigo Herd Management Area Plan. Desert bighorn sheep populations are monitored and managed on YPG. See Section 3.16 for a discussion of the protection and management practices established for TES species that occur on YPG (YPG, 2012b).

Common small mammals known to occur on YPG include the rock pocket mouse (*Chaetodipus intermedius*), Merriam's kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami*), black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus*), desert cottontail, woodrats (*Neotoma* spp.), Harris' antelope squirrel (*Ammospermophilus harrisii*), round-tailed ground squirrel (*Spermophilus tereticaudus*), California leaf-nosed bat (*Macrotus californicus*), California myotis (*Myotis californicus*), and western pipistrel (*Pipistrellus hesperus*) (YPG, 2012b).

Mesquite bosques provide excellent habitat for mammal species. The most common species observed utilizing the bosques on YPG include mule deer, desert cottontail rabbits, black-tailed jackrabbits, and coyotes. Remote camera surveys determined that larger bosques (10 ac or more in size) received greater wildlife use than small bosques (AGFD, 2011e).

3.21.1.2 Reptiles and Amphibians

Surveys for reptiles and amphibians were conducted for East Arm and the Cibola Region in 1986 and identified 30 reptile and 3 amphibian species occurring on the installation. The most commonly occurring reptile species included the desert horned lizard (*Phrynosoma platyrhinos*), western whiptail (*Cnemidophorus tigris*), side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*), sidewinder snake (*Crotalus cerastes*), western diamondback rattlesnake (*Crotalus atrox*), coachwhip (*Masticophis flagellum*), and western shovel-nosed snake (*Chionactis occipitalis*). The red-spotted toad (*Anaxyrus punctatus*), Couch's spadefoot (*Scaphiopus couchii*), and Sonoran desert toad (*Incilius alvarius*) are the three amphibian species known to occur on YPG (YPG, 2012b).

3.21.1.3 Birds

Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

The MBTA of 1918 established Federal responsibilities to protect birds migrating between the United States and Canada. Subsequent treaties with Mexico (1936), Japan (1972), and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (1976) expanded the scope of international protection of migratory birds. Each subsequent treaty was incorporated into the MBTA as an amendment. The provisions of the MBTA are implemented domestically within the signatory countries. Under the MBTA, nearly all species of birds occurring in the United States, their eggs, and their nests are protected. There are 836 bird species protected by the MBTA in the United States, 58 of which are legally hunted as game birds. The MBTA makes it illegal to take (to hunt, pursue, wound, kill, possess, or transport by any means) listed bird species, their eggs, feathers, or nests unless otherwise authorized, such as within legal hunting seasons (USFWS, 2011d). The *National Defense Authorization Act of 2003* authorizes the Armed Forces to take migratory birds incidental to military readiness activities, subject to certain limitations.

The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940, as amended, makes it illegal to take, transport, or possess bald and golden eagles or to engage in commerce in these species with limited allowed exceptions (USFWS, 2011e).

Avifauna. YPG supports an abundant and diverse avifauna typical of the Colorado Desert subregion. All native species occurring on YPG are protected under the MBTA. Common resident birds include the Gambel's quail (*Callipepla gambelii*), verdin (*Auriparus flaviceps*), cactus wren (*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus*), black-throated sparrow (*Amphispiza bilineata*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), black-tailed gnatcatcher (*Polioptila melanura*), American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), and red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*) (YPG, 2012b).

The white-winged dove and mourning dove are seasonally abundant on YPG, and many other species migrate through the area as part of the general Pacific Flyway. Surveys conducted in North Cibola Region and East Arm indicated that certain bird species were locally abundant in specific habitats. The rock wren (*Salpinctes obsoletus*) and canyon wren (*Catherpes mexicanus*) were found to be common in high elevation montane habitats dominated by paloverdes and mixed cacti plant communities and two other species, the Costa's hummingbird (*Calypte costae*) and phainopepla (*Phainopepla nitens*), also were seasonally abundant in montane habitats. The sage sparrow (*Amphispiza belli*), LeConte's thrasher (*Toxostoma lecontei*), and horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris*) were identified as typical

residents of the sparsely vegetated lower bajadas dominated by creosote bush and bursage or big galleta plant communities (YPG, 2012b).

In the Colorado Desert, the greatest bird use occurs along washes due to greater availability of water and increased habitat diversity (Phillips and Comus, 2000). On YPG, the large washes with bosques of foothills paloverde and smoketree plant associations support the highest densities and richest diversity of desert bird species. Desert washes make up 5 percent of the habitat on YPG, but account for 90 percent of desert birdlife. Common residents of these washes include the lesser goldfinch (*Carduelis psaltria*), common yellowthroat (*Geothlypis trichas*), and red-winged blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*). The Lucy's warbler (*Vermivora luciae*) and yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia*) are seasonal migrants species also commonly observed in these habitats (YPG, 2012b).

Wintering golden eagles are likely to be uncommon or incidental on the YPG and nesting by this species on the installation has not been documented (YPG, 2012b). Nesting by golden eagles has been reported on the Kofa NWR.

3.21.1.4 Fisheries

Of the approximately 36 fish species historically native to Arizona, 21 are federally protected and 1 is extinct. Some native fish species of the Colorado River basin include the roundtail chub (*Gila robusta*), humpback chub (*Gila cypha*), bonytail (*Gila elegans*), Colorado squawfish (*Ptychocheilus lucius*), razorback sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*), speckled dace (*Rhinichthys osculus*), and striped mullet (*Mugil cephalus*) (Colorado Plateau-Land Use History Northern Arizona [CP-LUHNA], 1998). The desert sucker (*Catostomus clarkii*), Gila longfin dace (*Agosia chryogaster chryogaster*), machete (*Elops affinis*), Sonora sucker (*Catostomus insignis*), speckled dace, and striped mullet are native fishes to the Gila River basin (USBR, 2009).

Natural and man-made water tanks are present on the installation but do not support native fisheries. Naturally occurring waters on YPG are ephemeral and do not provide adequate and sustainable fisheries habitat (YPG, 2012b).

YPG is east of the Colorado River and north of the Gila River. These rivers have been impacted by dam construction and withdrawal of water for irrigation and other human uses, and the native fish populations have been greatly altered (Phillips and Comer, 2000). Both rivers support game fish populations of flathead catfish (*Pylodictis olivaris*), channel catfish (*Ictalurus punctatus*), largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*), smallmouth bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*), striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), bluegill (*Lepomis macrochirus*), redear sunfish (*Lepomis microlophus*), tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus niloticus*), striped mullet (*Mugil cephalus*), common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), black crappie (*Pomoxis nigromaculatus*), and rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) (Yuma Sun, 2008).

3.21.2 Environmental Consequences

The following were evaluated to determine potential impacts to wildlife and fisheries:

- Permanent loss of habitat due to construction or clearing
- Temporary loss of habitat due to testing and training activities
- Disruption of wildlife behavior due to construction or training and testing activities

- Reduction in reproduction and survival rates of wildlife species due to construction or testing and training activities
- Unauthorized take of an MBTA species, including bald and golden eagles, during construction or testing and training activities
- Loss of habitat as a result of sedimentation or migration of toxic substances into off-post waters

3.21.2.1 Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for the analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to wildlife and fisheries include:

- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would cause changes in behavior that result in long-term or permanent changes of habitat use.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would cause changes in behavior that do not result in a level of physiological stress that substantially affects productivity or survival.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would cause changes in behavior that result in temporary displacement of populations or temporary changes in habitat use that do not lead to a substantial decrease in productivity or survival.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would affect a fish population but do not cause population-level impacts within local waterways.
- Minor to Moderate (less than significant) Activities that would result in changes to habitat for birds protected under the MBTA but do not cause population-level effects.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would cause increases in species mortality rates that jeopardize sustainable regional populations or adversely affect established state wildlife management levels for populations.
- Severe (significant) -Activities that would violate the MBTA or Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act or otherwise cause discernible population-level impacts at the installation or regional level.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would lead to population-level impacts to any fish species within local waterways.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would cause changes in behavior that result in long-term or permanent changes of habitat use.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would cause changes in behavior that result in physiological stress that substantially affects productivity or survival of a wildlife or fisheries population.
- Severe (significant) Activities that would cause changes in habitat use that result in permanent displacement of populations from current range or shifts in habitat use that result in substantially decreased productivity or survival.

3.21.2.2 Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, conditions on YPG would not change and testing and training activities would continue at current levels. Ongoing testing and training would occur in specific areas within YPG (Figures 2-4 through 2-12). Tables identifying the testing and training activities that would occur under the No Action Alternative are provided in Appendix B (Tables B-1 through B-3), separated according to the three regions (Laguna, Cibola, and Kofa Regions). No test areas, munitions impact areas, or DZs would be expanded under the No Action Alternative. No construction or demolition would occur under the No Action Alternative. Mission operations would result in minor impacts to wildlife, as testing and training activities continue in authorized areas at authorized levels. Wildlife impacts could result from on-road and off-road vehicle use, illegal hunting, dismounted maneuvers, and test operations (including set-up for these operations). Impacts of these activities have been previously evaluated under NEPA in the assessments listed in Section 2.3.2.

The evaluations and analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed in Section 2.3.2 provide an assessment of the potential impacts to wildlife that would result from the No Action Alternative. The analyses presented in the NEPA documents listed above are incorporated into this DPEIS by reference.

Under the No Action Alternative, YPG would continue to coordinate with AGFD to rehabilitate injured animals where recovery is practicable. YPG would continue to maintain movement corridors and migratory pathways to allow seasonal movements of animals. YPG would coordinate law enforcement efforts with AGFD and USFWS to address illegal hunting and habitat degradation associated with unauthorized recreation and illegal hunting. YPG would patrol remote areas and maintain boundary and access signs to deter illegal and unauthorized activities that could adversely affect wildlife.

Wildlife could be startled by noise created by testing or training on YPG and the No Action Alternative, but have not been observed to alter long-term behavior or to exhibit reduced survival as a result of noise from YPG. Testing and training activities have been occurring on YPG since the 1950s and wildlife have become acclimated to this type of noise disturbance. Disturbance to wildlife from noise created by testing and training on YPG would recur through time, but individual events would be minor and temporary.

Ongoing testing and training activities do not seem to have adversely affected populations of game species. Desert bighorn sheep populations have been stable in the past 10 years and the current population is larger than in the 1980s (YPG, 2012b). Mule deer on YPG increased by approximately 1,000 animals, from 1,256 to 2,254, between 1991 and 2007. No impacts to game species would be expected under the No Action Alternative.

The NRC-licensed DU impact area has a DU Catchment Structure, and spent DU rounds are regularly collected by Ammunition Recovery personnel and stored by YPG Radiation Protection until packaged and transported to a licensed disposal facility by the Army's Radioactive Waste Authority. There is an evaporative lagoon that collects runoff from the DU Catchment Structure and is sized to accommodate a 100-year storm event to minimize the potential for stormwater transport of DU off-post or to other areas on-post. Studies have shown (Obregon, 2013c, personal communication) that DU is contained within the DU licensed area and does not migrate. Therefore, DU would not directly affect any wildlife species. Previous investigations indicate that impacts likely would be limited to small

herbivores that are less mobile and have limited foraging ranges rather than large mammals, such as mule deer and desert bighorn sheep (Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation, 2001).

3.21.2.3 Impacts of the Proposed Action

Impacts to wildlife that would occur under the No Action Alternative also would occur under the Proposed Action. In addition, there would be direct and indirect impacts from construction and increased testing and training activities. Direct impacts to wildlife would result from displacement or incidental mortality. Indirect impacts to wildlife could result from disturbance that results in nest/den abandonment, loss of habitat, or disruption of migratory pathways. The majority of wildlife habitat on YPG would remain intact and would be able to sustain wildlife populations. Additional indirect impacts could result from introduction or spread of exotic invasive plant species that would result in habitat degradation. Disruption of normal activity patterns and loss of habitat would be the primary impacts to wildlife. Limited incidental mortality would likely occur, but would be less than significant at the population level. YPG would continue to maintain movement corridors and migratory pathways for wildlife. This section addresses potential impacts to common wildlife on YPG; potential impacts to TES species are addressed in Section 3.16.

Wildlife on YPG tends to be most abundant near sources of water. Artificial water tanks have been placed to encourage wildlife to relocate away from areas where testing and training activities regularly occur. Proposed activities would not be conducted in proximity to artificial water sources, which would reduce the potential for impacts to wildlife.

Exotic invasive plant species can become established in areas where soils are disturbed, such as construction sites and areas used for testing and training. Exotic invasive plant species displace native vegetation and offer less habitat value than native plants. Encroachment by exotic invasive plants can eliminate food resources and structural habitat used by native wildlife. Native wildlife species are not adapted to these non-native plants and may not be capable of using them for food or habitat. Exotic invasive plant species consume more water than native vegetation and can reduce available surface or shallow groundwater. The reduction in available water can lead to water stress in wildlife and ultimately to mortality and reduction of population viability. Because exotic invasive plants can affect wildlife through alteration of habitat, increased wildfire, and loss of available water, it is desirable to control these species on YPG. A program to establish exclusion, monitoring, and eradication of exotic invasive plants on YPG is being developed as part of the ongoing INRMP implementation (YPG, 2012b). Control of exotic invasive plant species would be beneficial to wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Wildfire could impact wildlife species on YPG through direct mortality, disruption of reproduction, or loss of habitat. Exotic invasive plant species have the greatest potential to affect wildfire size and intensity through creation of extensive stands with high fuel loads (see Sections 3.7 and 3.18). Areas where native vegetation is cleared or where soils are disturbed are more susceptible to colonization by exotic invasive plant species. Because desert vegetation recovers slowly, wildfire impacts to wildlife habitat are long-term. Depending on size and intensity, impacts from a particular wildfire could range from minor to severe. Measures that would be implemented to minimize the potential for colonization and growth of exotic invasive plant species are discussed in Sections 3.7 and 3.18. Implementation of these measures would minimize the potential for severe impacts to

wildlife from wildfire. Control of exotic invasive plant species would reduce wildfire risk to wildlife.

Noise and the physical activity associated with the presence of humans during construction and during testing and training events can cause wildlife to relocate. Animals, such as birds and mammals, may abandon nests or dens in the immediate area of human activities, including abandonment of young. These types of impacts can be minimized during construction by conducting work outside of the reproductive period, but avoidance of this type would not be practicable for testing and training activities. The nearly constant level of testing and training conducted on YPG makes it unlikely that animals would nest or den in proximity to areas used for these purposes unless those animals were already acclimated to increased human activity. Because most construction would occur in areas where high levels of human activity already occur and because testing and training are ongoing at or near most locations where increases are proposed, it is expected that the potential for nest/den abandonment would be minor. Where feasible, activities would be scheduled to minimize potential conflict with animal reproduction and rearing of young.

Incidental mortality of wildlife and avian species could occur during construction or during testing and training activities. Because the activity level would increase under the Proposed Action, it is likely that additional incidental mortality would occur compared to the No Action Alternative. No species would be expected to become locally extinct as a result of increased incidental mortality caused by the Proposed Action. Where practicable, wildlife would be relocated from proposed activity areas in accordance with procedures established in the INRMP. Any impacts from incidental mortality associated with construction would be minor and short-term. Incidental mortality from testing and training activities would be minor and long-term.

Development of new facilities or infrastructure can increase predation. As electrical transmission lines, communication towers, or other structures are constructed, avian predators may utilize these areas as hunting perches. A common characteristic of roads in a desert environment is that water shedding from the road surface frequently causes a higher abundance of vegetation along roadsides, which can draw wildlife near roads where they may be hit by vehicles. This roadkill can attract predators such as ravens and coyotes, which further prey upon smaller mammals and reptiles.

Managed game species could be impacted by testing and training activities under the Proposed Action. Construction under the Proposed Action would not occur in areas where game management is conducted and would not be expected to impact game species. Potential impacts would be the same as described for general wildlife. Impacts to game species could affect recreational hunting. The potential for the Proposed Action to impact recreational hunting is discussed in Section 3.12. New and expanded testing and training areas would largely be placed outside of preferred habitats of the desert bighorn sheep. Impacts to this species would be expected to be minor and short-term. Mule deer would be expected to experience similar short-term impacts. Both species would be expected to acclimate to the increased testing and training levels with time.

Most impacts to wildlife from the Proposed Action would be indirect impacts from loss of habitat. As directed by the INRMP, YPG would monitor habitat and wildlife and would use adaptive management to maintain biological resources to the maximum extent practicable. The potential for impacts wildlife is discussed by region in the following sections.

Laguna Region. Most proposed construction would occur in the Laguna Region. Because of extensive previous development and high levels of human activity in the Laguna Region, the potential for construction to impact wildlife is less than in other regions of YPG, where less development and activity occur. Construction could displace wildlife from suitable habitat that is within or adjacent to the construction footprint. Displacement could be short-term, where habitat would not be lost, or permanent if the habitat area would be destroyed by construction. Because there is suitable habitat for relocation both on YPG and in the area surrounding the Laguna Region, impacts from displacement in the Laguna Region would be expected to be minor.

In the Laguna Region approximately 350 ac of desert scrub habitat would be removed and, of that total, 125 ac would be converted to impervious surfaces, as discussed in Section 3.18. Approximately 160 ac of the cleared area would be used for a UAS launch/recovery area and the remainder would be mainly associated with range road improvements. Creation of a new DZ would result in the disturbance of approximately 45 ac. Installation of utility lines would remove approximately 0.6 ac of desert scrub habitat. Because of the level of development and human activity in the Laguna Region, loss of habitat would have less impact on wildlife than in other parts of YPG.

Expansion of dismounted maneuver areas and new vehicle test courses would impact respectively approximately 8,490 ac and 9,040 ac, most of which would not be cleared of vegetation, unless required to meet specific testing requirements. Because vegetation would not be removed and because these areas are in proximity to locations that currently receive high human activity, impacts to wildlife would be expected to be minor.

Continued implementation of the INRMP to manage habitat on YPG would minimize the potential for impacts to wildlife from loss of habitat. Wildlife impacts in the Laguna Region would be long-term and minor.

Development of a renewable solar electric generation facility at a West Kofa Site, which is in the Laguna Region, would result in removal of up to 322 ac of desert scrub habitat. There likely would be minor incremental cumulative impacts to wildlife species that utilize this habitat when this loss is combined with other projects on YPG that would remove desert scrub habitat.

Cibola Region. In the Cibola Region, approximately 740 ac of desert scrub vegetation would be removed and, of that total, 130 ac would be converted to impervious surfaces, as discussed in Section 3.18. Approximately 530 ac of the cleared are would be used as a UAS launch/recovery area and the remainder would be associated with TGPs and the forward staging area. Creation and expansion of DZs would result in disturbances to approximately 978 ac of desert scrub vegetation. Installation of utility lines would disturb approximately 16 ac cleared for installation of utilities. Because of the small area that would be cleared relative to the size of the Cibola Region, impacts to wildlife would be minor to moderate.

Expansion of munitions impact areas would impact approximately 16,310 ac, most of which would not be cleared of vegetation, unless required to meet specific testing requirements. Because vegetation would not be removed and because these areas are in proximity to locations that currently receive munitions impacts and high human activity, impacts to wildlife would be expected to be minor.

YPG would establish 23 new TGPs that would include clearing of up to 50.6 ac of desert scrub habitat in the Cibola Region. Clearing would be spread across the Cibola Region and would be spread in time, but the slow recovery of desert vegetation would result in habitat impacts being long-term. Because individual TGPs would be relatively small and would be dispersed across the landscape, wildlife impacts from TGPs would be expected to be minor and long-term.

Expansion of dismounted maneuver areas would cover approximately 66,400 ac. No direct impacts to habitat would result from creation of this maneuver area. Dismounted maneuvers typically would result in diffuse movement through the area, which would have negligible impacts on habitat. Dismounted maneuver activities could displace wildlife from the areas during operational testing and training activities. Because testing and training activities could occur throughout the year, displacement could range from temporary to permanent.

Establishment of a new vehicle test course would cover an area up to 4,644 ac. Minor direct impacts to habitat would result from creation of discernible trails. Vehicle testing and dismounted maneuver activities could displace wildlife from the areas during operational testing and training activities. Because testing and training activities could occur throughout the year, displacement could range from temporary to permanent.

Development of a renewable solar electric generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in removal of up to 1,000 ac of desert scrub habitat. There likely would be minor to moderate incremental cumulative impacts to wildlife species that utilize this habitat when this loss is combined with other projects on YPG that would remove desert scrub habitat.

Continued implementation of the INRMP to manage habitat on YPG would minimize the potential for impacts to wildlife from loss of habitat. Impacts of the Proposed Action on wildlife in the Cibola Region would be long-term and moderate.

Kofa Region. New building/facility construction in the Kofa Region is primarily limited to new or replacement structures at fixed GPs, where previous clearing would limit the potential for impacts to vegetation, and at new training complexes. Much like the situation in the Laguna Region, the potential for impacts to wildlife would be minor due to the previous and ongoing disturbance and the level of human activity associated with the fixed GPs.

Proposed construction activities would result in clearing of approximately 240 ac of desert habitat in the Kofa Region, with all vegetation removed from this acreage as a result. New construction, including paving, creation of a UAS launch/recovery area near SWTR, East Kofa Operations Center, and the training complex in the northern part of East Arm, would convert approximately 54 ac of the Kofa Region to impervious surfaces. Approximately 156 ac of the cleared are would be used as a UAS launch/recovery area and the remainder would be associated with TGPs. Approximately 2.7 ac of desert scrub habitat would be cleared for utilities placement and approximately 305 ac of desert scrub habitat would be disturbed by activities related to DZs. Because of the small area that would be minor.

New dismounted maneuver areas would be established in the Kofa Region, which would cover approximately 53,180 ac. No direct impacts to habitat would result from this activity.

Dismounted maneuvers typically would result in diffuse movement through the area, which would have negligible impacts on habitat. Dismounted maneuver activities could displace wildlife from the areas during operational testing and training activities. Because testing and training activities could occur throughout the year, displacement could range from temporary to permanent.

Approximately 29,757 ac of desert scrub habitat would be used for munitions impact area expansion, which would not be cleared except to meet specific testing requirements. Because vegetation would not be removed and because these areas are surrounded by large areas that currently receive munitions impacts, impacts to wildlife would be expected to be minor to moderate.

YPG would establish up to 12 TGPs annually in the Kofa Region that would result in clearing of up to 26.4 ac of desert scrub each year. Clearing would be spread through both space and time, but the slow recovery of desert vegetation would result in habitat impacts being long-term. Because individual TGPs would be relatively small and would be dispersed across the landscape, wildlife impacts from TGPs would be expected to be minor and long-term.

Impacts Summary. Wildlife would be temporarily disturbed by construction activities and associated noise. It is likely that wildlife would relocate to similar habitat nearby. After construction is complete, wildlife may resume use of areas adjacent to the construction or acclimate to the new habitat occupied at the time of displacement. Most proposed construction would occur in cantonment areas or other previously developed locations where wildlife habitat is limited and human activity is common. Impacts from construction would likely be minor and short term.

Wildfire could impact wildlife species on YPG through direct mortality, disruption of reproduction, or loss of habitat. Exotic invasive plant species can affect wildfire size and intensity in areas where native vegetation is cleared or where soils are disturbed during activities. Depending on size and intensity, impacts from a particular wildfire could range from minor to severe. Measures that would be implemented to minimize the potential for colonization and growth of exotic invasive plant species are discussed in Sections 3.7 and 3.18.

New TGPs could result in disturbance, including clearing, of up to 50.6 ac of desert scrub habitat in the Cibola Region and up to 26.4 ac of desert scrub vegetation annually in the Kofa Region, but only within isolated areas of up to 2.2 ac each. Clearing would be spread through both space and time, but the slow recovery of desert vegetation would result in habitat impacts being long-term. Because individual TGPs would be relatively small and would be dispersed across the landscape, wildlife impacts from TGPs would be expected to be minor and long-term.

The cumulative effect of incremental habitat loss within YPG from all proposed activities would be moderate. No significant incremental impacts to wildlife from this habitat loss would be expected. Past and reasonably foreseeable future activities also could interact with the effects of the Proposed Action concerning impacts to wildlife. Because all impacts to wildlife resulting from the Proposed Action would be confined within the boundary of YPG and because there would be no loss of species, it is not expected that wildlife impacts of the Proposed Action would interact with off-post actions to affect regional wildlife populations.

Development of a renewable solar electric generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site could contribute to incremental cumulative impacts to wildlife species that utilize desert scrub habitat through incremental loss of habitat.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. This project would result in the loss of up to 1,675 acres of wildlife habitat. However, it is not anticipated this would contribute to regional cumulative wildlife populations.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to wildlife and fisheries. While specific impacts are unknown at this time, it is likely that a substantial acreage would be cleared of native vegetation for each project, which would reduce available habitat for native wildlife and likely would contribute to individual mortality for some species. It is likely that BLM will require appropriate measures, possibly including modifications to site designs to prevent loss of any habitat type or species from the region. Therefore, any contribution to cumulative impacts to wildlife and fisheries would be expected to be minor.

3.21.2.4 Mitigation

YPG considered potential impacts to wildlife in selecting locations for proposed activities. Because wildlife species tend to be most abundant near sources of water, YPG avoided placing activities in proximity to artificial water sources to the extent practicable. By avoiding wildlife concentration areas, YPG minimized the potential for impacts to wildlife. When implementing construction projects in areas where wildlife are likely to nest or den, YPG would schedule construction to occur outside the nesting or denning period where practicable.

To minimize the potential for impacts to wildlife YPG would limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable and would avoid vegetation where feasible.

The INRMP (YPG, 2012b) directs the management of natural resources, including wildlife, within YPG. Through continued implementation of the INRMP, YPG utilizes the best available scientific knowledge and techniques to manage wildlife. To manage and sustain wildlife on YPG, the installation would:

- Survey, monitor, and analyze wildlife population trend information
- Assess wildlife habitat needs
- Manage resources to provide and protect wildlife habitat
- Maintain wildlife movement corridors and migration routes
- Relocate wildlife to maintain, enhance, or restore populations and distributions
- Ensure that water tanks provide the water needed to sustain wildlife populations
- Undertake actions to minimize illegal hunting
- Undertake actions to minimize habitat degradation from unauthorized activities
- Cooperate with AGFD to obtain wildlife rehabilitation services
- Cooperate with AGFD and USFWS for wildlife law enforcement

In addition, YPG is developing an exotic invasive plant management program (see Section 3.18) that would benefit wildlife through improved habitat conditions. Measures that would be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to soils (see Section 3.15), vegetation (see

Section 3.18), and water resources (see Section 3.20) would provide indirect benefits to wildlife through improved habitat conditions.

3.22 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

Potential impacts of the alternatives considered in this DPEIS are summarized in Table 3-24. Cumulative impacts and potential minimization and mitigation measures are summarized in Tables 3-25 and 3-26.

TABLE 3-24
Impacts by Resource Area
Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
Air Quality No change from existing conditions. Benefits from reduced use of portable generators would not occur.	Minor impacts from increased emissions due to operation of minor permanent sources of air emissions created by proposed construction activities, operation of new facilities, vehicle operation to travel to new facilities, and testing and training activities that would be conducted.	
		Temporary negative impacts due to fugitive dust from construction. Negligible short-term impacts to local air quality as a result of emissions from construction equipment.
		Minor beneficial impacts from installation of hard power and telecommunications lines with associated reduction in the use of portable generators for testing and training.
Airspace Management	No change from existing conditions.	No change from existing conditions.
Cultural Resources	Cultural Resources Potential impact from inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during testing or training activities at current approved locations and levels. Potential for damage to cultural resources from vandalism. As appropriate, surveys, SHPO consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and mitigation would be implemented	Potential impacts to cultural resources in areas not previously surveyed. As appropriate, surveys, SHPO consultation under the NHPA, and mitigation would be implemented. Potential for minor to moderate impacts from
		construction and training activities and from increased potential for inadvertent discovery due to increase in area where activities would be implemented. Potential for damage to cultural resources from vandalism.
Energy/Utilities	Portable generators would continue to be used at current levels and locations. Continued use of utilities at current levels. Continued use of bottled water and individual reverse osmosis systems outside of MAA. Satellite uplinks powered by portable generators would continue to be used for	Energy/Electricity Beneficial impacts from construction of more energy-efficient buildings. Increase in energy demand would result in minor to moderate impacts to energy use in the region. Minor beneficial impacts from use of solar- powered lights. Moderate long-term beneficial impacts to regional energy consumption from installing hard power to locations currently using portable

TABLE 3-24Impacts by Resource AreaYuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
	telecommunications.	generators.
	 Benefits from reduced use of portable generators would not occur. No change from existing conditions for solid waste. No significant increase in nonhazardous waste is anticipated to occur. No significant impacts to the non-hazardous waste landfill capacity would be anticipated. Potential for conflicts in scheduling multiple users with needs to conduct testing in areas free of electromagnetic interference from cellular/radio towers. 	Minor beneficial impacts to air quality from reduced emissions and to hazardous materials management from reduced transport and handling of fuels following installation of hard power to testing and training locations with associated reduction
		in generator use. Water Minor impacts to groundwater from anticipated increased usage. Minor beneficial impact from water plant at CDH, reducing reliance on bottled and bulk water.
		Wastewater New wastewater treatment system at CDH and new sewage lagoon at Kofa cantonment area would have minor beneficial impacts on wastewater utilities.
		Telecommunications Minor beneficial impacts to air quality from reduced emissions and to hazardous materials management from reduced transport and handling of fuels following installation of hard power to testing and training locations with associated reduction in use of generators and satellite uplinks. Greater flexibility in scheduling users needing test areas free of electromagnetic interference.
		Solid Waste No significant increase in non-hazardous waste is anticipated to occur. No significant impacts to the non-hazardous waste landfill capacity or regional construction and demolition landfills are anticipated.
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	No change from existing conditions.	No changes from existing conditions and no impacts.
Fire Management	No change from existing conditions. The potential for wildfires would continue and fire management activities would continue.	Minor increase in potential for wildfires due to increased testing and training.
		Minor to moderate potential for increased fuel load from growth of exotic invasive plant species.
Fire management from nev EOC in the Laguna Region would not occur.	Fire management from new EOC in the Laguna Region would not occur.	New EOC in the Laguna Region would benefit fire management.
Geological Resources	No change from existing conditions.	No change from existing conditions and no impacts.
Hazardous Materials/Hazardous	No change from existing conditions. No changes in volumes of hazardous materials	Impacts described for the No Action Alternative would occur, plus additional potential for minor impacts from leaks

TABLE 3-24
Impacts by Resource Area
Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
Waste	used or hazardous wastes generated. Potential for leaks from on-road and off-road vehicle use and maintenance,	associated with vehicle use and maintenance, POL spills, and chemical decomposition of MCOCs as a result of increased testing and training.
	POL spills, and chemical decomposition of munitions constituents of concern (MCOCs) would remain.	Minor short-term increase in hazardous waste generation due to demolition of buildings containing asbestos-containing materials (ACMs).
		Potential for minor impacts from increased use and disposal of certain hazardous materials during testing and training activities.
		Potential for impacts from installation of air conditioning components.
		Minor beneficial effects from construction of appropriate down-range facilities to store and contain POLs and reduce the potential for spills.
		Minor beneficial effects from installation of hard power and telecommunications to testing and training sites that would reduce use of portable generators and also reduce the transport of fuel.
Land Use	No change from existing conditions.	Minor changes from conversion of open space to other uses, but consistent with military land uses.
		The slight changes in the noise zones associated with large artillery would not require any changes to the land uses designated in the Yuma County 2020 Comprehensive Plan.
No change from exis conditions. Continue impacts to wildlife from during testing and tra- activities. Continued potential complaints from the Lake area.	No change from existing conditions. Continued sporadic impacts to wildlife from noise during testing and training	The slight changes in the noise zones associated with large artillery would not adversely affect use of surround lands outside the installation boundary.
	activities. Continued potential for complaints from the Martinez Lake area.	Minor long-term impact on wildlife from disturbance from sporadic noise from increased testing and training.
		Minor temporary impact to wildlife from noise due to construction activities.
		Potential for minor disturbance of outdoor conversations due to construction noise. No permanent sensitive human receptors in proximity to construction areas.
Recreation	No change from existing conditions.	No impacts to off-post recreational opportunities.
	No new recreation facilities would be constructed.	Potential for minor to moderate impacts to recreational hunting in the Cibola Hunting Area, Martinez Hunting Area, and the East Arm Hunting Area due to increased testing

TABLE 3-24 Impacts by Resource Area *Yuma Proving Ground*

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
		and training.
		Beneficial impacts to other on-post recreation from construction of new park, youth center addition, and improvements to other passive recreational opportunities.
		Loss of greenspace in MAA that is used by residents for passive recreation from Cox Field improvements.
		Potential disruption of some on-post recreation during construction.
Safety	No change from existing conditions. Safety benefits that would result from the Proposed Action would not occur.	Potential for minor increase in safety incidents due to increase in testing and training, but the rate of incidents (expressed per worker hour) would not be expected to change.
		Minor potential increase in frequency of wildfire ignition due to increase in testing and training.
		Potential for minor short-term impacts to construction worker safety.
		Potential minor temporary impacts to traffic safety due to construction-related traffic.
		Moderate benefits to operational safety due to AT/FP improvements, MEDEVAC helicopter pads, flood upgrades on Aberdeen Road, pedestrian safety from D Street conversion to walkway, and installation of shading at multiple locations.
		Minor benefit to personnel safety from installation of hard power and telecommunications in the Cibola and Kofa Regions due to decreased transportation of fuel and portable generators.
		Moderate benefit from relocating safe haven away from YPG personnel.
Socioeconomics	No change from existing conditions. Short-term benefits to local economy from construction would not occur.	Minor short-term beneficial impacts to local economy from purchase of building materials, short-term construction jobs, and secondary spending by construction workers.
		Potential for negligible to minor impacts on local fuel and water retailers from reduction in demand for these services on YPG.
Soils	No change from existing conditions. Continued impacts to soils from testing and training activities at authorized locations and levels.	Impacts described for the No Action Alternative would continue, but with increased potential for impacts due to increase in testing and training activities and expansion or creation of testing and training areas.

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
		to soils used for dismounted maneuver training, munitions impact areas, DZs, and UAS launch/recovery areas resulting in negligible to minor impacts to soils that are not susceptible to erosion to moderately erodible and moderate impacts to highly erodible soils that are disturbed.
		Minor impact from establishment of TGPs in the Cibola and Kofa Regions.
		Long-term indirect impact from degradation of munitions into soils in munitions impact areas.
		Disturbance due to construction resulting in negligible to minor impacts to soils that are not highly erodible to moderately erodible and moderate impacts to highly erodible soils.
		Minor impacts from disturbances to soils during installation of utilities.
Threatened and Endangered Species and Species of Concern sp ac loc	No change from existing conditions. Potential for minor impacts to threatened, endangered, or sensitive (TES) species, as testing and training activities continue at existing locations and levels.	Transient or Incidental Species Negligible to minor impacts likely from displacement during construction, testing, or training activities.
		Sonoran Desert Tortoise Long-term moderate impacts from loss of habitat and potential for incidental mortality.
		Sonoran Pronghorn Long-term minor impacts to the experimental population due to loss of habitat and disturbances from testing and training activities.
		Banded Gila Monster Minor long-term impacts from loss of habitat and disturbances from construction, testing, and training activities.
		TES Bat Species Negligible to minor long-term impacts due to loss of foraging habitat.
		Loggerhead Shrike Moderate long-term impacts from loss of habitat and disturbances caused by construction, testing, and training activities.
		Western Burrowing Owl Moderate long-term impacts due to loss of habitat and disturbances from construction, testing, and training activities.
		Parish Onion Negligible to minor long-term impacts from incidental mortality and due to the slow growth rate of these species.
		Other TES Plants Minor long-term impacts from clearing of

TABLE 3-24 Impacts by Resource Area

TABLE 3-24Impacts by Resource AreaYuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
		vegetation for construction, testing, and training purposes. Wild Horses and Burros Minor temporary impacts due to construction activities. Minor long-term impacts due to displacement and loss of habitat from increased testing and training areas. No impacts to other species.
Traffic/Transportation	No change from existing conditions. No new impacts would occur.	Potential increase in temporary road closures and construction-related traffic. Minor short-term impact. Long-term beneficial impacts from improved traffic safety due to flood upgrades, intersection improvements, and range road improvements.
		Long-term benefits from increased air transportation efficiency due to new infrastructure.
Vegetation	No change from existing conditions. Continued impacts to vegetation from testing and training activities at current locations and levels.	Minor to moderate impacts due to removal of vegetation for construction, increases in testing and training, and use of new impact areas.
Visual Resources	No change from existing conditions. Current testing and training activities would continue to have negligible to minor impacts to visual resources.	Temporary minor impacts from construction- related airborne dust.
		Recurring temporary minor impacts from dust and other obscurants caused by testing and training.
		Potential long-term minor impacts from increased use of lighter-than-air UASs.
		Potential minor long-term impacts from appearance of new buildings.
Water Resources	Continued impacts from contaminants and water consumption due to testing and training activities at current locations and levels.	Potential temporary minor adverse impacts to water quality resulting from sediment runoff during construction and an increase in impervious surfaces following construction, reduced with use of appropriate BMPs
		Minor to moderate increased potential for impacts to groundwater from degradation of munitions.
		Minor potential for offsite impacts due to transport of contaminants and sediments generated from testing and training activities by stormwater runoff.
		Potential negligible reduction in groundwater recharge rates due to new impervious area.
Wildlife and Fisheries	No change from existing conditions. Minor impacts to wildlife would continue under	Minor short-term impact from incidental mortality, displacement, and disturbance due to construction.

Yuma Proving Ground		
Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action
	current levels of testing and training activities at current locations.	Potential for minor to moderate long-term impacts from incidental mortality, displacement, and disturbance due to increased testing and training.
		Minor to moderate long-term indirect impacts from loss of habitat due to construction, UAS launch/recovery areas, utilities, and TGPs and only minor impacts from disturbance of habitat due to use of DZs.

TABLE 3-24 Impacts by Resource Area Yuma Proving Ground

Any activities and projects selected for implementation following analysis in this DPEIS will require additional evaluation and processing prior to implementation. Specific project proponents must submit a work order (DA 4283) or service order and other required documents, such as a dig permit, for approval by YPG Environmental Services Division for the proposed project. Further, a specific proposed project may require Real Property Planning Board approval, additional NEPA review (as determined by this analysis), NHPA Section 106 consultation, or environmental permit applications, and state or federal regulatory agency approvals prior to implementation. These approvals may result in additional mitigation measures being required for specific projects.

3.22.1 Cumulative Effects Summary

Table 3-25 summarizes the potential cumulative impacts for each resource area. This section summarizes the potential for cumulative impacts for the resource areas identified in the table as having the potential for cumulative impacts; those with no potential for cumulative impacts are not discussed further.

There are seven projects implemented on YPG in the past five years that could contribute to cumulative impacts to resources. These projects include:

- Final Environmental Assessment for the Unmanned Aircraft Systems Test Center. Jason Associates Corporation. January 2008. (Jason Associates Corporation, 2008a)
- Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Cobra Flats, Comanche Flats, and Site 2 Military Training Areas. Jason Associates Corporation. January 2008. (Jason Associates Corporation, 2008b)
- Final Environmental Assessment for the Army Test Tracks. Prepared for U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Jason Associates Corporation. March 2008 (Jason Associates Corporation, 2008c)
- Environmental Assessment for Improvised Explosive Devices (IED) Test Environment. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG Directorate of Public Works [DPW]). January 2010. (YPG DPW, 2010a)

- Environmental Assessment for Impact Areas Expansion. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. March 2010. (YPG DPW, 2010b)
- Environmental Assessment for Cibola Impact Areas. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. April 2011. (Gutierrez Canales Engineering, P.C., 2011)
- Environmental Assessment for Fuel Facilities Optimization. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. November 2011. (YPG DPW, 2011a)
- Environmental Assessment for Persistent Surveillance Systems Program. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. December 2011. (YPG DPW, 2011b)
- Environmental Assessment for Long Range Munitions. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. April 2013. (YPG DPW, 2013a)
- Environmental Assessment for Military Training Area Expansion. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. May 2013. (YPG DPW, 2013b)

Each of these projects was subjected to specific NEPA evaluation and the analyses included assessment of the potential for cumulative impacts to affected resources. The cumulative impacts analyses presented in these NEPA documents are incorporated into this DPEIS by reference and are not further discussed.

YPG has begun investigating the development of a solar renewable energy resource on the installation to increase YPG's energy security and meet federal mandates and legislative requirements to increase production and consumption of renewable energy resources. This development would be through an EUL with a private company. Solar technologies under consideration by the Army include solar PV, Dish Stirling, and dry-cooled concentrating solar thermal technologies. Two proposed locations have been identified: a Northeast Cibola Site and a West Kofa Site (see Figure 3-3). The Northeast Cibola Site would support a facility capable of producing up to 200 megawatts (MW) and the West Kofa Site would support a facility capable of producing up to 60 MW. Total solar development on YPG lands would not exceed 1,000 acres (ac) at these locations (USAEC, 2012). An EUL for solar power generation is not a component of the Proposed Action and an EA is being prepared for this project. The potential for cumulative impacts from development and operation of such a facility was considered in the assessment of potential cumulative impacts in this analysis. Construction, operation, and maintenance of a solar electric generation facility could contribute to cumulative impacts to air quality, cultural resources, energy and utilities, hazardous materials, land use, recreation, socioeconomics, soils, threatened and endangered species, traffic/transportation, vegetation, visual resources, surface water and groundwater resources, and wildlife.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct, operate, maintain, and decommission a 100-MW commercial solar thermal generation power plant using dry-cooling technology with a 1.5-mile generator tie-line, switchyard and access road over approximately 1,675 acres about 10 miles north of Quartzite, Arizona in LaPaz County. The Quartzite Solar

Energy Project would have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts to air quality, cultural resources, energy and utilities, hazardous materials, health and safety, land use, noise, recreation, socioeconomics, soils, threatened and endangered species, traffic/transportation, vegetation, visual resources, water resources, and wildlife. A discussion of each resource area with potential impacts follows Table 3-25 and contains additional details regarding the nature of the impacts. There are no cumulative impacts predicted for the following resource areas: airspace management, environmental justice and protection of children, and geological resources.

There are four proposed solar projects within approximately 10 miles of YPG and are associated with BLM. The Palomas project is proposed to be a concentrated solar power trough and would be located east of YPG adjacent to the Aqua-Caliente solar project. The LaPosa Solar Terminal and Quartzite project are proposed to be a concentrated solar power trough and would be located along I-95 between Cibola and the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. The Windcat Quartzite project is proposed as concentrated solar power tower and would be located along I-95 between Cibola and the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. At this time specific project details are unknown. However these solar projects have the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts to air quality, cultural resources, energy and utilities, hazardous materials, health and safety, land use, noise, recreation, socioeconomics, soils, threatened and endangered species, traffic/transportation, vegetation, visual resources, water resources, and wildlife. There are no cumulative impacts predicted for the following resource areas: airspace management, environmental justice and protection of children, and geological resources.

Tullia Flovilly Gloullu	
Resource Area	Potential Cumulative Impacts
Air Quality	Potential for minor incremental contributions to combustion emissions and dust generation from proposed actions. Potential for net minor benefits from reduced reliance on fossil fuels for electrical energy production with development of renewable solar electric generation projects.
Airspace Management	None
Cultural Resources	Unknown; there are areas not previously surveyed for cultural resources which would be evaluated on a project-specific basis in the future. Potential for minor cumulative impacts with development of the Quartzite Solar Energy Project and the four BLM solar projects
Energy/Utilities	Beneficial impacts from reduction in use of generators and fossil fuels. Minor incremental contribution to benefits to wastewater treatment. Potential for minor beneficial impacts to energy/utilities from development of renewable solar electric generation facilities in the region.
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	None
Fire Management	Potential for cumulative impacts relative to fuel loading and potential spread of wildfires from increased potential for establishment and growth of exotic invasive plant species in areas disturbed but not converted to impervious surface. Potential for incremental increase in ignition of wildfires from live fire activities

 TABLE 3-25

 Summary of Cumulative Effects

 Yuma Proving Ground
TABLE 3-25
Summary of Cumulative Effects
Vuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	Potential Cumulative Impacts
	resulting from the proposed action.
Geological Resources	None
Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste	Potential for cumulative impact from increased hazardous material use and disposal resulting from increases in testing and training from proposed action. Contribution from YPG would be minor. Potential for moderate cumulative impacts from heat transfer liquids and brine during operation of renewable solar energy facilities.
Land Use	Potential for cumulative impacts from operational and testing use and development of a renewable solar electric generation facility, which would prevent military use of up to 1,000 ac. Contribution from military mission from proposed actions would likely be minor. Potential for interaction with regional solar facilities for incremental impacts to regional land use from conversion to new uses.
Noise	Potential for cumulative impacts if aircraft traffic from Yuma Airport and MCAS Yuma increase in the future. Contribution from YPG would be minor.
Recreation	Potential for incremental cumulative impacts from operational use and development of a renewable solar electric generation facility as more land is made unavailable for recreational hunting. Potential for cumulative impacts to regional recreation from operational use and development of the Quartzite Energy Project and the four BLM solar projects.
Safety	Beneficial impacts from transportation improvements on US 95.
Socioeconomics	Potential for minor beneficial cumulative impacts from development and operation of renewable solar electric generation facilities.
Soils	Moderate incremental impacts from loss of vegetation associated with TGPs and development of renewable solar electric generation facilities.
Threatened or Endangered Species and Species of Concern	Potential for minor incremental loss of suitable habitat, including potential habitat loss from development of the renewable solar electric generation facilities.
Traffic/Transportation	Minor beneficial impacts from improved traffic flow. Potential for minor temporary cumulative impacts from increased traffic during construction of the renewable solar electric generation facilities.
Vegetation	Moderate incremental loss of vegetation and habitat, including potential habitat loss from the development of renewable solar electric generation facilities.
Visual Resources	Minor incremental increase in lighter-than-air UAS testing could contribute to cumulative impact to visual resources in some locations. Potential for minor cumulative impacts to visual resources from development of the renewable solar electric generation facility along the US 95 corridor and development of the Quartzite Energy Project and the four BLM solar projects.
Water Resources	Potential minor incremental cumulative impacts to water resources from proposed actions. Potential for minor to moderate cumulative impacts to water resources from development and operation of

Yuma Proving Ground	
Resource Area	Potential Cumulative Impacts
	renewable solar electric generation facilities.
Wildlife and Fisheries	Moderate incremental loss of habitat, including potential habitat loss from development of the renewable solar electric generation facilities.

TABLE 3-25 Summary of Cumulative Effects Yuma Proving Ground

3.22.1.1 Air Quality

Most air quality impacts would be minor and temporary. There would long-term incremental additions of dust from new or expanded testing and training as a result of increased vehicle operation, munitions firing, and other activities. Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site could generate fugitive dust. Appropriate BMPs, described in Section 3.2.2.3, would be implemented to minimize dust generated by testing and training activities. There also would be minor long-term increases in combustion engine emissions from increased vehicle use, but, as noted above, these would not be expected to result in exceedances of air quality standards. Development of commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facilities would result in long-term beneficial impacts to air quality through reduced fossil fuel emissions associated with other electrical generation methods; however, the use of fossil fuels to produce demineralized water to wash mirrors and to transport that demineralized water to the facility would partially offset any benefits. Any contribution to cumulative impacts would be expected to be minor.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would remain below all major source thresholds and any contribution to cumulative impacts would be expected to be minor.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to air quality during construction as a result of emissions from operation of construction equipment and personal vehicles and from the generation of fugitive dust. It is expected that BLM will require that construction contractors implement appropriate BMPs and equipment maintenance procedures to minimize this potential. Once operational, these facilities could contribute to beneficial impacts to regional air quality through a reduction in use of fossil fuels to generate electricity.

3.22.1.2 Cultural Resources

Activities that have been sited in areas that were surveyed and assessed for cultural resources and that have complete SHPO consultation with a determination that no significant cultural resources occur would not affect cultural resources and would have no potential for cumulative impacts to cultural resources. Implementation of the proposed activities may affect historic properties at YPG. Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site could impact cultural resources and any such impacts could interact with other activities that impact cultural resources to produce cumulative effects. YPG is developing a

PA in consultation with SHPO, ACHP, and interested tribes that will identify means to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential effects.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project area contains one cultural property that is recommended for inclusion in the NRHP that could be affected; impacts would be mitigated through avoidance and construction monitoring. Any contribution to cumulative impacts to cultural resources from the Quartzite Solar Energy Project would be expected to be minor.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to regional cultural resources. At this time cultural resources in the project areas are unknown and the potential for cumulative impacts to this resource area cannot be assessed accurately. However, it is expected that BLM will require that these projects conduct appropriate investigations and consultation with SHPO regarding cultural resources to ensure that these resources are not negatively impacted or to develop and implement appropriate mitigation for unavoidable impacts that would Reduce impacts to less than significant and minimize the potential for cumulative impacts.

3.22.1.3 Energy/Utilities

Replacement of portable generators with grid-supplied power would reduce demand and would be a moderate benefit to energy consumption in the region. A long-term cumulative benefit to air quality would be expected from this action due to the reduction in emissions.

The reduction in portable generator use would reduce the need to transport fuel for operation of generators to the areas receiving hard power and telecommunications services, which would reduce the use of vehicles to transport fuel, leading to reductions in fuel consumption and air emissions. The elimination of transporting fuel to these sites would indirectly benefit regional energy use and provide beneficial cumulative impacts to air quality. In addition, there would be reduced potential for petroleum spills, either from transport accidents or from refueling. This would be an indirect beneficial impact with regard to hazardous material by reducing the potential for a release of petroleum products to the environment.

Operation of the water treatment plant would reduce generation of solid waste associated with bottled water as well as reduce fuel consumption from the delivery of bottled water. This would be a minor cumulative benefit to waste generation and fuel consumption.

Should the Kofa cantonment wastewater treatment and sewer system be replaced, it be a benefit to wastewater treatment. Any new sewer lines installed as a result of the Proposed Action would likely make minor contributions to cumulative benefits to wastewater treatment.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site would result in beneficial cumulative impacts to energy and utilities by providing increased renewable energy sources in the region.

Several current or reasonably foreseeable energy projects are proposed in the YPG area and may result in cumulative impacts. The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. An additional solar power facility is also proposed at the former White Wing Ranch, but the size and location of the project are unknown at this time. Arizona Public Service proposes to construct a 500-kV transmission. There also are

four proposed solar facilities on BLM land near YPG. These proposed projects would be expected to result in increased demand for water for construction, cleaning, and operation, which could cause cumulative impacts on water utilities from incremental increased consumption. In addition, these projects also would result in reduced demand for fossil fuels to generate electrical power, which would result in beneficial impacts to energy supply and usage in the region.

3.22.1.4 Fire Management

There would be potential for cumulative impacts relative to fuel loading and potential spread of wildfires from increased potential for establishment and growth of exotic invasive plant species in areas disturbed but not converted to impervious surface. There also would be potential for incremental increase in ignition of wildfires from live fire activities resulting from the proposed action. No additional projects were identified that would have potential to interact with fire management on YPG to create cumulative impacts.

3.22.1.5 Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site could result in generation of hazardous materials.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to hazardous materials cumulative impacts. At this time details on hazardous materials in the project areas are unknown and the potential for cumulative impacts cannot be assessed accurately. However, it is expected that BLM will require that these projects implement appropriate use, storage, and disposal measures to minimize the potential for cumulative impacts.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County could result in the generation of hazardous materials. No cumulative impacts to hazardous materials would be expected from construction of either solar facility. Should a dry-cooled concentrating solar facility be selected as the technology to be implemented, thermal cooling fluid and brine would be by-products of electrical power generation that would require disposal. Depending on the Therminol compound used, there could be a moderate potential for cumulative impacts to hazardous materials from use and disposal of Therminol heat transfer fluids during operation of a dry-cooled concentrating solar facility.

No other future projects with potential hazardous materials impacts are known at this time. Testing and training requirements are expected to continue to evolve over time. This could result in an increase in testing and training activities throughout YPG. This would have the potential for increased use of hazardous materials, an increase in the need for disposal of hazardous wastes, and the potential for exposure of existing subsurface contamination.

3.22.1.6 Land Use

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site could interact with land use on YPG. Up to 1,000 ac of Range/Open Land in the Cibola Region or up to 322 ac in the Laguna Region within YPG would be converted to industrial use and would no longer be available for meeting the military mission (USAEC, 2012). When combined with land use impacts from other projects on YPG, development of a renewable solar facility could result in minor cumulative impacts to land use on YPG.

While YPG actions would not directly interact with land use outside the installation boundary, the potential for incremental impacts to regional land use would exist.. Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects and the Quartzite Solar Energy Project would cause land to be converted from open land into solar facilities, which would reduce available rangeland. The potential for these solar projects to contribute to regional land use cumulative impacts cannot be assessed accurately at this time, but there is a reasonable probability that implementation of these projects would contribute to regional land use impacts.

3.22.1.7 Noise

Predicted noise levels, which includes the doubling of current noise levels, from the Proposed Action would not be expected to interact with noise outside of the YPG boundary. Noise from the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range and from MCAS Yuma are not expected to overlap noise from YPG. Noise contours from YPG activities are within the YPG boundary except for a small area north of the Kofa Range and east of the Cibola Range.

Should flights from MCAS Yuma or the Yuma Airport increase in the future, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to noise. Aircraft operations on YPG could incrementally add to the noise from MCAS Yuma and the airport. Because most aircraft operated on YPG are rotary wing aircraft or UAS, the incremental contribution to the noise environment would be less than that from commercial jet aircraft operating from the airport or military jet aircraft operating from MCAS Yuma. Any incremental contribution from aircraft noise from increased YPG operations under the Proposed Action would be expected to be minor.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. There could be short-term noise impacts during construction, but the Project would not contribute to cumulative noise impacts because operational noise would be minimal.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to short-term noise impacts during construction, but the projects would likely not contribute to cumulative noise impacts because operational noise would be minimal.

3.22.1.8 Recreation

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in loss of hunting opportunities on up to 1,000 ac in the Cibola Hunting Area (USAEC, 2012). In conjunction with the DPEIS projects that would reduce some hunting opportunities on YPG, there could be minor to moderate cumulative impacts to recreational hunting on YPG, but the cumulative impacts on regional hunting would be minor. Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site would have no potential for cumulative impacts to hunting on YPG or in the region.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Approximately 1,675 acres would be converted from open land, which could cause indirect impacts to nearby recreational uses through alteration of the visual landscape. The Quartzite Solar Energy Project could contribute to cumulative impacts to regional recreation.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects would likely result in incremental loss of recreational opportunities on BLM lands as projects are implemented. In addition, the appearance of the solar facilities could be a negative experience for recreational users in the area. The combination of loss of usable land and degradation of the recreational experience through altered visual character could contribute to cumulative impacts to regional recreation.

3.22.1.9 Safety

There would be potential for foreseeable future projects to interact with safety on YPG. Should a commercial scale solar powered electrical generation facility be constructed in the Cibola Region within YPG, glare from such a facility could affect aircraft operations within YPG airspace, which could increase safety risks.

Proposed ADOT improvements to US 95 would provide increased traffic safety along this road for public travel and for YPG-related travel. This would be a cumulative benefit to safety in the region and would also occur under the No Action Alternative.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. There would be minimal health and safety risks during construction and operations of the project, and they would not contribute to regional safety cumulative impacts.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects would be unlikely to contribute to regional safety cumulative impacts. There would be minimal health and safety risks during construction and operations of the project, and they would not contribute to regional safety cumulative impacts.

No other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects would have the potential to interact with safety on YPG. No other cumulative impacts are expected.

3.22.1.10 Socioeconomics

There could be minor cumulative beneficial impacts to socioeconomics from development and operation of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site. There would be long-term creation of a few jobs, which would have a negligible beneficial impact on regional employment. Operation of this facility would reduce the demand for electricity from the grid for YPG, which could contribute to reduced rates paid for electricity and provide incremental benefits to the regional economy.

There could be minor cumulative beneficial impacts to regional socioeconomics from development and operation of the Quartzite Solar Energy Project, approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. There would be short-term creation of 280 jobs and long-term creation of 47 jobs, which would incrementally benefit regional employment. Operation of the facility would provide additional source of electrical power, which could contribute to reduced rates paid for electricity and provide incremental benefits to the regional economy.

There could be minor cumulative beneficial impacts to regional socioeconomics from development and operation of the four BLM solar projects. There would be likely be short-term and long-term job creation, which would incrementally benefit regional employment. Operation of the facilities would provide additional sources of electrical power, which could

contribute to reduced rates paid for electricity and provide incremental benefits to the regional economy.

3.22.1.11 Soils

Impacts to soils from establishment of TGPs would be minor with implementation of BMPs. There also could be a minor cumulative impact to soils on YPG from multiple TGPs established through time, but no regional cumulative impacts to soils beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site, which is in the Laguna Region, would result in soil disturbance on up to 322 ac. Development of such a facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in soil disturbance on up to 1,000 ac (USAEC, 2012). This could incrementally add to other projects on YPG that create soils disturbance and lead to minor cumulative impacts to soils.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Approximately 115 acres of the 1,675-acre project area would be completely cleared of vegetation. The project area is entirely within the Supersition-Rositas series, which exhibits a moderate to high susceptibility to water and wind erosion. Should the project be constructed, appropriate erosion control measures would be implemented. Any contribution to cumulative impacts to soils would be minor.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects would likely contribute to regional cumulative impacts to soils. While specific impacts are unknown at this time, it is likely that a substantial acreage would be cleared for each project, increasing the susceptibility of the soils to wind and run-off erosion. It is likely that BLM will require appropriate BMPs to minimize the potential for erosion. Therefore, any contribution to cumulative impacts to soils would be expected to be minor.

3.22.1.12 Threatened or Endangered Species and Species of Concern

The cumulative effect of incremental vegetation and habitat loss within YPG from all proposed activities would be moderate. No significant incremental impacts to TES from vegetation clearing or habitat loss would be expected. Past and reasonably foreseeable future activities also could interact with the effects of the Proposed Action concerning impacts to TES species. Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in loss of up to 1,000 ac of Sonoran desert tortoise habitat (USAEC, 2012). This could incrementally add to other projects on YPG or in the region that adversely affect Sonoran desert tortoise habitat and contribute to minor cumulative impacts to the species.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Should the project be constructed, approximately 51.5 acres of moderately suitable habitat for the Mojave fringe-toed lizard would be lost, but no other impacts to TES species or their habitats would result. There could be minor contributions to the cumulative impacts on TES species and their habitats.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to TES species and their habitats through land clearing and site

preparation activities associated with construction. The magnitude of disturbance, the occurrence of particular TES species, and the occurrence of potentially suitable habitats for TES species within and near the proposed projects is not known at this time and the potential for cumulative impacts cannot be assessed accurately. However, It is likely that BLM will require appropriate coordination or consultation with USFWS and AGFD with regard to the potential to impact TYES species. Through this process and subsequent implementation of any conservation measures identified by the regulatory agencies, it is expected that any contribution to cumulative impacts to TES species and their habitats would be minimal.

Because all impacts to TES species resulting from the Proposed Action would be confined within the boundary of YPG and because there would be no loss of species, it is not expected that TES species impacts of the Proposed Action would interact with off-post actions to affect regional TES species populations.

3.22.1.13 Traffic/Transportation

Road improvements along US 95 are expected to reduce congestion and improve flow, resulting in beneficial cumulative impacts.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. If construction were to coincide with other construction projects in the area, there could be incremental increases in traffic that would create minor temporary cumulative impacts to regional traffic on US 95. No potential for cumulative impacts to traffic would be expected from operation of the project.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to traffic/transportation. There of the four projects are located along the US 95 corridor and there could be incremental increases in traffic that would create minor temporary cumulative impacts to regional traffic on US 95. Because of the interface with US 95, use appropriate traffic control procedures to minimize traffic impacts. However, even brief delays associated with construction traffic could incrementally interact with military traffic to create more substantial traffic impediments. However, any such incremental impacts would be temporary and would end when construction was complete.

3.22.1.14 Vegetation

YPG would establish 23 new TGPs in the Cibola Region and up to 12 TGPs annually in the Kofa Region. The magnitude of impact to vegetation would vary depending on testing needs and the type of vegetation at a proposed TGP. For each TGP, up to 2.2 ac of desert shrub vegetation would be cleared. No species loss would be expected from clearing for TGPs. If a TGP would be in an area of native vegetation, the impact could range from minor (limited woody vegetation) to moderate (area predominantly desert shrub vegetation). Because desert vegetation recovers slowly, due to the harsh environment and the limited availability of water, any impacts from establishment of TGPs would be long-term.

There could be increased potential for invasion by herbaceous exotic invasive species as a result of clearing vegetation. The development and use of exotic invasive plant species control methods through continued implementation of the INRMP would minimize the potential for spread of the exotic invasive plants into disturbed areas. Clearing for TGPs could be beneficial if a selected TGP would be within an area dominated by exotic invasive

vegetation. Clearing of such an area would be a minor benefit to desert vegetation. Depending on the number of TGPs needed in the Kofa Region, impacts from vegetation clearing could reach approximately 150 ac across YPG within the timeframe for vegetative recovery of a given TGP site. This would constitute a minor cumulative impact to desert vegetation on YPG, but no regional cumulative impacts to vegetation beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected.

There are multiple locations within the Cibola and Kofa Region where new munitions impact areas would be established or where existing munitions impact areas would be expanded. Approximately 46,070 ac would be converted to munitions impact areas. Of this, approximately 45,820 ac would receive both inert and explosive fire and approximately 250 ac at JERC I, II, and III would be for inert fire only. There would be no direct impacts to vegetation in these areas from creation of the munitions impact areas. After munitions impact areas are established, there would be the potential for episodic disturbance to vegetation from munitions testing and operational testing or training activities that would fire into these areas. Munitions impact areas that receive only inert fire would be less impacted, as direct impacts to vegetation as a result of altered growing conditions should inert munitions degrade and release metals or other constituents of concern to the soil.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site would result in vegetation clearing on up to 322 ac. Development of such a facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in vegetation clearing on up to 1,000 ac (USAEC, 2012). This could incrementally add to other projects on YPG that remove vegetation and lead to minor cumulative impacts to vegetation.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Approximately 115 acres of the 1,675-acre project area would be completely cleared of vegetation and it is likely that there would be additional vegetation loss during construction. No loss of species or habitat types would be expected, and it is anticipated that any contribution to cumulative impacts to vegetation would be insignificant.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to vegetation. While specific impacts are unknown at this time, it is likely that a substantial acreage would be cleared of native vegetation for each project. It is likely that BLM will require appropriate measures, possibly including modifications to site designs to prevent loss of any vegetation type or species from the region. Therefore, any contribution to cumulative impacts to vegetation would be expected to be minor.

The cumulative effect of incremental loss of vegetation from clearing within YPG from all proposed activities would be moderate. Past and reasonably foreseeable future activities also could interact with the effects of the Proposed Action concerning impacts to vegetation.

Because all impacts to vegetation resulting from the Proposed Action would be confined within the boundary of YPG and because there would be no loss of species or specific habitat types, it is not expected that vegetation impacts of the Proposed Action would interact with off-post actions to affect regional vegetation.

3.22.1.15 Visual Resources

Under the Proposed Action, there would be an increase in use of lighter-than-air UASs and the size of these craft also may increase. It is likely that multiple lighter-than-air UAS would be deployed simultaneously across the installation if testing needs warrant. The incremental increase in lighter-than-air UAS testing could be considered a minor negative cumulative impact.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at either a Northeast Cibola Site or a West Kofa Site would change the visual characteristics of the US 95 corridor and incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts to visual resources in combination with other development projects along US 95.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. The 1,675-acre project area would change the visual characteristics of the area and incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts to visual resources.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could change the visual characteristics of the area and incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts to visual resources and would create a negative viewing experience for some observers.

3.22.1.16 Water Resources

YPG would establish 23 new TGPs in the Cibola Region and up to 12 TGPs annually in the Kofa Region. New TGPs would not be placed in washes, so no direct impacts to water resources would result. Each TGP would cover an area of up to 2.2 ac, which would be cleared of woody vegetation. Minor soil disturbance could occur and there would be increased potential for erosion. The potential for indirect impacts to water resources would vary depending on testing needs and the type of vegetation at a proposed TGP. Impacts could range from minor (limited exposed soils from vegetation clearing and not in proximity to a wash) to moderate (extensive soil exposure and in proximity to a wash). Depending on the number of TGPs needed in the Kofa Region, impacts from vegetation clearing could reach approximately 150 ac across YPG within the timeframe for vegetative recovery of a given TGP site. This would create the potential for minor cumulative impacts to surface waters on YPG, but no regional cumulative impacts to surface waters beyond the boundary of YPG would be expected.

Because potential direct effects to water resources would be confined within the boundaries of YPG and because BMPs and design features would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to offsite waters, there is little potential for interaction of the Proposed Action with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. As discussed above, no cumulative impacts would be expected on YPG.

Incremental impacts to water quality and groundwater depletion would be the potential routes of interaction with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable off-post actions. Because activities under the Proposed Action would not affect water quality, no cumulative impacts to water quality would be expected as a result of implementation of the Proposed Action. Consumptive use of groundwater would occur under the Proposed Action, but the anticipated use would be small relative to the aquifer capacity. It is expected that minor cumulative impacts to groundwater would result in conjunction with other actions that also consumptively use groundwater.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electrical energy generation facility at a West Kofa Site would create new impervious surface area over much of the 322-ac site. Development of such a facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would create new impervious surface area over much of the 1,000-ac site. Depending on post-construction stormwater controls that would be implemented with development of the facility, there could be increased stormwater runoff from the facility that could contribute to cumulative impacts to surface water and groundwater resources. Operation of the solar facility would result in consumptive use of water. The amount of operational water depends on the technology chosen during the separate NEPA analysis. However, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to groundwater from long-term consumptive use. The Northeast Cibola Site would support a 200-MW facility that would require approximately three times the water of a 60-MW facility at the West Kofa Site. The potential for cumulative impacts to moderate depending on the technology chosen (minor for a solar PV or Dish Stirling system and minor to moderate for a concentrating solar facility).

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. Should the proposed alternative (dry-cooled) be implemented the project would require over 1,150 acre-feet of water for construction of the facility and would require 200 acre-feet of water annually for operation. Should the hybrid-cooled alternative be implemented water use during construction would be comparable to that for the dry-cooled alternative, but annual operational water use would be greater, between 500 and 700 acre-feet per year. Water for the Quartzite facility would be obtained from the regional aquifers or from the Colorado River. If groundwater is the source, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to surface water from long-term consumptive use. If water is obtained from the Colorado River, there would be potential for cumulative impacts to surface water from long-term consumptive use. The potential for cumulative impacts to water resources would be minor for a dry-cooled system and would be moderate for a hybrid-cooled facility.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to water resources. Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to water resources. These proposed projects would be expected to result in increased demand for water for construction, cleaning, and operation, which could cause cumulative impacts on regional water resources from incremental increased consumption.

3.22.1.17 Wildlife and Fisheries

The cumulative effect of incremental habitat loss within YPG from all proposed activities would be moderate. No significant incremental impacts to wildlife from this habitat loss would be expected. Past and reasonably foreseeable future activities also could interact with the effects of the Proposed Action concerning impacts to wildlife. Because all impacts to wildlife resulting from the Proposed Action would be confined within the boundary of YPG and because there would be no loss of species, it is not expected that wildlife impacts of the Proposed Action would interact with off-post actions to affect regional wildlife populations.

Development of a commercial scale renewable solar electric generation facility at a West Kofa Site would result in removal of up to 322 ac of desert scrub habitat. Development of such a facility at a Northeast Cibola Site would result in removal of up to 1,000 ac of desert

scrub habitat. There likely would be minor incremental cumulative impacts to wildlife species that utilize this habitat when this loss is combined with other projects on YPG that would remove desert scrub habitat.

The Quartzite Solar Energy Project would construct a 100-MW solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzsite, Arizona in La Paz County. This project would result in the loss of up to 1,675 acres of wildlife habitat. However, it is not anticipated this would contribute to regional cumulative wildlife populations.

Construction, operation, and maintenance of the four BLM solar projects could contribute to cumulative impacts to wildlife and fisheries. While specific impacts are unknown at this time, it is likely that a substantial acreage would be cleared of native vegetation for each project, which would reduce available habitat for native wildlife and likely would contribute to individual mortality for some species. It is likely that BLM will require appropriate measures, possibly including modifications to site designs to prevent loss of any habitat type or species from the region. Therefore, any contribution to cumulative impacts to wildlife and fisheries would be expected to be minor.

3.22.2 Mitigation Summary

Table 3-26 summarizes the proposed mitigation measures for resource areas with the potential for significant impacts from the Proposed Action. Avoidance of resources would be considered as the primary mitigation measure, but it would not be possible to avoid all resources for all proposed activities. The table shows potential mitigation measures, including implementation of BMPs, in the event avoidance is not practicable.

A discussion of each resource area follows the table and contains additional details regarding potential mitigation measures and the conditions under which each may be appropriate. There are no significant impacts, and thus no mitigation, for the following resource areas: airspace management, energy/utilities, environmental justice and protection of children, geological resources, recreation, and socioeconomics. Summaries of the proposed mitigation measures for these resource areas are not included. This document

TABLE 3-26

Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures for Each Resource Area Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Mitigation Measures	Document Section
Air Quality	Yes, for activities in non-attainment area	Implement BMPs during construction to reduce fugitive dust emissions. Yuma would revise the Title V permit as needed to align with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) regulations and Title V permit monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements.	3.2.2.4
Airspace Management	No	Continue coordination with MCAS Yuma and private/commercial air traffic controllers.	3.3.2.3
Cultural Resources	Yes	Implement Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) procedures; avoid or protect significant sites; monitor protection measures; implement data	3.4.8

TABLE 3-26

Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures for Each Resource Area Yuma Proving Ground

Resource Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Mitigation Measures	Document Section
		recovery; coordinate/consult with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Native American tribes, as appropriate, and implement any required mitigation from SHPO consultation. Environmental Awareness Training for persons working in areas where paleobotanical resources occur.	
Energy/Utilities	No	Incorporate energy-efficient design into new buildings. Use solar lights where practicable. Recycle/reuse to the extent practicable.	3.5.2.4
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	No	None	3.6.2.3
Fire Management	Yes	Develop and implement a program to monitor invasive plants; continue to implement ITAM; coordinate with BLM, Kofa NWR, and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) on fire management; develop and interpret wildfire data with other agencies.	3.7.2.4
Geological Resources	No	None	3.8.2.3
Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste	Yes	Continue management of hazardous materials; consult with state and federal agencies; manage and dispose of hazardous materials and wastes in compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance; follow standard protective measures and procedures. Update, as necessary and implement SPCCP. Require non-ozone- depleting chemicals as refrigerants in new air conditioning systems.	3.9.2.4
Land Use	Yes	Continue coordination with local plans to avoid incompatibilities, as appropriate.	3.10.2.4
Noise	Yes	Require construction workers to use appropriate hearing protection. Maintain aircraft operations in compliance with established Installation Compatible Use Zones (ICUZs). Locate noise-generating activities away from sensitive noise receptors and use natural barriers where practicable. Conduct noise-intensive activities during favorable weather conditions where practicable.	3.11.2.4

Resource Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Mitigation Measures	Document Section
		Use lower noise products where practicable. Continue noise complaint management procedure and implement fly- neighborly programs. Adjust timing of disruptive activities and inform the public of unusual increases in intensity of testing and training.	
Recreation	No	None	3.12.2.4
Safety	Yes	Minimize potential risks and exposure; require contractors to follow Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards; comply with YPG safety program and specific safety protocols for testing and training activities.	3.13.2.4
Socioeconomics	No	None	3.14.2.4
Soils	Yes	Avoid highly erodible soils; minimize soil disturbance to the extent practicable; implement construction BMPs and stormwater controls; continue to implement ITAM program and Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP).	3.15.2.5
Threatened or Endangered Species and Species of Concern	Yes	Avoid known sensitive habitats during siting process. Avoid impacts to water sources; schedule construction projects to avoid or minimize conflicts with reproduction; avoid implementing activities in areas where sensitive species occur to the extent practicable; relocate or deter species to minimize impacts if necessary; implement INRMP procedures. Limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable. Avoid vegetation where feasible. Should the Sonoran desert tortoise be	3.16.2.4
		listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), then activities proposed in areas where the tortoise may occur on YPG would be re-evaluated with regard to potential impacts and appropriate consultation with the USFWS would be conducted prior to any land-disturbing activities.	
		Should the experimental Sonoran pronghorn population in the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge be reclassified under the ESA, then activities proposed in areas where the pronghorn may occur	

TABLE 3-26

Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures for Each Resource Area Yuma Proving Ground

TABLE 3-26

Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures for Each Resource Area *Yuma Proving Ground*

Resource Area	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Mitigation Measures	Document Section
		on YPG would be re-evaluated with regard to potential impacts and appropriate consultation with the USFWS would be conducted prior to any land-disturbing activities.	
Traffic/Transportation	Yes	Implement traffic control procedures as appropriate; minimize construction activities during peak traffic periods on YPG.	3.17.2.3
Vegetation	Yes	Develop and implement a program to monitor invasive plants; continue to implement ITAM and INRMP; implement appropriate construction BMPs and stormwater controls. Limit surface- disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable. Avoid vegetation where feasible.	3.18.2.4
Visual Resources	Yes	Apply appropriate dust suppression practices; design buildings to blend with existing structures; continue implementation of the Environmental Awareness program.	3.19.2.4
Water Resources	Yes	Develop and implement Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) to reduce potential for environmental exposure to pollutants in stormwater. Implement appropriate construction BMPs and stormwater controls; design to maximize use of pervious and semi-pervious surfaces; continue to implement INRMP; implement any mitigation required in Section 404 permits obtained.	3.20.2.4
Wildlife and Fisheries	Yes	Avoid wildlife concentration areas and sensitive habitats (e.g. water sources); schedule construction projects to avoid or minimize conflicts with reproduction; continue to implement INRMP. Limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable. Avoid vegetation where feasible.	3.21.2.4

Notes:

Information provided is summarized from the analysis provided for each resource area elsewhere in Section 3. Mitigation measures identified would be implemented, as appropriate, for each specific activity undertaken. Only those measures appropriate for a given action would be implemented.

presents a programmatic approach to impact analysis. For some resource areas, additional analysis may be required to assess impacts from specific activities and additional mitigation measures may be developed.

3.22.2.1 Air Quality

Mitigation measures would reduce fugitive dust emissions during construction. Measures to reduce or eliminate fugitive dust emissions would include the use of BMPs during construction.

3.22.2.2 Airspace Management

To reduce impacts and conflicts with airspace management, YPG would continue to coordinate with MCAS Yuma and private and commercial air traffic controllers.

3.22.2.3 Cultural Resources

The YPG ICRMP explains how YPG can mitigate impacts to significant historic properties through avoidance, physical protection, data recovery, or other mitigation measures. As there are currently no NRHP-eligible structures on YPG, there is no discussion of mitigation measures for historic structures.

The following are treatment plans for the protection and mitigation of prehistoric, historic archaeological sites, and paleobotanical resources: avoidance of areas with known significant sites; physical protection of individual sites through fencing, berming, or other protective measures to make the sites inaccessible; and monitoring the effectiveness of the protection measures

U.S. Army Garrison has determined that implementation of projects in this DPEIS would affect historic properties at YPG. A PA is being developed, in consultation with SHPO, ACHP, and interested tribes, that will identify means to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the potential effects.

Through the planning process for the Proposed Action, activities were sited to avoid known archaeological and paleobotanical resources to the extent practicable in order to minimize impacts to significant cultural resources. For areas proposed for activities where previous cultural resource surveys have not been conducted, measures may include surveys, tribal consultation, compliance with stipulations in the Section 106 PA, and activity-specific NEPA analysis.

Environmental Awareness Training would be implemented for persons working or training on YPG for cultural resources. This training would explain the importance of archaeological and paleobotanical resources and the protection of these resources on YPG

3.22.2.4 Energy/Utilities

To mitigate and reduce the energy demand of the Proposed Action YPG would incorporate energy-efficient design into new buildings and use solar lights where practicable.

3.22.2.5 Fire Management

Mitigation measures would reduce the potential for fires and improve fire management. YPG is developing a program to monitor and manage all invasive plants on YPG. YPG would continue to implement ITAM and restore disturbed areas to natural conditions when practicable to prevent the spread of exotic invasive species. YPG would continue to coordinate with BLM, the Kofa NWR, and the USFS on fire management strategies and to develop and interpret wildfire data. To the extent allowed within safety constraints from UXO, efforts to control and manage wildfires on YPG would be implemented.

3.22.2.6 Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste

Mitigation of the potential impacts from the Proposed Action includes the continued management of hazardous materials using existing environmental programs and guidance to manage the handling and disposal of hazardous materials and waste in compliance with applicable laws and regulations. If new facilities would be sited in previously contaminated sites, appropriate protective measures would be implemented to safeguard construction workers. If contaminated soil is encountered during construction, it would be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with appropriate regulations. Appropriate protective procedures would be implemented to result in potential exposure to ACM.

In the event that munitions and explosives of concern are discovered in areas of proposed construction, they would not be disturbed until qualified personnel could properly assess and implement appropriate disposition. As required, the Army would consult with the appropriate state and federal agencies.

3.22.2.7 Land Use

YPG would continue coordination and participation in local plans and development meetings to ensure that encroachment and land use incompatibilities from adjacent lands are avoided.

3.22.2.8 Noise

Measures to prevent land use incompatibilities with adjacent lands, including impacts from noise, would include physical and procedural measures. Physical mitigation measures would include:

- Locating or relocating ranges relative to natural barriers such as valleys and mountains
- Constructing berms or barriers around small caliber ranges
- Orienting noise sources toward the interior of the installation and away from sensitive receptors

Procedural mitigation measures would include:

- Participating actively in local and regional planning, including use of GIS and noise contours
- Conducting noise-intensive activities under favorable weather conditions that minimize noise transfer
- Maintaining aircraft operations in compliance with established ICUZ
- Implementing fly-neighborly programs
- Adjusting the timing of particularly disruptive activities where feasible
- Informing the public of any unusual increases in intensity of testing and training activities or of activities to be resumed after a period of inactivity
- Reviewing EAs and EISs
- Monitoring noise on the ground when appropriate

• Implementing noise complaint management procedures

To minimize human exposure, safety zones and hazardous noise areas would be established as needed and would include the use of noise level meters and warning signs.

3.22.2.9 Safety

YPG would implement mitigation measures to minimize the potential adverse impacts to safety from construction and active munitions areas. During construction, workers would follow appropriate OSHA regulations and on-post personnel would comply with the YPG safety program. Each testing and training activity would have a specific safety protocol that would be followed.

3.22.2.10 Soils

Mitigation measures, including measures implemented to avoid impacts, would address the potential for increased erosion from either wind or water. All disturbed soils would have a greater potential for erosion because the soils would be directly exposed to the effects of precipitation and wind. Mitigation measures would include: planning, site selection, and site design to avoid disturbance of highly erodible soils; implementation of construction BMPs to minimize the potential for onsite erosion (for example, preserving existing vegetation, mulching, slope protection, silt fencing, wet suppression and chemical dust suppression); construction and post-construction stormwater controls (for example, site design, temporary detention areas, mulching, use of pervious and semi-pervious surfaces); and continued implementation of the ITAM program and the INRMP.

3.22.2.11 Threatened or Endangered Species and Species of Concern

By avoiding known TES species locations and water sources, YPG would minimize the potential for impacts to TES species. When implementing construction projects in areas where TES animal species are likely to nest or den, YPG would schedule construction to occur outside the nesting or denning period where practicable.

Surveys would be conducted to minimize the potential for impacts from activities proposed within or adjacent to high quality TES species habitat, as necessary. If TES species are found in the proposed activity areas, YPG would determine whether the proposed activity could be relocated. If relocation of the activity is not practicable, YPG would relocate TES species to nearby suitable habitat if practicable. If proposed activities could not be scheduled outside the nesting/denning periods for TES species, work could be delayed until after young had fledged or departed the area when practicable or the nest could be sheltered in place using the appropriate protocols through coordination with AGFD.

Where vegetation clearing might occur in or adjacent to suitable habitat for the banded Gila monster or Sonoran desert tortoise, simple barriers such as silt fencing would be placed to deter entry by these species.

Should the Sonoran desert tortoise be listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA, either additional coordination or ESA Section 7 consultation with USFWS would occur prior to any land-disturbing activities in areas where Sonoran desert tortoise are known to occur on YPG. Depending on the activity, either a Biological Assessment or Biological Evaluation would be prepared to support consultation.

To minimize the potential for impacts to TES species YPG would limit surface-disturbing activities to the smallest area practicable and would avoid vegetation where feasible.

The INRMP directs the management of natural resources, including TES species within YPG. Through continued implementation of the INRMP, YPG utilizes the best available scientific knowledge and techniques to manage its resources. Measures that would be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to soils, vegetation, and water resources would provide indirect benefits to wildlife through improved habitat conditions.

3.22.2.12 Traffic/Transportation

YPG would implement mitigation to minimize the potential adverse impacts to traffic from temporary road closures. During road closures, traffic control procedures would be implemented such as flaggers or posted detours. During construction of the Aberdeen Road flood upgrades, appropriate traffic control measures would be implemented to minimize the disruption of traffic flow, and may include detours, timing construction to avoid peak traffic volume times, and flaggers.

3.22.2.13 Vegetation

Construction and post-construction stormwater controls would be implemented to facilitate infiltration and reduce the potential for scour. Depending on the location of the new impervious areas, the potential loss of vegetation through scour from erosive water flow could extend off-post and affect vegetation on adjacent downstream properties. During construction, BMPs would be used to stabilize disturbed soils, which would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to vegetation as a result of erosion of exposed disturbed soils from stormwater runoff.

YPG would modify its INRMP to address invasive plant species control in the new disturbed areas. Without future management to control exotic invasive plant species, the impacts to vegetation from displacement of native species could be significant. Continued implementation of the YPG ITAM program would help to maintain desert vegetation in areas used for training activities. It would also maintain or rehabilitate testing and training areas to maintain conditions that realistically simulate conditions in other desert regions.

3.22.2.14 Visual Resources

The use of dust suppression practices during construction would minimize the amount of airborne dust. New buildings would be designed using the YPG Installation Design Guide to blend with the existing visual landscape. The YPG Environmental Awareness program developed instructions for units training on YPG that include proper procedures and avoidance measures to be implemented during ground-based training activities to minimize potential impacts to areas of aesthetic and visual value.

3.22.2.15 Water Resources

There would be potential for localized increased runoff from new impervious areas. Without appropriate control measures, increased runoff could affect downstream areas, including off-post lands, by creating scour that could remove soils from uplands along washes. Stormwater controls would be implemented to facilitate infiltration and reduce the potential for scour (for example, site design, use of temporary detention areas, preserving existing vegetation, mulching, use of pervious and semi-pervious surfaces). YPG would obtain a CWA Section 404 permit from USACE and CWA Section 401 Water Quality certification from ADEQ prior to construction of the Aberdeen Road flood improvements. YPG and its construction contractor would be required to comply with all conditions of the CWA Section 404 permit and Section 401 Water Quality certification, including implementation of any mitigation that may be specified as a condition of the permit.

The INRMP directs YPG to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, including CWA Section 404 permits, CWA Section 401 water quality certifications, and Arizona Department of Water Resources Water Rights.

3.22.2.16 Wildlife and Fisheries

The following steps would be used when practicable to minimize impacts: avoid wildlife concentration areas; avoid impacts to water sources; schedule construction projects to avoid or minimize conflicts with reproduction; and continue to implement INRMP procedures.

YPG considered potential impacts to wildlife in selecting locations for proposed activities in order to avoid wildlife concentration and water sources. When implementing construction projects in areas where wildlife are likely to nest or den, YPG would schedule construction to occur outside the nesting or denning period where practicable.

Through continued implementation of the INRMP, YPG utilizes the best available scientific knowledge and techniques to manage wildlife, including, but not limited to: survey, monitor, and analyze wildlife population trend information; assess wildlife habitat needs; maintain wildlife habitat needs; maintain wildlife movement corridors and migration routes; ensure water tanks provide the needed water for wildlife; relocate wildlife; minimize illegal hunting and unauthorized activities; cooperate with AGFD and USFWS for wildlife rehabilitation and law enforcement.

Measures that would be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to soils, vegetation, and water resources would provide indirect benefits to wildlife through improved habitat conditions.

List of Preparers

NEPA Project Team

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Joe	Hand	USACE
Karla	James	YPG Environmental Science Division
Meg	McDonald	YPG Environmental Science Division
Sergio	Obregon	YPG Environmental Science Division
Charles	Ruerup	YPG Environmental Science Division

List of Preparers

Name	Degree(s)	Years of Experience	Document Sections
Mark Cochran	BA, Biology	31	3
David Dunagan	MA, English	29	All
Michael Graham	BS, Urban and Regional Studies MURP Urban and Regional Planning MIM International Management AICP	32	2
Josh Jamell	BS, Ecology	12	All
Elizabeth Jorgensen	BS, Environmental Science	8	All
Sara Kent	BS, Ecology	6	3
Jay Minix	BS, Environmental Geology	12	2,3
Sara Orton	BS, Political Science MPS, Preservation Studies	14	1,2,3
Robert Price	BS, Zoology, History MS, Environmental Science Master of Public Affairs	17	All
Richard Reaves	BS, Wildlife Ecology and Resource Management PhD, Wetland and Wildlife Ecology	20	All
Janet Hill	BS, Civil Engineering MS, Civil Engineering	17	3
Tom Simpson	PhD, Ecology	29	All
Frank Smith	BS, Industrial Engineering MS, Administration AICP	24	2

Kira Zender	MS, Urban and Regional Planning	18	All
Melanie Wiggins	BS, Biology MAS, Environmental Policy and Management	18	3
Ron Vaughn	BS, Chemical Engineering MS, Environmental Engineering	21	3
Greg Twigg	BA, Geography	13	2,3
Scott Smith	BS, Geology	13	2,3

Distribution List

Native American Organization

Ak-Chin Indian Community Chemehuevi Indian Tribe Cocopah Indian Tribe Colorado River Indian Tribes Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Fort Mojave Indian Tribe Gila River Indian Community Council Quechan Indian Tribe Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community San Carlos Apache Tribe Hopi Tribe Tohono O'Odham Nation Yavapai-Apache Nation

Agency

ACC PMS/CEV Arizona Department of Agriculture, Native Plant Program Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division Arizona Game and Fish Department Bureau of Indian Affairs - Western Regional Office Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office Environmental Department MCAS Yuma Imperial National Wildlife Refuge Kofa National Wildlife Refuge Southwest Arizona National Wildlife Refuge Complex U.S. Border Patrol Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Yuma Area Office U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wellton-Mohawk Natural Resources Conservation District NRCS Yuma Service Center Laguna Natural Resource Conservation District (NRCD), Yuma NRCD **Public and Local Government** Arizona Deer Association Arizona Desert Bighorn Sheep Society Arizona Historical Society Arizona Wilderness Coalition Audubon Society City of Yuma Greater Yuma Economic Development Corp La Paz County Sierra Club, Grand Canyon Chapter Yuma Chamber of Commerce Military Affairs Committee Yuma County Yuma County Chamber of Commerce Yuma County Development Services

Political Representatives

City of Yuma Congressman Raul M. Grijalva – AZD07 House of Representatives House of Representatives La Paz County Community Development United States Senate United States Senate

Yuma County

SECTION 6 References

AECOM, bws architects, and Kaya Associates, Inc. 2011. *Installation Design Guide Prepared for U.S. Army/Yuma Proving Ground*. January.

Arizona Department of Commerce. 2006. *Arizona Military Regional Compatibility Project Policy Guidebook*. July.

Arizona Department of Economic Security. 2006. Population Projections from 2006-2055, Research Administration, Population Statistics Unit. March 31.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). 2006. *Yuma PM*₁₀ *Maintenance Plan*. Air Quality Division. August 11, 2006.

http://www.azdeq.gov/environ/air/plan/download/yumaplan.pdf Accessed on February 8, 2013.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). 2008. Fact Sheet: Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System 2008 Construction General Permit (AZG2008-01). Available from: <u>http://www.azdeq.gov/environ/water/permits/index.html</u>.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). 2009. U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground ADEQ Report.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). 2010. 2006/2008 List of 3030(d) Impaired Waters. http://www.azdeq.gov/environ/water/assessment/assess.html. Accessed on May 23, 2011.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). 2011a. State of Arizona Air Monitoring Network Plan for the Year 2011. Air Quality Division, Air Assessment Section Final Report, August 2, 2011.

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). 2011b. Water Quality Division: Application Forms and Guidance. http://www.azdeq.gov/function/forms/ appswater.html#cgp. Accessed on May 26, 2011.

Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). 2005. *Erosion and Pollution Control Manual*. February. Available at: http://www.azdot.gov/inside_adot/OES/Water_Quality/Stormwater/Index.asp.

Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). 2013. Yuma District – Current Projects. Http://www.azdot.gov/highways/districts/Yuma/Current_Projects.asp. Accessed on June 17, 2013.

Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR). 2009. Arizona Water Atlas. Volume 7, Lower Colorado River Planning Area.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD). 2008. Nichol Turk's Head cactus (*Echinocactus horizonthalonius* var. *nicholii*). Unpublished abstract compiled and edited by the Heritage Data Management System, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ. 7 p.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), 2010a. Game Management Unit 43B, updated March 2010. http://www.AGFD.gov/h_f/hunting_units_43b.shtml. Accessed on March 11, 2011.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), 2010b. Game Management Unit 41, updated April 2010. http://www.AGFD.gov/h_f/hunting_units_41.shtml. Accessed on March 11, 2011.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD). 2010c. Element Status Designations by County, Taxon, Scientific Name. Updated November 24. Accessed from Arizona Game and Fish Department Species Lists.

http://www.azgfd.gov/w_c/edits/hdms_species_lists.shtml. Accessed on February 8, 2013.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD). 2011a. Reptile Abstracts, Distribution Maps, and Illustrations. http://www.azgfd.com/w_c/edits/hdms_abstracts_reptiles.shtml. Accessed on February 25, 2011.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD). 2011b. Mammal Abstracts, Distribution Maps, and Illustrations. http://www.azgfd.com/w_c/edits/hdms_abstracts_mammals.shtml. Accessed on February 25, 2011.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD). 2011c. Plant Abstracts, Distribution Maps, and Illustrations. http://www.azgfd.com/w_c/edits/hdms_abstracts_plants.shtml. Accessed on February 25, 2011.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD). 2011d. Bird Abstracts, Distribution Maps, and Illustrations. http://www.azgfd.com/w_c/edits/hdms_abstracts_birds.shtml. Accessed on February 25, 2011.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD). 2011e. Wildlife Use of Mesquite Bosques in the Sonoran Desert. http://www.azgfd.gov/w_c/WildlifeUseMesquiteBosque.shtml. Accessed on October 28, 2011.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), 2012. Game Management Unit 43A, updated May 2012. http://www.AGFD.gov/h_f/hunting_units_43a.shtml. Accessed on January 07, 2013.

Berli, M., T.G. Caldwell, E.V. McDonald, and D.A. Gilewitch. 2007. Modeling Desert Pavement Deterioration due to Heavy Vehicle Traffic. Proceedings of the Joint North America, Asia-Pacific ISTVS Conference and Annual Meeting of Japanese Society for Terramechanics. June 23-26, 2007.

Brandon, Michael. 2011a. Personal communication with Rich Reaves/CH2M HILL. October 24, 2011.

Brandon, Michael. 2011b. Personal communication with Melanie Wiggins/CH2M HILL. May 17, 2011.

Brown, J.K. and J.K Smith (editors). 2000. Wildland fire in ecosystems: effects of fire on flora. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-42-vol. 2. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 257 pp.

Bullard, Thomas F., Eric V. McDonald, E. Jamie Trammell, and Graham K. Dalldorf. 2011.

Development of a Geomorphic-Based Archaeological Sensitivity Model for the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona. Prepared by Desert Research Institute. On file at Environmental Sciences Division, U.S. Army Garrison, Yuma Proving Ground, Yuma, Arizona.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2006. The Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971 (Public Law 92-195). January.

Bureau of Land Management California. 2011. Imperial Sand Dunes. http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/elcentro/recreation/ohvs/isdra.html. Accessed on January 17, 2011.

Bureau of Reclamation. 1996. *Biological Assessment: Description and Assessment of Operations, Maintenance, and Sensitive Species of the Lower Colorado River-August 1996* http://www.usbr.gov/lc/region/g2000/assess/toc.htm. Accessed on March 9, 2011.

Caldwell, T.G., E.V. McDonald, S.N. Bacon, and G. Stullenbarger. 2008. *The Performance and Sustainability of Vehicle Dust Courses for Military Testing*. Journal of Terramechanics 45: 213-221.

California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA). 2003. Wind Erosion Control. January.

Climate Change Advisory Group. 2006. Climate Change Action Plan. August, 2006. Accessed from ADEQ Arizona Climate Change Initiatives: Documents Website. http://www.azclimatechange.gov/docs.html. Accessed on March 21, 2011.

Cocopah Indian Tribe. 2011. Yuma Arizona Recreation. http://www.cocopah.com/recreation.html. Accessed on December 6, 2011.

Colorado Plateau-Land Use History Northern Arizona (CP-LUHNA) 1998. *Endangered Fish and of the Colorado Plateau*. http://cpluhna.nau.edu/Biota/fishes.htm. Accessed on January 5, 2011.

Department of Defense (DoD). 1998. Stratigraphic, Sedimentologic, and Paleobotanical Investigations of Terrace Gravels, U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground. January.

Department of Defense (DoD). 2010. Memorandum of DOD Implementation of Storm Water Requirements under Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA). January 19.

Dickinson, J.E., Land, M., Faunt, C.C., Leake, S.A., Reichard, E.G., and J.B. Fleming. 2006. Hydrogeologic Framework Refinement, Ground-Water Flow and Storage, Water-Chemistry Analyses, and Water-Budget Components of the Yuma Area, Southwestern Arizona and Southeastern California. Prepared in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, U.S.

Flores, M. 2011. YPG water treatment plants soon to begin operating. Special to Yuma Sun, February 18, 2011 5:02 PM. http://www.yumasun.com/articles/water-67768-area-ground.htm. Accessed on March 9, 2011.

Franklin, Patrick. 2013. Personal communication to CH2M HILL. Expanded Descriptions of Kofa and Cibola Region Activities. January 30, 2013.

Global Security. 2013. Preliminary Planning. Army FM 5-430-00-2 Chapter 10. http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/5-430-00-2/Ch10.htm. Accessed on January 17, 2013. Glover, J. 2011. Personal communication to J. Jamell/CH2M HILL. May 2, 2011.

Gutierrez Canales Engineering, P.C. 2011. Environmental Assessment, Cibola Impact Areas. April. Prepared for Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground/

Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. and Jason Associates Corporation. 2001. Final Range Wide Environmental Impact Statement, U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, Yuma and La Paz Counties, Arizona. Command Technology Directorate CSTE-DTC-YP-CD-ES. July 2001.

Hendricks, D. M. 1985. Arizona Soils. College of Agriculture, University of Arizona.

Homefacts.com. 2011a. Yuma County Federal Communication Commission Towers. http://www.homefacts.com/fcctowers/Arizona/Yuma-County.html. Accessed on June 22, 2011.

Homefacts.com. 2011b. La Paz County Federal Communication Commission Towers. http://www.homefacts.com/fcctowers/Arizona/La-Paz-County.html. Accessed on June 22, 2011.

Hoon, Brian. 2013. Personal communication to Rob Price/CH2M HILL and Richard Reaves/CH2M HILL regarding Wastewater Resources. August 6, 2013.

Inter Tribal Council of Arizona. 2011a. Cocopah Tribe. http://www.itcaonline.com/tribes_cocopah.html. Accessed on February 10, 2011.

Inter Tribal Council of Arizona. 2011b. Quechan Tribe. http://itcaonline.com/?page_id=1173. Accessed on February 8, 2013.

Inter Tribal Council of Arizona. 2011c. Colorado River Indian Tribes. http://www.itcaonline.com/tribes_colriver.html. Accessed on February 10, 2011.

James, Karla. 2011. Personal communication with Rob Price/CH2M HILL on 5/9/11 regarding cultural resources surveys at YPG.

Jason Associates Corporation. 2000. Environmental Assessment for the Combat Systems Test Complex, May 30, 2000. Command Technology Directorate CSTE-DTC-YP-CD. Jason Associates Corporation. May 2000.

Jason Associates Corporation. 2001. Environmental Assessment for Mohave Drop Zone. Prepared for U.S. Army Proving Ground Command Technology Directorate. Jason Associates Corporation. September, 2001.

Jason Associates Corporation. 2007. Environmental Assessment for the Joint Experimentation Range Complex (JERC) III, Operational Road Course and Service/Access Road. December 2007.

Jason Associates Corporation. 2008a. Final Environmental Assessment for the Unmanned Aircraft Systems Test Center. Jason Associates Corporation. January 2008.

Jason Associates Corporation. 2008b. Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Cobra Flats, Comanche Flats, and Site 2 Military Training Areas. January 2008.

Jason Associates Corporation. 2008c. Final Environmental Assessment for the Army Test Tracks. Prepared for U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Jason Associates Corporation. March 2008. Jason Associates Corporation. 2008d. Hazardous Waste Management Plan U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground Yuma, Arizona, August.

Jason Associates Corporation and North Wind Environmental. 2000. Solid Waste Facility Plan, Revised Final Report. Prepared for U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. October 2000.

Johnson, M.; Holmes, J.; Weber, R.; and Dionne, M. 2006. Yellow-billed Cuckoo Distribution, Abundance and Habitat Use Along the Lower Colorado and Gila Rivers in La Paz and Yuma Counties, 2005, Final Report. July 30.

Lewis, Marla. Personal communication with Melanie Wiggins/CH2M HILL. June 23, 2011 regarding SWMUs at YPG.

The Maguire Company. 2008. Economic Impact of Arizona's Principal Military Operations, Final Report.

McDonald, Alison. Personal communication with Rob Price/CH2M HILL. May 02, 2011 regarding cultural resource surveys at YPG.

McDonald E., E. Hamerlynck, J. McAuliffe, and T. Caldwell. 2004. *Analysis of Desert Shrubs Along First-Order Channels on Desert Piedmonts: Possible Indicators of Ecosystem Condition and Historic Variation.* Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. Desert Research Institute.

Merrill, Laura. Personal communication with CH2M HILL. December 19, 2012 regarding invasive plant species on YPG.

Mittlehauser Corporation. 1994. Environmental Assessment Yuma Proving Ground United States Army. Original Document (1987) by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Michael Brandman Associates, Inc., revised by Mittlehauser Corporation, 1994.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 1991. The soil survey of the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona-parts of La Paz and Yuma Counties, U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey Report, 164 p.

Neary, D.G., K.C. Ryan, and L.F. DeBano. 2005. Wildland fire in ecosystems: effects of fire on soils and water. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-42-vol.4. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 250 pp.

Obregon, Sergio. 2013a. Personal communication to Rich Reaves/CH2M HILL and Kira Zender/CH2M HILL regarding 2012 Air Emissions Report. July 11, 2013.

Obregon, Sergio. 2013b. Personal communication to Rob Price/CH2M HILL and Richard Reaves/CH2M HILL regarding Water Resources. August 1, 2013.

Obregon, Sergio. 2013c. Personal communication to Rob Price/CH2M HILL and Richard Reaves/CH2M HILL regarding DU Comments. January 29, 2013.

Office of the Undersecretary of Defense. 2010. *DoD Policy on Implementing Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA)*.

Parsons. 2008. Long Range Component, Real Property Master Plan. Preliminary Submittal. October.

Parsons. 2011. Long Range Component, Real Property Master Plan. Final Submittal. March 2011.

Phillips, S.J. and P.W. Comus (editors). 2000. A Natural History of the Sonoran Desert. Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum. University of California Press. 628 pp.

President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1997. Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act.

http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/ccenepa/ccenepa.htm. Accessed on June 2, 2011.

Reilly, T.E., Dennehy, K.F., Alley, W.M., and Cunningham, W.L. 2008. Ground-Water Availability in the United States: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1323, 70 p., also available online at http://pubs.usgs.gov/circ/1323/

Robson, S.G. and E.R. Banta. 1995. HA 730-C: Groundwater Atlas of the United States Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah. Online Version of the Groundwater Atlas of the United States, available from http://pubs.usgs.gov/ha/ha730/ch_c/index.html.

Skaggs, Gregory. 2013. Personal Communication with Rich Reaves/CH2M HILL in regards to the Energy/Utility Section.

Solutia Inc. 2012a. MSDS for Therminol products - North America. <u>http://www</u>. therminol.com/pages/region/na/msds.asp. Accessed on November 2, 2012.

Solutia Inc. 2012b. MSDS for Therminol 66. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u>pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012c. MSDS for Therminol 72. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u> pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012d. MSDS for Therminol 75. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u>pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012e. MSDS for Therminol LT. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u>pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012f. MSDS for Therminol VP-3. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u> pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012g. MSDS for Therminol VP-1. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u>pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012h. MSDS for Therminol XP. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u>pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012i. MSDS for Therminol FF. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u>pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012j. MSDS for Therminol 55. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u>pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012k. MSDS for Therminol D-12. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u> pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012l. MSDS for Therminol VLT. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u>pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012m. MSDS for Therminol 59. Available from <u>http://www.therminol.com/</u>pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Solutia Inc. 2012n. MSDS for Therminol 62. Available from http://www.therminol.com/pages/region/na/msds.asp.

Sonoran Desert Museum. 2011. Invaders of the Sonoran Desert Region: Sahara Mustard (*Brassica tournefortii*).

http://www.desertmuseum.org/invaders/invaders_saharamustard.php. Accessed on May 27, 2011.

Spellenberg, R. 2003. Sonoran Desert Wildflowers: A Falcon Guide. The Globe Pequot Press. 246 pp.

Tierra Environmental Services. 2001. Final Native American Consultation Plan for U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, Yuma, Arizona. Report on file at Environmental Sciences Division, U.S. Army Garrison, Yuma Proving Ground, Yuma, Arizona.

Trafzer, Clifford E. In preparation. Quechan Indian Traditional Lands on Yuma Proving Ground.

Tribal Energy and Environmental Information Clearinghouse. 2012. Solar Energy System Descriptions. <u>http://teeic.anl.gov/er/solar/restech/desc/index.cfm</u>. Accessed on November 2, 2012.

U.S. Army. 2011. Pollution Prevention (P2). U.S. Army Environmental Command website http://aec.army.mil/usaec/p2/index.html. Accessed on March 8, 2011.

U.S. Army Environmental Command (USAEC). 2005. USAEC Environmental Update: Spring 2005. http://aec.army.mil/usaec/newsroom/update/spr05/spr0518.html. Accessed on March 29, 2011.

U.S. Army Environmental Command (USAEC). 2007. NEPA Analysis Guidance Manual. 404 pp plus appendices.

U.S. Army Environmental Command (USAEC). 2012. Memorandum For Record: YPG Solar Development.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, Environmental Sciences Directorate (YPG). 2004. Environmental Assessment for the Joint Experimental Range Complex. March 2, 2004.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, Environmental Sciences Directorate (YPG) 2006. Environmental Assessment for the Joint Experimental Range Complex. August 2006.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). 2007. Hazardous Waste Treatment Facility-Arizona HWMA Permit Application.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). 2008a. *Standard Operating Procedure* (*SOP*) for Conducting Automotive Testing (YP-YTC-P-5001). Yuma Test Center. 17 December 2008.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). 2008b. *Standard Operating Procedure* (*SOP*) for Conducting Combat Vehicle Weapons Systems and Ammunition (YP-YTC-P-5100). Yuma Test Center.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). 2008c. Form 1391: Open Burn Pad with Storm Retention.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). 2011a. Learn More About Yuma Proving Ground. http://www.yuma.army.mil/chub_what.shtml. Accessed on February 8, 2011.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). 2011b. Family Assistance Center. http://www.yuma.army.mil/garrison/sites/services/family.asp. Accessed on February 10, 2011.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). 2012a. Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, Yuma, Arizona, Fiscal Years 2012-2016. Revised by David Rhode of Desert Research Institute, and Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground Yuma, Arizona (YPG). 2012b. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan and Environmental Assessment. June 2012.

U.S. Army Installation Management Command. 2010. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Practices and Procedures. IMCOM Circular 200-10-1. 22 November 2010.

U.S. Army Public Health Command. 2011. U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground Draft Installation Operational Noise Management Plan. September.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation: Lower Colorado Region – Phoenix Office (USBR). 2009. *Native Aquatic Species of the Gila River Basin in Arizona and New Mexico*. http://www.usbr.gov/lc/phoenix/biology/azfish/profintro.html. Accessed on January 5, 2011.

U.S. Census Bureau (USCB). 2000. (NP-D1-A) Projections of the Resident Population by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1999 to 2100. Issued January 13.

U.S. Census Bureau (USCB). 2011a. American FactFinder 2010 Census Data. http://factfinder2.census.gov/main.html. Accessed on November 18, 2011.

U.S. Census Bureau (USCB). 2011b. American Community Survey Data from 2008 to 2010, Poverty Data. <u>http://factfinder2.census.gov/main.html</u>. Accessed on November 18, 2011.

U.S. Census Bureau (USCB). 2011c. American FactFinder 1990 Summary File 1 Population Data. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTGeoSearchByListServlet?ds_name=DEC_1990_STF1_&_lang=en&_ts=315160907488. Accessed on February 7, 2011.

U.S. Census Bureau (USCB). 2011d. American FactFinder 2000 Summary File 1 Data. http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTSubjectShowTablesServlet?_ts=315161122561. Accessed on February 7, 2011.

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. 1993. *Energy Efficiency: Challenges and Opportunities for Electric Utilities, OTA-E-561*. September.

U.S. Department of Energy, undated. Concentrating Solar Power Commercial Application Study: Reducing Water Consumption of Concentrating Solar Power Electricity Generation. Report to Congress. Available from: <u>http://www.nrel.gov/csp/publications.html</u>. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1974. *Information Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*. EPA/ONAC 550/9-74-004. March 1974.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2009a. Enclosure 2: Waters Added by EPA to Arizona's Section 303(d) 2006-2008 List. http://www.epa.gov/region09/water/tmdl/arizona.html. Accessed on May 23, 2011.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2009b. Technical Guidance on Implementing the Stormwater Runoff Requirements for Federal Projects under Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act. EPA 841-B-09-001. December 2009.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2010. Glossary of Climate Change Terms.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2012. National Ambient Air Quality Standards. http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html. Accessed on July 31, 2013.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2011a. Climate Change: Greenhouse gas Emissions. <u>http://epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/index.html</u>. Accessed on March 7, 2011.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2011b. Draft Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2009. http://epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/usinventoryreport.html. Accessed on March 21, 2011.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2012. National Ambient Air Quality Standards. http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html. Accessed on July 31, 2013.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2013. State and County Emission Summaries. <u>http://www.epa.gov/air/emissions/</u>. Accessed July 30, 2013.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2003. Monitoring Plan for the American Peregrine Falcon. December.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2005. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (Empidonax trallii eximus); Final Rule. Federal Register Vol. 70, No. 201. Wednesday October 19, 2005.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2008a. Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. http://www.fws.gov/southwest/refuges/arizona/kofa/index.html. Accessed on January 17, 2011.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2009a. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Brown Pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis*) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife. Vol. 74, No. 220. Tuesday November 17, 2009.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2009b. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 12-Month Finding on a Petition To List a Distinct Population Segment of the Roundtail Chub (*Gila robusta*) in the Lower Colorado River Basin. Federal Register Vol. 74, No. 128. Tuesday July 7, 2009.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2009. Draft Environmental Assessment for the Reestablishment of Sonoran Pronghorn. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Region 2. 1 October 2009.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2010. Imperial National Wildlife Refuge. http://www.fws.gov/southwest/refuges/arizona/Imperial/index.html. Accessed on January 17, 2011.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011a. Cibola National Wildlife Refuge. http://www.fws.gov/southwest/refuges/CibolaNWR/. Accessed on January 17, 2011.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011b. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Withdrawal of Proposed Rule to List the Flat-Tailed Horned Lizard as Threatened. Federal Register Vol. 76, No. 50. Tuesday March 15, 2011.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011c. *White-nose syndrome: The devastating disease of hibernating bats in North America*. November 2011. Available from: http://www.fws.gov/WhiteNoseSyndrome/about.html.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011d. Migratory Birds and Habitat Programs. http://www.fws.gov/pacific/migratorybirds/mbta.htm. Accessed on May 18, 2011.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011e. Bald Eagle Protection Act. http://wildlifelaw.unm.edu/fedbook/eagleact.html. Accessed on May 18, 2011.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services (USFWS AES). 2009. Nichol Turk's Head Cactus (*Echinocactus horizonthalonius* var. *nicholii*) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services Field Office. Phoenix, Arizona.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services (USFWS AES). 2009b. Bonytail (*Gila elegans*). February.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services (USFWS AES). 2009c. Razorback Sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*). February.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services (USFWS AES). 2010a. Threatened and Endangered Species: Yuma County. http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/arizona/Threatened.htm. Accessed on February 15, 2011.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services (USFWS AES) 2010b. Threatened and Endangered Species: La Paz County. http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/arizona/Threatened.htm. Accessed on February 15, 2011.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services (USFWS AES). 2010c. Roundtail chub, Lower Colorado River Distinct Population Segment (DPS) (*Gila Robusta*). http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/arizona/Roundtail.htm. Accessed on March 22, 2011.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services (USFWS AES). 2010d. News Release - Fish and Wildlife Service to Update Road Map to Recovering Endangered Yuma Clapper Rail. February 10.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arizona Ecological Services (USFWS AES). 2012. Sonoran Desert Tortoise – general Species information. August 2012. Available from http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/arizona/Sonoran_Tort.htm.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 1999. National Water Summary on Wetland Resources, United States Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 2425: State Summaries, Arizona.

http://water.usgs.gov/nwsum/WSP2425/state_highlights_summary.html. Accessed on April 4, 2011.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2004. Geologic Provinces of the United States: Basin and Range Province. http://geomaps.wr.usgs.gov/parks/province/basin-range.html. Accessed on January 27, 2011.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2006. Hydrogeologic Framework Refinement, Ground-Water Flow and Storage, Water-Chemistry Analyses, and Water-Budget Components of the Yuma Areas, Southwestern Arizona and Southeastern California, Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5135.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2008. National Seismic Hazard Maps. http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/products/conterminous/2008/maps/. Accessed on January 28, 2011.

University of Arizona. 2011. Arizona's Native American Tribes. http://edrp.arid.arizona.edu/tribes.html. Accessed on February 10, 2011.

Yuma Area Ag Council. 2011. Yuma Area Irrigation Districts. http://www.yaac.net/ irrigation.html. Accessed on March 29,2011.

Yuma County. 2011. About the County. http://www.co.yuma.az.us/index.aspx?page=542. Accessed on February 7, 2011.

Yuma County. 2013. Yuma County 2020 Comprehensive Plan. Updated January 22, 2013. http://www.co.yuma.az.us/index.aspx?page=1037. Accessed on June 25, 2013.

Yuma County Chamber of Commerce. 2011. Demographics. http://www.yumachamber.org/demographics.html. Accessed on February 7, 2011.

Yuma Metropolitan Planning Office (YMPO). 2010. YMPO 2033 Regional Transportation Plan

Yuma Proving Ground Department of Public Works (YPG DPW). 2009. Environmental Assessment for All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) Designated Recreational Use Area. January 2009.

Yuma Proving Ground Department of Public Works (YPG DPW). 2010a. Environmental Assessment for Improvised Explosive Devices (IED) Test Environment. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. January 2010.

Yuma Proving Ground Department of Public Works (YPG DPW). 2010b. Environmental Assessment for Impact Areas Expansion. Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. March 2010.

Yuma Proving Ground Department of Public Works (YPG DPW). 2011a. Environmental Assessment for Fuel Facilities Optimization, Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. November 2011.

Yuma Proving Ground Department of Public Works (YPG DPW). 2011b. Environmental Assessment for Persistent Surveillance Systems Program, Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. December 2011. Yuma Proving Ground Department of Public Works (YPG DPW). 2013a. Environmental Assessment for Long Range Munitions, Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. April 2013.

Yuma Proving Ground Department of Public Works (YPG DPW). 2013b. Environmental Assessment for Military Training Area Expansion, Environmental Sciences Division, Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. May 2013.

Yuma Proving Ground Hunting Program (YPG HP). 2011. Rules and Regulations. http://www.yuma.army.mil/hunting_rules.shtml. Accessed on January 20, 2011.

Yuma Sun. 2008. *Winter Guide: Yuma Not too Dry for Fishing*. http://media.yumasun.com/winterguide/fishing06.php. Accessed on January 5, 2011.

Zia Engineering and Environmental Consultants, 2011. Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan, U. S. Army Garrison Yuma. April.
7.1 Introduction

NEPA is intended to ensure public participation in the EIS process. Public participation includes effective communication between all federal, state, and local agencies, tribal governments, and other persons or organizations that may have an interest in the project. As required by NEPA, the public was invited to attend public scoping meetings held on June 14 and 15 2011. In the future a public hearing will be held on the DPEIS and public comments will be solicited in the DPEIS and FPEIS. Other methods used to reach the general public and interested stakeholders include meeting announcements in newspapers and news releases to local print and broadcast news media. Further public communication includes maintaining contact with public officials and agency representatives, ensuring that calls from the public are addressed in a timely manner, and contacting stakeholders through placement of notices of public meetings. The DPEIS and FPEIS will be circulated to potentially interested stakeholders and comments requested. Public involvement materials are located in Appendix A. These materials include copies of the NOI, public notices for the scoping meeting, and the project mailing list.

7.2 Notice of Intent

An NOI to prepare a Programmatic EIS (PEIS) was published in the FR (Vol. 76, No. 101) on May 25, 2011.

7.3 Coordination

Potentially interested stakeholders were identified and invited to participate in the NEPA process. The nature of the correspondence with each stakeholder is summarized in Table 7-1. Appendix A contains copies of correspondence directed to and received from cooperating local, state and federal agencies and tribal governments.

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Louis J.	Manuel, Jr.	Ak-Chin Indian Community Council
Caroline	Antone	Ak-Chin Indian Community
Charles	Wood	Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
Ronald	Escobar	Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
Sherry	Cordova	Cocopah Indian Tribe
Jill	McCormick	Cocopah Indian Tribe

TABLE 7-1 Native American Coordination Yuma Proving Ground

Yuma Proving Ground	Yuma Proving Ground			
Lisa	Swick	Colorado River Indian Tribes		
Eldred	Enas	Colorado River Indian Tribes		
Clinton M.	Pattea	Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation		
Karen	Ray	Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community		
Linda	Otero	Fort Mojave Indian Tribe		
Timothy	Williams	Fort Mojave Tribal Council		
Barnaby V.	Lewis	Gila River Indian Community Council		
William R.	Rhodes	Gila River Indian Community Council		
Mike	Jackson, Sr.	Quechan Indian Tribe		
Bridget	Nash-Chrabascz	Quechan Indian Tribe		
Diane	Enos	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community		
Kelly	Washington	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community		
Vernelda	Grant	San Carlos Apache Tribe		
Terry	Rambler	San Carlos Apache Tribe		
Leigh	Kuwanwisiwma	Hopi Tribe		
LeRoy N.	Shingoitewa	Hopi Tribe		
Ned	Norris, Jr.	Tohono O'Odham Nation		
Peter	Steere	Tohono O'Odham Nation		
David	Kwail	Yavapai-Apache Nation		
Delores	Plunkett	Yavapai-Apache Nation		
Ernest	Jones, Sr.	Yavapai-Prescott Tribe		
Linda	Ogo	Yavapai-Prescott Tribe		

TABLE 7-1 Native American Coordination Yuma Proving Ground

TABLE 7-2Agency CoordinationYuma Proving Ground

First Name	Last Name	Company
Elvie R.	Hoag	ACC PMS/CEV
James	McGinnis	Arizona Department of Agriculture, Native Plant Program
Delfina C.	Olivarez	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Edward	Ranger	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Henry	Darwin	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division

TABLE 7-2
Agency Coordination
Yuma Proving Ground

First Name	Last Name	Company
Rebecca	Davidson	Arizona Game and Fish Department
Troy	Smith	Arizona Game and Fish Department
Bryan	Bowker	Bureau of Indian Affairs - Western Regional Office
Irene	Herder	Bureau of Indian Affairs - Western Regional Office
Dave	Daniels	Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office
Dave	Rodriguez	Environmental Department MCAS Yuma
Elaine	Johnson	Imperial National Wildlife Refuge
Susanna	Henry	Kofa National Wildlife Refuge
Mitch	Ellis	Southwest Arizona National Wildlife Refuge Complex
Richard	Hays	U.S. Border Patrol
Cynthia	Hoeft	Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office
Christopher	Wallis	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Yuma Area Office
Wayne	Nastri	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX
Steven L.	Spangle	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
David	Sharpe	Wellton-Mohawk Natural Resources Conservation District
Cheryl	Lambert	NRCS Yuma Service Center
Sheryl	Christenson	Laguna Natural Resource Conservation District (NRCD), Yuma NRCD

TABLE 7-3Public and Local Government CoordinationYuma Proving Ground

First Name	Last Name	Company
Pete	Cimellaro	Arizona Deer Association
Bill	Luffy	Arizona Desert Bighorn Sheep Society
Carol	Brooks	Arizona Historical Society
Jason	Williams	Arizona Wilderness Coalition
Patricia	Rather	Audubon Society
Laurie	Lineberry	City of Yuma
Julie	Engel	Greater Yuma Economic Development Corp
Scott	Bernhart	La Paz County
Sandy	Bahr	Sierra Club, Grand Canyon Chapter
Don	Foltz	Yuma Chamber of Commerce Military Affairs Committee

Yuma Proving Ground		
Robert	Pickles	Yuma County
Ken	Rosevear	Yuma County Chamber of Commerce
Monty	Stansbury	Yuma County Development Services

 TABLE 7-3

 Public and Local Government Coordination

 Yuma Proving Ground

TABLE 7-4 Political Representatives Yuma Proving Ground

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Alan	Krieger	City of Yuma
Charlene	Fernandez	Congressman Raul M. Grijalva – AZD07
Russ	Jones	House of Representatives
Lynne	Pancrazi	House of Representatives
Colleen	McVey	La Paz County Community Development
John	McCain	United States Senate
Don	Shooter	United States Senate
Maria	Gonzalez	Yuma County

7.4 Scoping and Information Meetings

Federal, state, and local agencies, environmental groups, and the public were invited to attend open house public scoping meetings on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at YPG and on Wednesday, June 15, 2011 in Yuma, Arizona.

The public scoping meetings announced the commencement of the PEIS process and was used to gather initial public concerns and issues. Background information was presented on the project and its purpose, the area of study, and the potential options available. A public notice was mailed to stakeholders prior to the public scoping meeting. Notice of the public scoping meeting was also posted in the local newspapers. At the scoping meeting, the public was given an opportunity to ask questions and make comments concerning the project. No comments were received at the public scoping meetings. The court reporter prepared an affidavit stating no comments were received.

7.5 Distribution of the DPEIS

Upon completion, the DPEIS will be posted on the YPG website and made available at local libraries. Copies of the DPEIS will also available from YPG upon request.

7.6 Point of Contact

Written comments regarding this DPEIS should be sent to the following contact. Requests for more information may also be obtained from the following point of contact:

Attention: Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground Environmental Division, IMWE-YMA-PWE 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498 This page intentionally left blank.

SECTION 8 Public, Agency, and Tribal Comments and Responses

<<NOTE TO READER: This section will be completed once comments have been received on the DPEIS.>>

This page intentionally left blank.

section 9

Aberdeen Road – ES-5, ES-23, 2-20, 2-42, 2-75, 3-83, 3-124, 3-127, 3-128, 3-130, 3-158, 3-169, 3-183, 3-207, 3-208

aerostat – ES-10, 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-5, 2-6, 2-9, 2-12, 2-14, 2-28, 2-57

airspace – ES-2, ES-18, 1-5, 1-6, 2-1, 2-3, 2-11, 2-12, 2-33, 2-44, 2-48, 2-49, 2-50, 2-51, 2-61, 2-62, 2-63, 2-64, 2-65, 2-72, 2-78, 3-2, 3-7, 3-16, 3-17, 3-63, 3-64, 3-65, 3-68, 3-69, 3-80, 3-84, 3-123, 3-125, 3-126, 3-130, 3-180, 3-188, 3-194, 3-200, 3-204

Air Cargo Complex - 2-2, 3-125,

ambient air quality - 3-7, 3-13, 6-9

asbestos – ES-21, 2-73, 3-32, 3-52, 3-126, 3-182

asbestos-containing material (or ACM) -ES-21, 2-73, 3-47, 3-52, 3-57, 3-59, 3-182, 3-205

Barranca Road – ES-3, 2-17, 2-37, 3-9, 3-125, 3-127

bat – ES-25, 2-76, 3-107, 3-109, 3-110, 3-111, 3-112, 3-119, 3-122, 3-169, 3-184

best management practices (or BMP) – ES-18

Big Eye Wash - 3-151

Blaisdell Railroad Siding (or Blaisdell Siding) – 1-4, 2-4, 3-126

Camp Laguna - 3-21, 3-145, 3-147

Camp Navajo - 1-4, 2-3

Castle Dome Annex (or CDA) – ES-10, 2-30, 2-58, 2-69, 3-31, 3-32, 3-61, 3-53, 3-125 Castle Dome Heliport (or CDH) – ES-3, ES-4, ES-6, ES-19, 2-2, 2-18, 2-23, 2-38, 2-39, 2-46, 2-47, 2-69, 2-73, 3-16, 3-31, 3-32, 3-35, 3-60, 3-61, 3-69, 3-94, 3-125, 3-127, 3-129, 3-157, 3-164, 3-181

Castle Dome Wash – 2-42, 3-22, 3-83, 3-128, 3-131, 3-151, 3-158

Chocolate Mountains - 3-20, 3-21, 3-45

Cibola National Wildlife Refuge (or Cibola NWR) – 3-62, 3-76, 3-147, 6-10

Clean Air Act (or CAA) – 3-7, 3-9, 3-11, 3-47

Clean Water Act (or CWA) – ES-27, 3-46, 3-150, 3-152, 3-156, 3-158, 3-159, 3-169, 3-208

Cocopah Indian Reservation - 3-38, 3-39

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (or CERCLA) – 3-46, 3-48

Death Valley - 1-4, 2-4

depleted uranium (or DU) – 2-3, 2-10, 2-11, 2-14, 2-17, 3-47, 3-49, 3-56, 3-62, 3-81, 3-114, 3-152, 3-153, 3-173, 6-5

desert pavement - 3-43, 3-56, 3-89, 3-90, 3-91, 3-82, 3-132, 3-153, 6-2

desert tortoise – ES-24, ES-25, 2-76, 2-76, 2-79, 3-41, 3-106, 3-108, 3-109, 3-110, 3-113, 3-116, 3-117, 3-118, 3-122, 3-123, 3-184, 3-195, 3-206, 6-10

East Arm – ES-2, ES-14, ES-15, ES-16, ES-22, 2-1, 2-3, 2-33, 2-35, 2-36, 2-63, 2-66, 2-68, 2-74, 3-14, 3-16, 3-21, 3-36, 3-43, 3-58, 3-75, 3-78, 3-80, 3-84, 3-89, 3-100, 3-109,

3-116, 3-124, 3-128, 3-130, 3-140, 3-145, 3-4, 3-147, 3-165, 3-170, 3-177, 3-182

enhanced use lease (or EUL)– ES-16, 1-4, 3-4, 3-5, 3-15, 3-36, 3-58, 3-65, 3-73, 3-167, 3-187

Fort Yuma Indian Reservation – 3-38, 3-39

greenhouse gas (or GHG) – 3-10, 3-11, 3-12, 3-15, 6-9

Golden Knights - 2-6

groundwater – ES-16, ES-19, ES-27, 1-6, 2-73, 2-77, 3-30, 3-33, 3-35, 3-47, 3-49, 3-57, 3-115, 3-134, 3-153, 3-154, 3-155, 3-156, 3-157, 3-159, 3-160, 3-161, 3-162, 3-164, 3-165, 3-166, 3-167, 3-168, 3-174, 3-181, 3-185, 3-187, 3-198, 3-199, 6-6

hazardous air pollutant (or HAP) – 3-9, 3-47

hazardous substance - 3-47, 3-52

highly erodible – ES-24, 2-75, 2-79, 3-13, 3-91, 3-93, 3-94, 3-95, 3-96, 3-97, 3-98, 3-99, 3-101, 3-102, 3-104, 3-184, 3-202, 3-206

hunting – ES-22, 2-74, 3-20, 3-60, 3-68, 3-75, 3-76, 3-77, 3-78, 3-79, 3-80, 3-81, 3-114, 3-170, 3-173, 3-175, 3-179, 3-182, 3-189, 3-193, 3-208, 6-2, 6-12

Imperial Sand Dunes - 1-4, 2-4, 3-76, 6-3

Indian Wash - 3-125, 3-151

Integrated Training Area Management (or ITAM) – ES-20, ES-24, ES-26, 2-78, 2-79, 2-80, 3-42, 3-43, 3-44, 3-57, 3-92, 3-95, 3-96, 3-97, 3-98, 3-99, 3-100, 3-101, 3-102, 3-103, 3-104, 3-105, 3-134, 3-135, 3-136, 3-137, 3-138, 3-140, 3-141, 3-143, 3-144, 3-145, 3-146, 3-149, 3-160, 3-161, 3-163, 3-164, 3-166, 3-167, 3-201, 3-202, 3-203, 3-204, 3-206, 3-207

invasive – ES-20, ES-26, 2-73, 2-78, 2-80, 3-41, 3-42, 3-43, 3-44, 3-84, 3-114, 3-115, 3121, 3-123, 3-132, 3-133, 3-134, 3-135, 3-136, 3-137, 3-138, 3-139, 3-140, 3-141, 3-142, 3-143, 3-145, 3-1563-157, 3-161, 3-174, 3-175, 3-178, 3-179, 3-181, 3-188, 3-192, 3-196, 3-201, 3-203, 3-204, 3-207, 6-5

Kofa Mountains - 3-111, 3-151

Kofa National Wildlife Refuge (or Kofa NWR) – ES-2, ES-20, ES-25, 1-5, 2-1, 2-3, 2-78, 2-80, 3-5, 3-16, 3-41, 3-45, 3-62, 3-63, 3-68, 3-69, 3-70, 3-71, 3-72, 3-76, 3-109, 3-111, 3-112, 3-118, 3-120, 3-123, 3-145, 3-147, 3-151, 3-171, 3-188, 3-201, 3-202, 3-204, 5-1, 6-9, 7-2

La Posa Dunes - 3-145, 3-147

Laguna Army Airfield (or LAAF) – ES-3, ES-5, ES-6, 2-2, 2-15, 2-17, 2-21, 2-22, 2-37, 2-38, 2-44, 2-45, 2-46, 2-69, 3-9, 3-16, 3-26, 3-30, 3-31, 3-42, 3-44, 3-51, 3-60, 3-61, 3-67, 3-69, 3-124, 3-125, 3-127, 3-129

Laguna Mountains - 3-20, 3-45

laser systems - 2-12, 2-13

lead – 3-7, 3-8, 3-45, 3-47, 3-49, 3-50, 3-52, 3-80, 3-93, 3-96, 3-99, 3-104, 3-105, 3-115, 3-126, 3-136, 3-140, 3-155, 3-161, 3-166, 3-172, 3-174, 3-195, 3-197

lead-based paint (or LBP) - 3-47, 3-52

Light Maneuver Training Area (or LTA) – ES-4, ES-10

Los Angeles Wash - 3-151

Main Administrative Area (or MAA) – ES-4, ES-5, ES-6, ES-19, ES-22, 2-2, 2-18, 2-22, 2-37, 2-39, 2-40, 2-46, 2-47, 2-69, 2-72, 2-74, 3-9, 3-29, 3-30, 3-31, 3-33, 3-60, 3-61, 3-70, 3-76, 3-79, 3-80, 3-83, 3-124, 3-125, 3-126, 3-127, 3-129, 3-180, 3-183

mammal – 3-169, 6-2

Martinez Lake – ES-21, 2-37, 2-74, 3-62, 3-64, 3-68, 3-70, 3-76, 3-82, 3-125, 3-145, 3-146, 3-147, 3-148, 3-182,

McAllister Wash - 3-151

Migratory Bird Treaty Act (or MBTA) – 3-106, 3-170, 3-172, 6-10

mining - 3-20, 3-21, 3-32, 3-46, 3-109

Muggins Mountains – 3-20, 3-21, 3-45, 3-72, 3-145, 3-147

munitions impact area – ES-14, ES-15, 2-2, 2-33, 2-34, 2-35, 2-64, 2-65, 2-66, 3-61, 3-161, 3-178

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (or NAAQS) – 3-7, 3-8, 6-9

Native American – 1-7, 2-78, 3-18, 3-22, 3-38, 3-201, 5-1, 6-7, 6-117-1, 7-2

Oatman Hill - 1-4, 2-4

pesticide - 3-51, 3-150

PM₁₀ - 3-7, 3-8, 3-9, 3-10, 3-13, 3-93, 6-1

PM_{2.5} - 3-8

Prescott Airport – 1-4, 2-3

Quechan - 3-29, 5-1, 6-4, 6-7, 7-2

recreation – ES-16, ES-22, 1-5, 1-6, 2-6, 2-16, 2-74, 2-79, 3-2, 3-39, 3-70, 3-75, 3-75, 3-77, 3-79, 3-80, 3-173, 3-182, 3-183, 3-187, 3-188, 3-189, 3-193, 3-194, 3-200, 3-202, 6-3

reptile - 3-169, 3-170, 6-2

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (or RCRA) – 2-43, 3-46, 3-48, 3-50, 3-51, 3-52, 3-54

Senator Wash - 1-4, 2-3, 3-150,

smoke obscurant - 3-146, 3-148

solid waste – ES-19, ES-20, 2-16, 2-73, 3-32, 3-33, 3-35, 3-36, 3-48, 3-54, 3-181, 3-191, 6-5,

solid waste management units (or SWMUs) - 3-48, Sonoran Desert – ES-24, ES-25, 2-76, 2-79, 3-6, 3-40, 3-41, 3-42, 3-106, 3-108, 3-109, 3-110, 3-111, 3-113, 3-116, 3-117, 3-122, 3-123, 3-131, 3-132, 3-157, 3-170, 3-184, 3-195, 3-202, 3-206, 6-2, 6-6, 6-7, 6-10

Sonoran pronghorn – ES-24, ES-25, 2-76, 2-80, 3-107, 3-109, 3-110, 3-114, 3-116, 3-118, 3-123, 3-184, 3-202, 6-9

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (or SWPPP) – 2-80, 3-57, 3-159, 3-162, 3-165, 3-203

surface water – ES-16, 1-6, 3-88, 3-94, 3-105, 3-115, 3-132, 3-133, 3-134, 3-149, 3-150, 3-152, 3-153, 3-155, 3-159, 3-160, 162, 164, 3-166, 3-167, 3-168, 3-187, 3-198, 3-199

tinajas – 3-151, 3-152

Trigo Mountains - 3-63, 3-145

U.S. Highway 95 (or US 95) – 1-5, 2-2, 2-42, 2-60, 3-16, 3-21, 3-68, 3-71, 3-81, 3-82, 3-83, 3-84, 3-123, 3-128, 3-129, 3-145, 3-146, 3-147, 3-148, 3-151, 3-158, 3-189, 3-194, 3-196, 3-198

unexploded ordnance (or UXO) – ES-21, 2-44, 2-48, 2-49, 2-63, 2-64, 2-67, 3-6, 3-27, 3-41, 3-43, 3-44, 3-45, 3-49, 3-61, 3-64, 3-80, 3-81, 3-99, 3-102, 3-103, 3-139, 3-142, 3-143, 3-204

volatile organic compounds (or VOCs) – 3-9, 3-10, 3-14, 3-48, 3-155

wastewater – ES-6, ES-19, 2-16, 2-23, 2-46, 2-69, 2-73, 3-12, 3-29, 3-31, 3-32, 3-33, 3-35, 3-36, 3-154, 3-161, 3-181, 3-188, 3-191

water erosion – 3-89, 3-90, 3-94, 3-95, 3-97, 3-98, 3-100, 3-105

water quality – ES-26, ES-27, 2-77, 3-30, 3-91, 3-94, 3-133, 3-149, 3-150, 3-152, 3-155, 3-156, 3-158, 3-160, 3-162, 3-163, 3-165, 3-167, 3-169, 3-185, 3-198

water tank – ES-4, ES-9, ES-10, ES-12, ES-14, 2-19, 2-27, 2-28, 2-29, 2-31, 2-33, 2-40,

2-53, 2-55, 2-57, 2-60, 2-64, 3-149, 3-151, 3-155, 3-171, 3-174, 3-179, 3-208,

White Tanks - 3-21, 3-22, 3-145, 3-147

wild horses and burros – ES-25, 2-76, 3-106, 3-110, 3-113, 3-120, 3-121, 3-185

wildfire – ES-20, ES-23, 2-73, 2-74, 2-78, 3-40, 3-41, 3-42, 3-43, 3-44, 3-45, 3-62, 3-81, 3-84, 3-95, 3-96, 3-99, 3-102, 3-103, 3-105, 3-115, 3-121, 3-132, 3-134, 3-136, 3-139, 3-142, 3-143, 3-144, 3-161, 3-174, 3-175, 3-178, 3-181, 3-183, 3-188, 3-192, 3-201, 3-204,

wind erosion - 3-13, 3-88, 3-89, 3-90, 3-93, 3-94, 3-95, 3-96, 3-97, 3-98, 3-100, 3-103, 3-104, 3-105, 3-195, 6-3

YPG safety program – ES-23, 2-79, 3-80, 3-82, 3-84, 3-85, 3-202, 3-206

Yuma Wash – ES-8, ES-12, ES-13, 2-26, 2-32, 2-52, 2-61, 2-62, 3-22, 3-151, 3-163

Figures

This page intentionally left blank.



Yuma, Arizona



For Planning Purposes Only



FIGURE ES-2 Designated Areas on Yuma Proving Ground Yuma Proving Ground Yuma, Arizona



For Planning Purposes Only



FIGURE ES-3 Yuma Proving Ground Restricted Airspace *Yuma Proving Ground Yuma, Arizona*





ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\ES-4_20121012.MXD GTWIGG 10/15/2012 9:01:58 AM



For Planning Purposes Only



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\LAGUNA_BUILDINGS_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/8/2013 9:09:42 AM



For Planning Purposes Only



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\LAGUNA_POI_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/1/2013 4:45:30 PM



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\CIBOLA_IMPACTAREAS_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/8/2013 8:17:25 AM



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\CIBOLA_BUILDINGS_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/8/2013 9:51:25 AM



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\CIBOLA_POI_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/1/2013 4:57:04 PM







ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\KOFA_BUILDINGS_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/8/2013 2:51:30 PM







For Planning Purposes Only



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\LAGUNA_PROPOSEDACTION_20121025.MXD JJAMELL 6/4/2013 8:58:36 AM





ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\CIBOLA_PROPOSEDACTION_20121025.MXD JJAMELL 5/30/2013 3:12:26 PM





Yuma, Arizona



For Planning Purposes Only



FIGURE 2-2 Designated Areas on Yuma Proving Ground Yuma Proving Ground Yuma, Arizona



For Planning Purposes Only







ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\LAGUNA_IMPACT_AREAS_20121012.MXD GTWIGG 10/15/2012 9:02:06 AM

For Planning Purposes Only



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\LAGUNA_BUILDINGS_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/8/2013 9:09:42 AM



For Planning Purposes Only



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\LAGUNA_POI_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/1/2013 4:45:30 PM





ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\CIBOLA_IMPACTAREAS_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/8/2013 8:17:25 AM
For Planning Purposes Only



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\CIBOLA_BUILDINGS_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/8/2013 9:48:52 AM

For Planning Purposes Only



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\CIBOLA_POI_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 2/7/2013 2:02:25 PM



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\KOFA_IMPACT_AREAS_20121012.MXD AJOSHI2 10/15/2012 4:18:38 PM





ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\KOFA_BUILDINGS_20121012.MXD JJAMELL 7/8/2013 10:43:53 AM







For Planning Purposes Only



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\LAGUNA_PROPOSEDACTION_20121025.MXD JJAMELL 10/25/2012 2:38:51 PM



For Planning Purposes Only



ATL \\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\CIBOLA_PROPOSEDACTION_20121025.MXD JJAMELL 5/30/2013 3:07:45 PM





FIGURE 3-1 Air Quality Yuma Proving Ground Yuma, Arizona



ES052411072225ATL





\GALILEO\PROJ\YUMA_364516\MAPFILES\SOILS.MXD JMINIX 5/9/2011 16:58:30

FIGURE 3-2 Soil Map Units *Yuma Proving Ground Yuma, Arizona*





Figure 3-3 Tentative Locations for EUL Project Yuma Proving Ground Yuma, AZ



This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A Public Outreach This page intentionally left blank.

Education Division conducted a formal section 7 consultation under the ESA. On November 18, 2008, NMFS issued a Biological Opinion (2008 BiOp) and concluded that the issuance of an IHA is likely to affect, but not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of Steller sea lions. NMFS has also issued an incidental take statement (ITS) for Steller sea lions pursuant to section 7 of the ESA. The ITS contains reasonable and prudent measures for implementing terms and conditions to minimize the effects of this take. NMFS has reviewed the 2008 BiOp and determined that there is no new information regarding effects to Steller sea lions; the action has not been modified in a manner which would cause adverse effects not previously evaluated; there has been no new listing of species or no new designation of critical habitat that could be affected by the action; and the action will not exceed the extent or amount of incidental take authorized in the 2008 BiOp. Therefore, the proposed IHA does not require the reinitiation of Section 7 consultation under the ESA.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

To meet NMFS' NEPA requirements for the issuance of an IHA to PRBO, NMFS prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) in 2007 that was specific to seabird research activities on SEFI, WEI, ANI, and PRNS and evaluated the impacts on the human environment of NMFS' authorization of incidental Level B harassment resulting from seabird research in Central California. At that time, NMFS determined that conducting the seabird research would not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment and issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and, therefore, it was not necessary to prepare an environmental impact statement for the issuance of an IHA to PRBO for this activity. In 2008, NMFS prepared a supplemental EA (SEA) titled "Supplemental Environmental Assessment for the Issuance of an Incidental Harassment Authorization to Take Marine Mammals by Harassment Incidental to Conducting Seabird and Pinniped Research in Central California and Environmental Assessment for the Continuation of Scientific Research on Pinnipeds in California Under Scientific Research Permit 373-1868-00," to address new available information regarding the effects of PRBO's seabird and pinniped research activities that may have cumulative impacts to the physical and biological environment. At that time, NMFS concluded that issuance of an IHA for the December

2008 through 2009 season would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment and issued a FONSI for the 2008 SEA regarding PRBO's activities. In conjunction with this year's application, NMFS has again reviewed the 2007 EA and the 2008 SEA and determined that there are no new direct, indirect or cumulative impacts to the human and natural environment associated with the IHA requiring evaluation in a supplemental EA and NMFS, therefore, reaffirms the 2008 FONSI. A copy of the EA, SEA, and the NMFS FONSI for this activity is available upon request (see ADDRESSES).

Dated: May 20, 2011.

James H. Lecky,

Director, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service. [FR Doc. 2011–12978 Filed 5–24–11; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Real Property Master Plan Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, at Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD. **ACTION:** Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from adoption and implementation of a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP), including test areas and training activities at Yuma Proving Ground.

ADDRESSES: For questions concerning the RPMP PEIS, please contact Mr. Sergio Obregon, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator, IMWE–YMA–PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, AZ 85365–9498. Written comments may be mailed to that address or e-mailed to *ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Chuck Wullenjohn, Yuma Proving Ground Public Affairs Office, at (928) 328–6189 Monday through Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Mountain Standard Time.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Yuma Proving Ground consists of approximately 840,000 acres of DoDmanaged land in the Sonoran Desert in southwestern Arizona and occupies portions of Yuma and La Paz counties. The mission at Yuma Proving Ground is ensuring the readiness of U. S. forces

and materiel to perform in hot arid conditions around the world. This requires rigorous testing of ground and aerial vehicles, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems and realistic training. The U.S. has been engaged in hostile conflicts in environments similar to those found at Yuma Proving Ground, resulting in a need for increased testing of existing and developing military equipment, vehicles, and munitions under these environmental conditions. To meet these needs, the U.S. Army intends to prepare a RPMP PEIS at Yuma Proving Ground to analyze potential impacts from new construction, changes in testing and training, and activities conducted under private industry partnerships. Renewable energy initiatives will also be discussed in the PEIS, but project-specific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives.

Alternatives will consist of alternative siting locations for certain activities within Yuma Proving Ground and different magnitudes of implementation with regard to spatial extent of potential impacts and frequency and duration of specific events. The EIS will also analyze the No Action Alternative, under which no new construction would occur and there would be no changes in testing and training activities conducted at Yuma Proving Ground.

No changes are proposed to activities conducted at off-post areas in Arizona and California that are used for specific testing activities under conditions not found at Yuma Proving Ground. Therefore, these areas would not be considered in the development of alternatives for the RPMP PEIS.

All activities under consideration would be conducted within the boundaries of the installation. Resource areas that may be impacted include air quality, airspace, traffic, noise, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, utilities, land use, and solid and hazardous materials/waste. Impacts to these resources may occur as a result of converting existing land use to support military testing and training or from increasing the scope or magnitude of testing and training activities. The analysis will also consider the potential for cumulative environmental effects.

The public will be invited to participate in the scoping process to provide input on the proposed action and alternatives, which will be evaluated in the PEIS. After publication of the Notice of Intent to prepare the PEIS, the Army will schedule at least two public meetings to provide information about the proposed action and alternatives and to solicit input and feedback from the public on issues to be addressed in the PEIS. Meetings will be announced in local media. The public will also be invited to review and comment on the Draft PEIS when it is released. Comments from the public will be considered before any decision is made regarding implementing the proposed action.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer. [FR Doc. 2011–12914 Filed 5–24–11; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3710–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Public Scoping Meeting and Preparation of Environmental Impact Statement for Luce Bayou Interbasin Transfer Project in Liberty County and Harris County, TX

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD. **ACTION:** Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District, has received a permit application for a Department of the Army Permit pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) from the Coastal Water Authority (SWG-2009-00188) for the proposed Coastal Water Authority's Luce Bayou Interbasin Transfer Project located in eastern Liberty County with the 26.5-mile corridor extending southwestward from the Trinity River to a discharge point near the confluence of Luce Bayou with Lake Houston. The primary Federal involvement associated with the proposed action is the discharge or dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including jurisdictional wetlands, and the construction of structures that may affect navigable waters. Federal authorizations for the proposed project would constitute a "major federal action." Based on the potential impacts, both individually and cumulatively, the Corps intends to prepare an Environmental Statement (EIS) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act to render a final decision on the permit applications.

The Corps' decision will be to either issue, issue with modification or deny Department of the Army permits for the proposed action. The EIS will assess the potential social, economic and environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the interbasin conveyance, associated facilities, and appurtenances and is intended to be sufficient in scope to address Federal, State and local requirements, environmental issues concerning the proposed action, and permit reviews.

DATES: The scoping period will commence with the publication of this notice. The formal scoping period will end 60 days after the publication of this notice. Comments regarding issues relative to the proposed project should be received.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods: *Mail:* Jayson M. Hudson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Branch, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77553–1229; *Fax:* (409) 766–3931 or *E-mail: Jayson.m.hudson@usace.army.mil.* Emailed comments, including attachments, should be provided in .doc, .docx, .pdf or .txt formats. Documents pertinent to the proposed project may be examined at *http:// www.swg.usace.army.mil/reg/eis.asp.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jayson Hudson, (409) 766–3108.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Galveston District intends to prepare a DEIS on the proposed Luce Bayou Interbasin Transfer Project which is the proposed transfer of water from the Trinity River in Liberty County to Lake Houston in Harris County, TX. The Coastal Water Authority proposed this project and is the applicant for the Department of the Army permit (DA) SWG-2009-00188.

1. Project Background: The Coastal Water Authority is proposing to convey up to 400 million gallons of water per day (MGD) under gravity in accordance with the City of Houston's existing water rights permit from the Trinity River to Lake Houston, a distance of approximately 26.5 miles. The Trinity River water would be conveyed from the proposed pump station through large diameter pipelines to a sediment storage and settling basin and then through an earthen canal to outfall at the Lake Houston discharge point. The canal would have side berms and there would be an access road, drainage ditches, and perimeter fencing surrounding the water conveyance canal. The proposed project consists of the following:

a. A new water pumping station will be constructed on the Trinity River at Capers Ridge approximately 10 miles north of Dayton, TX.

b. Dual, 108-inch diameter force mains will be constructed extending from the Capers Ridge pump station approximately 3.5 miles to the west and southwest to outfall to the sedimentation settling basin.

c. An approximate 20-acre sedimentation settling and storage basin.

d. An approximate 23.5 mile claylined earthen canal with 4:1 side slopes within a 300-foot easement that would include access roads, berms, chain link perimeter fencing, flow control structures, and metering stations.

e. Box culverts at canal and roadway crossings and multiple bawl-ground siphons constructed to facilitate wildlife movement and maintain existing hydrology along the canal conveyance system.

f. An approximate 10-acre maintenance facility located approximately 6 miles north of Dayton, TX.

g. Discharge structure along the southeastern shoreline of Lake Houston.

2. Scoping and Public Involvement *Process:* A Public Notice was published on April 19, 2010 to initiate the public scoping process for the proposed project. At that time, based on information provided by the Applicant, a preliminary review indicated that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was not required. However, based on continuing permit assessment and information brought forth during the initial coordination process, areas of potential significant impact on the human environment have been identified. Therefore, the EIS process is being implemented so that the permit application can be fully evaluated and a permit decision can be made. All comments received to date, including those provided for review during the initial scoping process, will be considered by the Galveston District during EIS preparation. The purpose of the EIS scoping meeting is to gather information on the subjects to be studied in detail by the EIS.

3. *Purpose and Need.* The basic purpose of the proposed action is to provide drinking water for the City of Houston and surrounding area. The overall purpose is to provide drinking water utilizing water rights currently held by the City of Houston in the Trinity River. The Corps recognizes that there is a public and private need for drinking water.

4. *Alternatives.* An evaluation of alternatives to the Applicant's preferred alternative initially being considered includes a No Action alternative, alternatives that would avoid, minimize and compensate for impacts to the aquatic environment within the project right-of-way, alternatives that would avoid, minimize and compensate for

Affidavit of Publication

STATE OF ARIZONA

COUNTY OF YUMA

CITY OF YUMA

I, <u>Darlene</u> <u>Firestons</u> being duly sworn on oath now and during all times herein stated, have been the publisher (or authorized representative of Publisher) and designated agent of the publication known as,

<u>Yuma</u> Sun ("Publication"), a newspaper of general circulation in the county of Yuma, State of Arizona, by Newspapers of Southwestern Arizona, Inc.,

And having full knowledge of the facts herein stated as follows:

The advertisement for <u>US</u> <u>Proving Grou</u> ("Ad/Advertiser") was published to the Publication's full circulation as requested by Advertiser on the: <u>29</u>th Day of <u>May</u>, 20<u>11</u>.

a By:

Subscribed and sw This <u>th</u> day o	f <u>AUIL</u>	_, 20\\
Virgen F) Perez	
Notary Public	0	

Notary Seal:

OFFICIAL SEAL VIRGEN P PEREZ Commission # 163644 Notary Public - State of Arizona YUMA COUNTY My Comm. Expires Mar 0, 2013

Casey Anthony's mother, ex-boyfriend testify: murder trial to resume Tuesday

ORLANDO, Fla. - The mother of a Florida woman accused of killing her 2-year-old daughter gave a tour of the family home, including a playhouse built for the toddler and the above-ground pool the defense team claims the girl drowned in.

Cindy Anthony testified Saturday at her daughter's murder trial that she and Caylee went swimming on June 15, 2008 - the last day she saw her granddaughter. She said she removed a ladmo me poor - somening she did every time the pool wasn't being used.

Casey Anthony, who is charged with first-degree murder in the toddler's summer 2008 death, wiped away tears with a tissue during her mother's testimony. Prosecutors contend Casey Anthony suffocated the girl with duct tape. If convicted, she could be sentenced to death.

Cindy Anthony was not asked directly Saturday whether she thought the young girl drowned. The trial will resume Tuesday in Orlando.

PUBLIC NOTICE

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Sections 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementations of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. The Notice of Intent (NOI) for the PEIS was published in the Federal Register on May 25, 2011.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. Renewable energy initiatives will be discussed in the PEIS, but projectspecific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A public meeting will be held on YPG from 6:00 to 8:00 PM at Building 6, the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, located on the main administrative area, off of Imperial Dam Road on Tuesday, June 14, 2011. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364 on Wednesday, June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 PM. Draft and final versions of the PEIS will be made available to the public for review and comment when completed. The scoping process officially begins with the publication of the NOI in the Federal Register, Public scoping comments will be solicited through June 30, 2011. YPG will also accept public input throughout the NEPA process. All interested parties are invited to attend the public meetings and to submit comments or questions by mail to Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, or e-mail ypgnepa@conus.army.mil. By phone, contact Chuck Wullenjohn at (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday.

caylee remained on display on television monitors ter's marriage, she laughs along the courtroom, where evidence is displayed for the jury, media and spectaher career. tors. Anthony eventually interrupted her questioning, asking prosecutors to

Married folks now outnumbered: Census data shows them leading less than half of US households

PORTLAND, Ore. Three mornings a week, when Becky Leung gets ready for work, her boyfriend is just getting home Through most of her tes- from his overnight job.

remove the photo.

utura aport HeL IMIN at it off. And when she thinks about getting married herself, she worries first about

Leung, 27, cohabits in a Portland, Ore., townhome with her boyfriend but has no plans yet to wed, a reflection of the broader cultural shift in the U.S. away from the traditional definition of what it means to be a household.

Data released Thursday by the U.S. Census Bureau shows married couples have found themselves in a new position: They're no longer the majority.

It's a trend that's been creeping along for decades, but in the 2010 Census, married couples represent 48 percent of all households. That's down from 52 percent in the last Census and, for the first time in U.S. history, puts households led by married couples as a plurality.

"I see a lot of people not having the typical 8-to-5 job, or couples where one person is employed and one isn't. There's other priorities before marriage," Leung said.

The flip in the 2010 Census happened in 32 states. In another seven states, less than 51 percent of households were helmed by married couples.

PLAYS HIS GUITAR at borough of New York o American immigrants y only indigenous langua Spanish, and are findin U.S. means having to h

Some 1 cite no **Spanis** Speakers (indigenou languages fa extra hurd

ASSOCIATED PRES

NEW YORK -- Co Aguilar needs help she goes to the doc when her co-worker nail salon call her a phone.

A Mexican who ha in the U.S. for two she only speaks a v of Mixteco, an indig language from the sta Oaxaca, Puebla and rero in southern Mex

"It is hard somet whispers the 28-ye who was born in



Affidavit of Publication

STATE OF ARIZONA

COUNTY OF YUMA

CITY OF YUMA

I, $\underline{Darlene}$ Fire 3 to mbeing duly sworn on oath now and during all times herein stated, have been the publisher (or authorized representative of Publisher) and designated agent of the publication known as,

Bajo F1 Sol ("Publication"), a newspaper of general circulation in the county of Yuma, State of Arizona, by Newspapers of Southwestern Arizona, Inc.,

And having full knowledge of the facts herein stated as follows:

The advertisement for <u>US Proving Ground</u> (Ad/Advertiser") was published to the Publication's full circulation as requested by Advertiser on the: <u>3</u> Day of <u>June</u>, 20 <u>U</u>.

By: 1 al

Subscribed and swor This XHA day of	$\frac{\text{n to before me}}{\sqrt{100}}, 20 $
Vineo	P PONOR
Notary Publig	1 ICE COZ

Notary Seal:

OFFICIAL SEAL VIRGEN P PEREZ Commission # 163644 Notary Public - State of Arizona YUMA COUNTY My Comm. Expires May 10, 2013





del público versiones del borrador y finales de la PEIS para su revisión y comentario una vez finalizados. El proceso de exploración oficialmente comienza con la publicación de la NOI en el Registro Federal. Comentarios públicos serán solicitados hasta el 30 de junio de 2011. YPG también aceptará la opinión pública durante todo el proceso de NEPA. Todas las partes interesadas están invitadas a asistir a las reuniones públicas y a enviar comentarios o preguntas por correo a Sergio Obregon, Coordinador de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental a U.S Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, o por correo electrónico al ypgnepa@conus.army.mil. Por teléfono, llame a Chuck Wullenjohn al (928) 328-6189 de 6:30 AM a 5:00 PM, de lunes a jueves.



Summit focuses on MRAP tests

Event fosters communication between testers of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles throughout the U.S.

By Mark Schauer

tested at YPG.

During the worst years of the Iraqi insurgency, the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicle was developed to protect American Soldiers from the destructive power of roadside bombs and other improvised explosive devices (IEDs). After extensive testing, the heavily fortified platform with a blast-defusing V-shaped hull was rapidly fielded.

The vehicle's effectiveness resulted in the development of specialized variants, from the route-clearing Buffalo MRAP that uses a long hydraulic claw to dig land mines and IEDs to the MRAP All-Terrain Vehicle (M-ATV), a lighter and more

The number of variants and the program's status as a joint effort between the Army, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Navy mean the engineers who design and test MRAPs are scattered throughout the country. To facilitate interaction, the MRAP Joint Program Office (JPO) has held an annual engineering summit for the past three years. This year's two day event was held at YPG, and every MRAP tester in the Combat and Automotive Systems division participated.

"They hear about what is going on within the whole spectrum of the MRAP program, not just the area they are focused in," said Isaac Rodriguez, team leader in YPG's combat and



THE OUTPOST

- NEWS NOTES

U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the real property master plan. The notice of intent for the PEIS was published in the federal register on May 25, 2011.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state-of-the-art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to

Public Notice

enter into legally permissible Army/ private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. Renewable energy initiatives will be discussed in the PEIS, but project-specific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet

the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A public meeting will be held on YPG, Tuesday, June 14 from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. at Bldg. 6, the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, located on the main administrative area. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, on Wednesday, June 15, from 6 p.m.to 8 p.m. Draft and final versions of the PEIS will be made available to the public for review and comment when completed. The scoping process officially begins with the publication of the NOI in the federal register.

Public scoping comments will be solicited through June 30, 2011. YPG will also accept public input throughout the NEPA process. All interested parties are invited to attend the public meetings and to submit comments or questions by mail to Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Act coordinator, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Ariz., 85365-9498, or e-mail ypgnepa@conus.army.mil. By phone, contact Chuck Wullenjohn at (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.



MOVE IN SPECIAL!

Twin Mattress Set - Starting at \$99! Full Mattress Set - Starting at \$129! Queen Mattress Set - Starting at \$139!

Full Sleigh Bed With FREE Mattress Set - Starting at \$3991 Queen Sleigh Bed With FREE Mattress Set - Starting at \$4291

Microfiber Sofa & Love Seat -Starting at \$399! Share Report Abuse Next Blog»

Create Blog Sign In

Desert Messenger, Quartzsite, AZ

from the publisher of Quartzsite's FREE Community Paper Newspaper with local events and entertainment.

Follow Desert Messenger by Email





Desert Messenger online

CLICK HERE to view the current issue

and to sign up for FREE SUBSCRIPTION to receive emails when the next issue becomes available online.

Quartzsite Links

Quartzsite Big Tent RV Shows Quartzsite Business Chamber of Commerce Quartzsite Gem & Mineral Club Quartzsite Library Quartzsite RV Parks, BLM Camping Quartzsite Scholars' Academy Quartzsite Videos Silly Al's Pizza, Quartzsite Town of Quartzsite, Arizona Tyson Wells Showgrounds



Thursday, June 2, 2011

YPG public meetings planned for June 14 & 15

Yuma, Arizona - The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. The Notice of Intent (NOI) for the PEIS was published in the Federal Register on May 25, 2011.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. Renewable energy initiatives will be discussed in the PEIS, but project-specific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A public meeting will be held on YPG at Building 6, the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, located on the main

administrative area off of Imperial Dam Road on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364 on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 PM.

Draft and final versions of the PEIS will be made available to the public for review and comment when completed. The scoping process officially begins with the publication of the NOI in the Federal Register. Public scoping comments will be solicited through June 30, 2011. YPG will also accept public input throughout the NEPA process.

All interested parties are invited to attend the public meetings and to submit comments or questions by mail to Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, or eDesert Messenger, Quartzsite, AZ: YPG public meetings planned for June 14 & 15

Join the conve **Blog Archive** 0 comments: ▼ 2011 (81) ▼ June (8) Quartzsite to Parker lane closures Mon. & Tues. Quartzsite Propane flames up at RV Post a Comment Pit Stop Quartzsite's own Paul Winer gives FREE concert Fri... So. Arizona: Seeking Veteran Advisory Council advo... YPG public meetings planned for June 14 & 15 Hwy. 72 & 95 construction extends into weekend Quartzsite Council no show for short noticed speci... Mittry Lake reopened ► May (21)

- ► April (19)
- ▶ March (12)
- ► February (12)
- ► January (9)
- ▶ 2010 (117)
- ▶ 2009 (25)
- ► 2008 (6)

www.DesertMesse nger.com

Quartzsite Newspaper. News, Events, & Entertainment. Download Deadlines, Rate Card, links to other Quartzsite sites! http://www.desertmessenger.co m/

MBA



Loaded Web LOADED WEB

Bullying Awareness Prevention month

Elephant in the room

mail ypgnepa@conus.army.mil. By phone, contact Chuck Wullenjohn at (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday. Posted by Shanana "Rain" Golden-Bear at 5:26 PM Labels: public meeting, Quartzsite AZ, ypg, yuma az, Yuma Proving Ground





Newer Post

Older Post

Subscribe to: Post Comments (Atom)





Home

powered by Google"

About Me



Shanana "Rain" Golden-Bear Quartzsite, Arizona, United States

Quartzsite newspaper. Just being a human tuning fork, sharing joy and gratitude everywhere I go! Creating a vehicle for the people's voice to be heard in Quartzsite, Arizona and having fun! Contact: "Rain" at desertmessenger7@yahoo.com or call 541-218-2560.

View my complete profile

Draft

Public Involvement Management Strategy

Environmental Impact Statement for Yuma Proving Ground, Yuma, Arizona

Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mobile District

December 1, 2010

CH2MHILL

Contents

Section

1.0	Introduction		
2.0) Project Background		
3.0	Proje	ect Issues and Stakeholders	3
4.0	Public Involvement Tools and Activities		4
	4.1	Public Scoping Workshops	4
	4.2	Agency and Tribal Scoping Meetings	5
	4.3	Public Hearing	5
	4.4	Fact Sheets/Meeting Handouts	5
	4.5	Press Releases and Public Notices	6
	4.6	Mailing List	6
	4.7	Internet Web Page	7
	4.8	Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice and Executive	
		Order 13045, Child Protection Requirements	7

Appendices

- A PIMS Schedule for the YPG EIS
- B Public Involvement Documents

1.0 Introduction

This Public Involvement Management Strategy (PIMS) has been prepared to support the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. The purpose of this PIMS is to develop and guide the implementation of a public involvement strategy that will inform and educate the general public and interested stakeholders about the YPG EIS process. The PIMS includes information about tools and activities, such as fact sheets/meeting handouts, a web page, public scoping meetings, a public hearing, public notices, and press releases that will be used to communicate with the general public and stakeholders as the project moves through the EIS process. The U. S. Army intends to prepare an EIS, in accordance with Section 102(2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from the implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at YPG.

3.0 Project Issues and Stakeholders

NEPA is intended to consider environmental impacts in agency decision making and ensure public participation in the EIS process, which includes the identification and evaluation of project-specific issues. Public participation includes effective communication between all Federal, state, and local agencies, tribal governments, and other persons or organizations that may have an interest in the project. As part of the process, the public will be invited to attend public scoping workshops, and once the draft EIS is completed, review the document and participate in a public hearing.

Public scoping workshops are planned for Spring/Summer of 2011 to announce the commencement of the EIS process and to gather any initial concerns or issues the public might have with the project. Information provided at these meetings will include background information on the project and its purpose, the area of study, and the options being considered. The public will be given an opportunity to ask questions and make comments concerning the project and provide input on development of alternatives. Continued public involvement for the remainder of this project will be ensured through enactment of this PIMS.

Methods to reach the general public and interested stakeholders, in addition to the public meetings and public hearing, will include meeting announcements, press releases to local print and broadcast media, and a web site.

The U.S. Army will be the lead agency for this EIS. Other interested agencies and stakeholders may include:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Bureau of Land Management
- Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
- Arizona Game and Fish Department
- Arizona Department of Mines and Mineral Resources
- Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer
- Other Department of Defense entities
- Native American tribes
- Other interest groups such as: Arizona Desert Big Horn Sheep Society

4.0 Public Involvement Tools and Activities

Public involvement is a vital part of the EIS process: it provides the general public and stakeholders an opportunity to understand and comment on Federal projects that could affect them. There are many different methods used to involve the general public and stakeholders; however, every public involvement strategy must include a public scoping workshop, a public hearing, and public comment period, as well as public notices and press releases. The public involvement tools and activities for the YPG EIS process will include the following:

- Public Scoping Workshops (planned for June 14, 2011 at the YPG Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center Yuma Public Library and June 15, 2011 at the Yuma Public Library)
- A Public Hearing in October 2011
- Fact Sheets/Meeting Handouts
- Public Notices and Press Releases
- Mailing Lists
- Compliance with Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice, and Executive Order 13045, Child Protection Requirements

4.1 Public Scoping Workshops

Public scoping meetings are scheduled for June 14, 2011 at YPG and June 15, 2011 at the Yuma Public Library to announce the commencement of the EIS process and to gather any initial concerns or issues the public might have with the project. The meeting will be conducted in a workshop format with a series of display stations available for the public to review and obtain information about the project. Information presented on these display boards will consist of background information on the project and its purpose, the area of study, and the options under consideration. All graphic displays and handouts will be reviewed by YPG prior to use.

A public notice will be mailed to interested stakeholders prior to the public scoping workshops. Notice of the public scoping workshops will be advertised in the Yuma Sun, Bajo El Sol, Desert Messenger, and the YPG Outpost. Press releases will be sent to local TV news Channels 11 and 13, and local radio stations as identified by YPG. At the scoping workshops, the public will be given an opportunity to ask questions and make comments concerning the project. A court reporter will be present to transcribe the meeting.

A draft and final meeting summary, submitted to the YPG, will be prepared, summarizing the results and comments received at the public scoping workshops. A

hard copy of the workshop transcripts will be included in the meeting summary. This meeting summary will be posted on the YPG EIS web site.

4.2 Agency and Tribal Scoping Meetings

Agency and tribal governmental scoping meetings will be scheduled to overlap with the public scoping meetings (i.e., during an afternoon prior to the public meeting) to provide an opportunity for interested agencies and Native American tribes to ask questions and provide feedback on the YPG EIS process. A draft and final meeting summary will be prepared. Additional scoping meetings or calls may be scheduled upon request of the interested parties.

4.3 Public Hearing

One public hearing will be held in winter 2011 in Yuma to address the Draft EIS. The format of the hearing will include a presentation of the purpose and need for the project; a short presentation on how an EIS is organized; a discussion of the alternatives evaluated under the EIS; and a discussion of the purpose of the public comment period. Various graphics, including maps and charts, will be displayed in the meeting area. All graphics and handouts will be reviewed by YPG prior to use.

YPG representatives will open the public hearing. The Project Manager and other key contractor personnel will present the proposed alternatives, the evaluation framework for the alternatives, and the possible environmental effects of the proposed alternatives. A summary of the Draft EIS will be presented. The general public and interested stakeholders will then be provided an opportunity to make oral comments on the proposed action.

A court reporter will record the meeting, and a draft and final summary of the public hearing will be prepared. The summary for the hearing will be posted on the EIS web site. A hard copy of the meeting summary, along with a copy of the court reporter's transcript, will be provided to the YPG.

A public notice will be mailed to interested stakeholders prior to the public hearing. A notice of the meeting will also be posted on the YPG EIS web site and in local newspapers.

4.4 Fact Sheets/Meeting Handouts

Public involvement tools will also include fact sheets and meeting handouts. Fact sheets to be produced will provide information on the YPG EIS activities and status. The fact sheets will be provided at the meetings and later posted to the YPG EIS web site. Additional meeting handouts will also be prepared for distribution and display at the public workshops and public hearing. Suggested presentation boards for the scoping meetings include:

- Welcome Board (Project Title/Project Proponent)
- Project Location
- What is an EIS?

- Purpose and Need
- NEPA Issues
- Project Schedule
- Recreation and Natural Resources
- Cultural Resources

4.5 Press Releases and Public Notices

Press releases and public notices serve to notify the public of the status of an EIS. Press releases for the YPG EIS will be distributed prior to the public scoping workshops, the Draft EIS filing, the public hearing, and the submittal of the Final EIS. A public notice will also be published prior to the public hearing. Press releases will be issued prior to the scheduled public scoping workshops and the public hearing. Each press release will include the date, location, and purpose of the scoping workshops and the hearing. All public meetings will be held either in the City of Yuma or at the YPG.

The press releases for the Draft and Final EIS will be issued concurrently with the filing of each document. The press release for the Draft EIS will include the Notice of Availability of the draft document as well as the date for the public hearing. The press release for the Final EIS will include the Notice of Availability for the final document.

The following list presents the total number of press releases and corresponding milestones:

Press Release #1	Public Scoping Meetings
Press Release #2/Public Notice Register)	Filing of Draft EIS (Date of publication in Federal
Press Release #3/Public Notice	Public Hearing
Press Release #4 Register)	Filing of Final EIS (Date of publication in Federal

4.6 Mailing List

Interested stakeholders and the general public also participate in the EIS process through inclusion on the public mailing list. Those included on the mailing list will be environmental organizations, Yuma organizations, local agencies, state and Federal agencies, state legislative representatives, and Federal congressional representatives. Others to be included on the list will be news media and public libraries within the Yuma area and those individuals who commented during the scoping process and/or during the public workshops and hearing.

The mailing list will be used as a source for the distribution of Notices of Availability for the Draft and Final EIS as well as for the public meeting announcements, press releases, and other notices and communications to the public. The distribution list for the Draft and Final EIS will also indicate the format in which these documents will be provided electronically. The mailing list will be edited and updated periodically (and prior to the release of the fact sheets) so that those individuals who commented at the scoping meeting, the public workshop, and public hearing will be included. The list will also be updated to include others who have expressed an interest in the project, as well as deleting those requesting removal from the list, changes in address, and undeliverable mail.

4.7 Internet Web Page

An internet web site will be used to increase communication with the general public and stakeholders. This has proven to be a very efficient means of providing information on public workshops and hearings and serves as another method for the general public to provide comments. Other information and materials, such as fact sheets and meeting handouts, can be promptly posted and updated on the web site.

The web site to be created for the Draft EIS will include a home page, information on the EIS process, status of the project, and updates on public involvement activities. The Draft EIS and other support documents will also be posted to the web site. This tool will also provide the means for the general public and stakeholders to respond to the various submittals during the YGP EIS process. Other information to be included on the web site will be meeting summaries, YPG EIS fact sheets/meeting handouts, Notices of Availability, the EIS bibliography, press releases, and the project schedule.

4.8 Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice and Executive Order 13045, Child Protection Requirements

Another component of an EIS, as part of the public involvement plan, is ensuring that two executive orders, Executive Order 12898 and Executive Order 13045, are followed. Executive Order 12898 requires Federal agencies, to the greatest extent possible and permitted by law, to address environmental justice in minority and low-income populations, when Federal actions are involved. Executive Order 13045 was issued to protect children from environmental health and safety risks.

To ensure compliance with these executive orders, representatives of minority and children's groups will be contacted and asked to identify issues of potential interest. They will also be asked to identify other groups or individuals that should be included on the general public mailing list.

To comply with these executive orders, all public notices, documents, and meeting summaries will be concise, understandable, and readily accessible to the public. These executive orders for environmental justice and child protection requirements will be explained at the public scoping workshop and hearing and in the EIS fact sheets.

APPENDIX A PIMS Schedule for the YPG EIS

Press Release/Public Notice sent prior to Public Scoping Workshops		
Public Scoping Workshop at YPG	June 14, 2011	
Public Scoping Workshop at Yuma Public Library	June 15, 2011	
Draft EIS to the Public	Fall 2011	
Public Hearing	Winter 2011-12	
FEIS Public Comment Period	Summer 2012	
Record of Decision	Summer 2012	

APPENDIX B Public Involvement Documents

Appendix B will be compiled upon completion of the project. This appendix will include fact sheets/meeting handouts, press releases, public workshop and hearing notices, meeting summaries, and other items created for the project, as appropriate.
U.S. ARMY YUMA PROVING GROUND NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Chuck Wullenjohn Public Affairs Office Telephone: (928) 328-6189

Yuma, Arizona - The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. The Notice of Intent (NOI) for the PEIS was published in the Federal Register on May 25, 2011.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. Renewable energy initiatives will be discussed in the PEIS, but project-specific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A public meeting will be held on YPG from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm at Building 6, the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, located on the main administrative area off of Imperial Dam Road on Tuesday June 14, 2011. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364 on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 PM. Draft and final versions of the PEIS will be made available to the public for review and comment when completed. The scoping process officially begins with the publication of the NOI in the Federal Register. Public scoping comments will be solicited through June 30, 2011. YPG will also accept public input throughout the NEPA process. All interested parties are invited to attend the public meetings and to submit comments or questions by mail to Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, or e-mail ypgnepa@conus.army.mil. By phone, contact Chuck Wullenjohn at (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday.

EJERCITO DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS DE YUMA PROVING GROUND COMUNICADO DE PRENSA

PARA DIFUSIÓN INMEDIATA

CONTACTO: Chuck Wullenjohn Oficina de Asuntos Públicos Teléfono: (928) 328-6189

El ejército de los Estados Unidos de Yuma Proving Grounds tiene la intención de preparar una Declaración de Programación de Impacto Ambiental (PEIS, por sus siglas en inglés) en conformidad con la sección 102(2)(c) de Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA, por sus siglas en inglés) para analizar los impactos ambientales como resultado de la implementación del Plan Maestro de Propiedad Real (RPMP, por sus siglas en inglés) en Yuma Proving Ground (YPG, por sus siglas en inglés) al noreste de Yuma, Arizona El Aviso de Intención (NOI por sus siglas en inglés) de la PEIS fue publicado en el Registro Federal el 25 de mayo de 2011.

El proyecto permitiría a YPG a mantener una instalación capaz de probar sistemas de vanguardia del terreno militar y sistemas de vehículos aéreos, armas, municiones, sensores y sistemas de orientación; para proporcionar una formación realista y permitir la flexibilidad necesaria para entrar en proyectos del ejército y del sector privado legalmente admisibles donde tales proyectos sean compatibles con la misión militar de YPG. Se discutirán iniciativas de energía renovable en la PEIS, pero un análisis de la NEPA específicos del proyecto será necesario antes a la implementación de las iniciativas de energía renovable específicas. YPG realizaría los proyectos de construcción y demolición (principalmente en las zonas de acantonamiento), continuará las pruebas existentes y actividades de capacitación y ampliará algunas pruebas de formación y actividades. No habría una expansión de YPG como resultado de la acción propuesta. La construcción nueva incluiría una variedad de instalaciones para satisfacer la demanda y el espacio necesario para cumplir con los requerimientos de la misión.

Se llevará a cabo una reunión pública en YPG de las 6:00pm a 8:00pm en el edificio 6, del Centro Comunitario Desert Brezee Travel Camp, ubicado en el área administrativa principal en la salida de la calle Imperial Dam Road, el martes 14 de junio de 2011. Se llevará a cabo una segunda reunión pública en la biblioteca pública de Yuma, ubicada en el 2951 South 21st, Yuma AZ, 85364 el miércoles 15 de junio de 2011 de las 6: 00pm a 8:00pm. Se pondrán a disposición del público versiones del borrador y finales de la PEIS para su revisión y comentario una vez finalizados. El proceso de exploración oficialmente comienza con la publicación de la NOI en el Registro Federal. Comentarios públicos serán solicitados hasta el 30 de junio de 2011. YPG también aceptará la opinión pública durante todo el proceso de NEPA. Todas las partes interesadas están invitadas a asistir a las reuniones públicas y a enviar comentarios o preguntas por correo a Sergio Obregon, Coordinador de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental a U.S Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, o por correo electrónico al <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>. Por teléfono, llame a Chuck Wullenjohn al (928) 328-6189 de 6:30 AM a 5:00 PM, de lunes a jueves.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Price, Robert/ATL Friday, June 03, 2011 9:37 AM 'news@kswt.com' Press Release YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Price, Robert/ATL Friday, June 03, 2011 9:38 AM 'news@kyma.com' Press Release YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Price, Robert/ATL Friday, June 03, 2011 9:45 AM 'kcfy@kcfyfm.com' Press Release YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Price, Robert/ATL Friday, June 03, 2011 9:48 AM 'kim.johnson@kawc.org' Press Release YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Ms. Johnson,

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

Rob Price

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Price, Robert/ATL Friday, June 03, 2011 9:58 AM 'todaysbestmusic@z93yuma.com' Press Release YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Price, Robert/ATL Friday, June 03, 2011 10:01 AM 'jeffharris@edbroadcasters.com' Press Release YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Mr. Harris,

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Price, Robert/ATL Friday, June 03, 2011 10:10 AM 'oldiesradio@kjokyuma.com' Press Release YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

 From:
 Price, Robert/ATL

 Sent:
 Friday, June 03, 2011 10:39 AM

 To:
 'kyrm@lwrn.org'

 Subject:
 Press Release

 Attachments:
 YPG_Press_Release_Spanish_06-03-11.docx; YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Price, Robert/ATL Friday, June 03, 2011 1:27 PM '928-782-3874' Press Release YPG_Press_Release_Spanish_06-03-11.docx; YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Ms. Rosella Lopez,

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Price, Robert/ATL Friday, June 03, 2011 2:01 PM '928-343-0218' Press Release YPG Press Release 6-3-11.docx

Please see the attached press release for information on an upcoming project at United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground. Two public meetings will be held in mid-June to provide an opportunity for comment.

Contacts for additional information on the project are included in the attachment.

Thank you.

Media Contact List

<u>Newspapers</u> Bajo El Sol Desert Messenger Yuma Sun

Television Stations KECY (Fox 9) KSWT (CBS 13) KYMA (NBC 11)

Radio Stations KCFY (88.1 FM) KAWC (88.9 FM/1320 AM) KYRM (91.9 FM) KLJZ (93.1 FM) KTTI (95.1 FM) KCEC (104.5 FM) KQSR (100.9 FM) KBLU (560 AM) KJOK (1400 AM)

Mailing List											1
Title	First Name	Last Name	Job Title	Company	Address1	Address2	City	State	Postal Code	Email Address	Phone Number
Ms.	Caroline	Antone	Cultural Resources Manager	Ak-Chin Indian Community	42507 W. Peters and Nall Road		Maricopa	Arizona	85239		
Ms.	Sandy	Bahr	Conservation Outreach Director	Sierra Club, Grand Canyon Chapter	202 East McDowell Road, Suite 277		Phoenix	Arizona	85004- 4536		
Mr.	Scott	Bernhart	Director, Community Development	La Paz County	1112 Joshua, Suite 202		Parker	Arizona	85344		
Mr.	Bryan	Bowker	Regional Director	Bureau of Indian Affairs - Western Regional Office	2600 N. Central Avenue #400		Phoenix	Arizona	85365		
Ms.	Carol	Brooks	Curator	Arizona Historical Society	240 S. Madison Avenue		Yuma	Arizona	85364		
Ms.	Sheryl	Christenson	District Supervisor	Laguna NRCD, Yuma NRCD	2197 S 4th Ave, Suite104		Yuma	Arizona	85364		
Mr.	Pete	Cimellaro	President	Arizona Deer Association	P.O. Box 21868		Mesa	Arizona	85277		
Ms.	Sherry	Cordova	Chairwoman	Cocopah Indian Tribe	County 15th and Avenue G		Somerton	Arizona	85350		
Mr.	Dave	Daniels	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office	2555 East Gila Ridge Road		Yuma	Arizona	85364		
Mr.	Henry	Darwin	Director	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division	1110 West Washington Street		Phoenix	Arizona	85365		
Ms.	Rebecca	Davidson	Project Evaluation Program Supervisor, Habitat Program	Arizona Game and Fish Department	5000 W. Carefree Highway		Phoenix	Arizona	85004- 3008		
Mr.	Mitch	Ellis	Complex Manager	Southwest Arizona National Wildlife Refuge Complex	9300 E. 28th St.		Yuma	Arizona	85007		
Mr.	Eldred	Enas	Chairman	Colorado River Indian Tribes	26600 Mohave Road		Parker	Arizona	85344		
Ms.	Julie	Engel	President/CEO	Greater Yuma Economic Deve	899 Plaza Circle Drive	Suite 2	Yuma	AZ	85364		
Ms.	Diane	Enos	Chairwoman	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	10005 East Osborn Road		Scottsdale	Arizona	85256		
Mr.	Ronald	Escobar	Secretary Treasurer	Chemehuevi Indian Tribe	P.O. Box 1976		Havasu Lake	Californi a	92363		
Ms.	Charlene	Fernandez	Community Representative	Congressman Raul M. Grijalva – AZD07	201 Bingham Avenue	Suite 2	Somerton	AZ	85350	Charlene.Fernandez@mail.house.gov	928-343-7933
Mr.	Don	Foltz	Chairman	Yuma Chamber of Commerce Miltary Affairs Committee	180 W 1st Street	Suite A	Yuma	AZ	85364		
Ms.	Maria	Gonzalez	Environmental Compliance Inspector	Yuma County	198 S. Main Street		Yuma	AZ	85364	maria.gonzalez@vumacounty.az.gov	928-817-5139
Ms.	Vernelda	Grant	Director, Historic Preservation Office	San Carlos Apache Tribe	P.O. Box O		San Carlos	Arizona	85550	<u></u>	
Mr.	Richard	Hays	Supervising Border Patrol Agent	U.S. Border Patrol	4035 South Avenue A		Yuma	Arizona	85007		
Ms.	Susanna	Henry	Refuge Manager	Kofa National Wildlife Refuge	Southwest Arizona National Wildlife Refuge Complex	9300 E. 28th St.	Yuma	Arizona	94105- 3901		
Ms.	Irene	Herder	Superintendent	Bureau of Indian Affairs - Western Regional Office	2600 N. Central Avenue #400		Phoenix	Arizona	85365		
Ms.	Elvie R.	Hoag	Chief, Environmental Branch	ACC PMS/CEV	11817 Canon Blvd., Suite 306		Newport News	Virginia	85004- 3008		
Ms.	Cynthia	Hoeft	Director of Resource Management Office	Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office	2555 East Gila Ridge Road		Yuma	Arizona	85364		
Mr.	Mike	Jackson. Sr.	President	Quechan Indian Tribe	P.O. Box 1899		Yuma	Arizona	85366		1
Ms.	Elaine	Johnson	Refuge Manager	Imperial National Wildlife Refuge	P.O.Box 72217	12812 N. Wildlife Way	Yuma	Arizona	85007		

Congressman	Russ	Jones	House of Representatives		1700 W. Washington	Room 345	Phoenix	AZ	85007		602-926-3002
Ũ			*		Ŭ						
										riones@azleg.gov	
Mr.	Ernest	Jones, Sr.	President	Yayapai-Prescott Tribe	530 East Merritt Street		Prescott	Arizona	86301	1	
Honorable	Alan	Krieger	Mayor	City of Yuma	One City Plaza		Yuma	AZ.	85366	Mayors invite must got out through Col.	
nonorable		meger			one ony rada		1 unu		00000	Payne's Office.	
										Alan.Krieger@YumaAz.gov	928-373-5002
Mr.	Leigh	Kuwanwisi	Director, Hopi Cultural	Hopi Tribe	P.O. Box 123		Kykotsmo	Arizona	86039		
		wma	Preservation Office				V1				
Mr.	David	Kwail	Chairman	Yavapai-Apache Nation	2400 W. Datsi Road		Camp	Arizona	86322		
							Verde				
Ms.	Cheryl	Lambert	District Conservationist	NRCS Yuma Service Center	2197 S 4TH AVE, STE		Yuma	Arizona	85364		
					104						
Mr.	Barnaby V.	Lewis	Tribal Historic Preservation	Gila River Indian Community	P.O. Box 2140		Sacaton	Arizona	85247		
			Officer	Council							
Ms.	Laurie	Lineberry	Assistant Director of Community	City of Yuma	P.O. Box 13013		Yuma	Arizona	85366-		
			Development						3013		
Mr.	Bill	Luffy	President	Arizona Desert Bighorn	P.O. Box 21705		Mesa	Arizona	85277		
		5		Sheep Society							
Mr	Louis I	Manuel Ir	Chairman	Ak-Chin Indian Community	42507 W Peters and Nall		Maricopa	Arizona	85239		
	Louis J.	ivianuei, sr.	Chairman	Council	Road		marcopa	7 mizona	05257		
Honorable	Iohn	McCain	United States Senate	Council	2201 East Camelback	Suite 115	Dhoenix	17	85016		
Tionorable	John	wiccalli	United States Senate		Pood	Sulle 115	THOUHA	ΛL	85010		
					Koau					N. D.11', F., 'I.A., 'I.1.	(02.052.2410
	T*11				0 151 14				05250	No Public Email Available	602-952-2410
Ms.	J111	McCormick	Cultural Resources Manager	Cocopah Indian Tribe	County 15th and Avenue		Somerton	Arizona	85350		
					G						
Mr.	James	McGinnis	Supervisor, Special Investigations	Arizona Department of	1688 West Adams		Phoenix	Arizona	85365		
				Agriculture, Native Plant							
				Program							
Ms.	Colleen	McVey		La Paz County Community	1112 Joshua Avenue	Suite 202	Parker	AZ	85344		
				Development						cmcvey@co.la-paz.az.us	928-669-6138
		Nash-	Quechan Historic Preservation								
Ms.	Bridget	Chrabascz	Officer	Ouechan Indian Tribe	P.O. Box 1899		Yuma	Arizona	85366		
Mr.	Wayne	Nastri	Regional Administrator (ORA-1)	U.S. Environmental	75 Hawthorne Street		San	Californi	85021		
	5		e (,	Protection Agency, Region IX			Francisco	a			
				6. 9, 6							
Mr	Ned	Norris Ir	Chairman	Tohono O'Odham Nation	P.O. Box 837		Sells	Arizona	86534		
Mr.	Linda	Ogo	Culture Research Department	Yayanai_Prescott Tribe	530 East Merritt Street		Prescott	Arizona	86301		
1015.	Linua	Ogo	Director	Tavapai-Tiescott Tibe	550 East Merritt Succi		riescou	Alizona	80501		
14	Dulfas C	01	Director	A day Department of	1110 West West's star		Dia	A .:	95007		
MS.	Delfina C.	Onvarez	Project Manager, Federal Project	Arizona Department of	1110 West wasnington		Phoenix	Arizona	85007		
	T · 1	0							06440		
Ms.	Linda	Otero	Director, AhaMaKav Cultural	Fort Mojave Indian Tribe	P.O. Box 5990		Mohave	Arizona	86440		
			Society				Valley				
Congresswoman	Lynne	Pancrazi	House of Representatives		1700 W. Washington	Room 324	Phoenix	AZ	85007		602-926-3004
1							1		1		
										lpancrazi@azleg.gov	
Dr.	Clinton M.	Pattea	President	Fort McDowell Yavapai	P.O. Box 17779		Fountain	Arizona	85268		
				Nation			Hills				
Mr.	Robert	Pickles	Yuma County Administrator	Yuma County	198 S. Main Street		Yuma	AZ	85364		1
Ms.	Delores	Plunkett	Director, Cultural Department	Yayapai-Apache Nation	2400 W. Datsi Road	1	Camp	Arizona	86322		
			eren, eren zeparanent				Verde				
					P.O. Box O		San	Arizona	85550		
Me	Torm	Domblor	Chairman	San Carlos Anasha Triba	1.0. DOX 0		Carlos	a vi izolid	05550		
Mr.	Edward	Panger	Administrative Councel	Arizona Department of	1110 West Washington	+	Dhoenir	Arizona	85086		
1911.	Luwaru	Ranger	Auministrative Counsel	Environmental Quality	Street		FIIOCIIIX	AIIZOIIA	5000		
	D	D .1	D. 11.	Environmental Quality			37		3000		
Ms.	Patricia	Kather	President	Audubon Society	P.O. Box 6395		Yuma	Arizona	85366		

Ms.	Karen	Ray	Language/Cultural Coordinator	Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community	P.O. Box 17779		Fountain Hills	Arizona	85268		
Mr.	Elliott George	Ray	Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum	Colorado River Indian Tribes	26600 Mohave Road		Parker	Arizona	85344		
Mr.	William R.	Rhodes	Governor	Gila River Indian Community Council	P.O. Box 2140		Sacaton	Arizona	85247		
Mr.	Dave	Rodriguez	Director	Environmental Department MCAS	Box 99110		Yuma	Arizona	85365		
Mr.	Ken	Rosevear	Executive Director	Yuma County Chamber of Commerce	180 W 1st Street	Suite A	Yuma	AZ	85364		
Mr.	David	Sharpe	Chairman	Wellton-Mohawk Natural Resources Conservation District	c/o Natural Resources Conservation Service	5578 South Avenue 37E	Roll	Arizona	85347		
Mr.	LeRoy N.	Shingoitewa	Chairman	Hopi Tribe	P.O. Box 123		Kykotsmo vi	Arizona	86039		
Honorable	Don	Shooter	United States Senate		1700 W. Washington	Room 304	Phoenix	AZ	85007		602-926-4139
Mr.	Troy	Smith	Habitat Program Manager	Arizona Game and Fish Department	9140 East 28th Street		Yuma	Arizona	85365	dshooter@azleg.gov	
Mr.	Troy	Smith		AZ Game and Fish Departmer	9140 E 28th Street		Yuma	Arizona	85365		
Mr.	Steven L.	Spangle	Arizona Ecological Services Field Office	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	2322 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103		Phoenix	Arizona	85364		
Mr.	Monty	Stansbury	Planning Director	Yuma County Development Services	2703 South Avenue B		Yuma	Arizona	85364		
Mr.	Peter	Steere	Tribal Historic Preservation Officer	Tohono O'Odham Nation	P.O. Box 837		Sells	Arizona	86534		
Ms.	Lisa	Swick	Acting Director, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum	Colorado River Indian Tribes	26600 Mohave Road		Parker	Arizona	85344		
Mr.	Christopher	Wallis	Director of Resource Management Office	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Yuma Area Office	7301 Calle Aqua Salada		Yuma	Arizona	85365- 3596		
Mr.	Kelly	Washington	Cultural Resources Department Director	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	10005 East Osborn Road		Scottsdale	Arizona	85256		
Mr.	Timothy	Williams	Chairman	Fort Mojave Tribal Council	500 Merriman Avenue		Needles	Californi	92363		
Mr.	Jason	Williams	Regional Director	Arizona Wilderness Coalition	P.O. Box 2741		Prescott	Arizona	86302		
Mr.	Charles	Wood	Chairman	Chemehuevi Indian Tribe	P.O. Box 1976		Havasu Lake	Californi a	92363		



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Elvie R. Hoag Chief, Environmental Branch ACC PMS/CEV 11817 Canon Blvd., Suite 306 Newport News, Virginia 23606

Dear Ms. Hoag:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. James McGinnis Supervisor, Special Investigations Arizona Department of Agriculture, Native Plant Program 1688 West Adams Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. McGinnis:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Delfina C. Olivarez Project Manager, Federal Project Unit Arizona Department of Environmental Quality 1110 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Ms. Olivarez:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Edward Ranger Administrative Counsel Arizona Department of Environmental Quality 1110 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Ranger:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Henry Darwin Director Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division 1110 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Darwin:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Rebecca Davidson Project Evaluation Program Supervisor, Habitat Program Arizona Game and Fish Department 5000 W. Carefree Highway Phoenix, Arizona 85086-5000

Dear Ms. Davidson:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Troy Smith Habitat Program Manager Arizona Game and Fish Department 9140 East 28th Street Yuma, Arizona 85365-3596

Dear Mr. Smith:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Allen Anspach Regional Director Bureau of Indian Affairs - Western Regional Office 2600 N. Central Avenue #400 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-3008

Dear Mr. Anspach:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Raymond Fry Superintendent Bureau of Indian Affairs - Western Regional Office 2600 N. Central Avenue #400 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-3008

Dear Mr. Fry:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Dave Daniels Planning & Environmental Coordinator Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office 2555 East Gila Ridge Road Yuma, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. Daniels:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Dave Rodriguez Director Environmental Department MCAS Box 99110 Yuma, Arizona 85369

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Elaine Johnson Refuge Manager Imperial National Wildlife Refuge P.O.Box 72217 12812 N. Wildlife Way Yuma, Arizona 85365

Dear Ms. Johnson:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Susanna Henry Refuge Manager Kofa National Wildlife Refuge 9300 E. 28th St. Yuma, Arizona 85365

Dear Ms. Henry:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Mitch Ellis Complex Manager Southwest Arizona National Wildlife Refuge Complex 9300 E. 28th St. Yuma, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. Ellis:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Richard Hays Supervising Border Patrol Agent U.S. Border Patrol 4035 South Avenue A Yuma, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. Hays:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Cynthia Hoeft Director of Resource Management Office U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Yuma Area Office 7301 Calle Aqua Salada Yuma, Arizona 85364

Dear Ms. Hoeft:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Christopher Wallis Director of Resource Management Office U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Yuma Area Office 7301 Calle Aqua Salada Yuma, Arizona 85364

Dear Mr. Wallis:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Wayne Nastri Regional Administrator (ORA-1) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, California 94105-3901

Dear Mr. Nastri:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Steven L. Spangle Arizona Ecological Services Field Office U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2322 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103 Phoenix, Arizona 85021

Dear Mr. Spangle:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your agency additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Sandy Bahr Sierra Club, Grand Canyon Chapter 202 East McDowell Road, Suite 277 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4536

Dear Ms. Bahr:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,


April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Scott Bernhart Community Development Director La Paz County 1112 Joshua, Suite 202 Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Mr. Bernhart:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Pete Cimellaro Arizona Deer Association P.O. Box 21868 Mesa, Arizona 85277

Dear Mr. Cimellaro:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Chairwoman Sherry Cordova Cocopah Indian Tribe County 15th and Avenue G Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Chairwoman Cordova:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Chairman Eldred Enas Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Chairman Enas:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

President Diane Enos Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear President Enos:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Secretary / Treasurer Ronald Escobar Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Secretary / Treasurer Escobar:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Vernelda Grant Historic Preservation Office Director San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Ms. Grant:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

President Mike Jackson, Sr. Quechan Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear President Jackson:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

President Ernest Jones, Sr. Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear President Jones:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma Director, Hopi Cultural Preservation Office The Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwisiwma:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Chairman David Kwail Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Chairman Kwail:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Gila River Indian Community Council P.O. Box 2140 Sacatan, Arizona 85247

Dear Mr. Lewis:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms Laurie Lineberry Assistant Director of Community Development City of Yuma P.O. Box 13013 Yuma, Arizona 85366-3013

Dear Ms. Lineberry:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Bill Luffy, President Arizona Desert Bighorn Sheep Society P.O. Box 21705 Mesa, Arizona 85277

Dear Mr. Luffy:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Chairman Louis J. Manual, Jr. Ak-Chin Indian Community Council 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85239

Dear Chairman Manual:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms Jill McCormick Cultural Resources Manager Cocopah Indian Tribe County 15th and Avenue G Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Ms. McCormick:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Bridget Nash-Chrabascz Quechan Historic Preservation Officer Quechan Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear Ms. Nash-Chrabascz:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Chairman Ned Norris, Jr. Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 86534

Dear Chairman Norris:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Ogo Culture Research Department Director Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear Ms. Ogo:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Otero, Director AhaMaKav Cultural Society Fort Mojave Indian Tribe P.O. Box 5990 Mohave Valley, Arizona 86440

Dear Ms. Otero:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Dr. Clinton M. Pattea, President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85268

Dear President Pattea:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Delores Plunkett Director, Cultural Department Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Ms. Plunkett:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Chairman Terry Rambler San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Patricia Rather President, Audobon Society P.O. Box 6395 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear Ms. Rather:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Karen Ray Language/Cultural Coordinator Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85268

Dear Ms. Ray:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Governor William R. Rhodes Gila River Indian Community Council P.O. Box 2140 Sacatan, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Rhodes:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. David Sharpe Wellton-Mohawk Natural Resources Conservation District c/o Natural Resources Conservation Service 5578 South Avenue 37E Roll, Arizona 85347

Dear Mr. Sharpe:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Chairman LeRoy Shingoitewa The Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Chairman Shingoitewa:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Monty Stansbury Planning Director Yuma County Development Services 2703 South Avenue B Yuma, Arizona 85364

Dear Mr. Stansbury:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Peter Steere Project Manager, Cultural Affairs Office Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 86534

Dear Mr. Steere:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Kelly Washington Director, Cultural Resources Department Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Mr. Washington:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Jason Williams Regional Director Arizona Wilderness Coalition P.O. Box 2741 Prescott, Arizona 86302

Dear Mr. Williams:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



April 22, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Chairman Timothy Williams Fort Mojave Tribal Council 500 Merriman Drive Needles, California 92363

Dear Chairman Williams:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. This letter provides advance notice of the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the EIS in the Federal Register to allow your organization additional time to consider the action and identify any issues relevant for consideration in the NEPA analysis.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet mission requirements.

Two public scoping meetings will be scheduled following publication of the NOI, likely in mid-May. A separate meeting for interested agencies will be held prior to one of the public meetings. A notification letter with proposed project and meeting details will be sent once the NOI is published and meeting dates are set. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Louis J. Manuel, Jr. Chairman Ak-Chin Indian Community Council 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85239

Dear Chairman Manuel:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Caroline Antone Cultural Resources Manager Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85239

Dear Ms. Antone:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Enclosure



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Charles Wood Chairman Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Chairman Wood:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Enclosure


May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ronald Escobar Secretary Treasurer Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Mr. Escobar:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Sherry Cordova Chairwoman Cocopah Indian Tribe County 15th and Avenue G Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Chairwoman Cordova:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Jill McCormick Cultural Resources Manager Cocopah Indian Tribe County 15th and Avenue G Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Ms. McCormick:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Lisa Swick Acting Director, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Ms. Swick:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Eldred Enas Chairman Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Chairman Enas:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Dr. Clinton M. Pattea President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85268

Dear President Pattea:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Karen Ray Language/Cultural Coordinator Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85268

Dear Ms. Ray:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Otero Director, AhaMaKav Cultural Society Fort Mojave Indian Tribe P.O. Box 5990 Mohave Valley, Arizona 86440

Dear Ms. Otero:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Timothy Williams Chairman Fort Mojave Tribal Council 500 Merriman Avenue Needles, California 92363

Dear Chairman Williams:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Gila River Indian Community Council P.O. Box 2140 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Mr. Lewis:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. William R. Rhodes Governor Gila River Indian Community Council P.O. Box 2140 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Rhodes:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Mike Jackson, Sr. President Quechan Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear President Jackson:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Bridget Nash-Chrabascz Quechan Historic Preservation Officer Quechan Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear Ms. Nash-Chrabascz:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Diane Enos Chairwoman Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Chairwoman Enos:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Kelly Washington Cultural Resources Department Director Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Mr. Washington:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Vernelda Grant Director, Historic Preservation Office San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Ms. Grant:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Terry Rambler Chairman San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma Director, Hopi Cultural Preservation Office Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwisiwma:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. LeRoy N. Shingoitewa Chairman Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Chairman Shingoitewa:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ned Norris, Jr. Chairman Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 86534

Dear Chairman Norris:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Peter Steere Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 86534

Dear Mr. Steere:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. David Kwail Chairman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Chairman Kwail:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Delores Plunkett Director, Cultural Department Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Ms. Plunkett:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr. President Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear President Jones:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Ogo Culture Research Department Director Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear Ms. Ogo:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Alan Krieger City of Yuma One City Plaza Yuma, AZ 85366

Dear Honorable Krieger:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

The first public meeting will be held at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.</u>

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Charlene Fernandez Congressman Raul M. Grijalva – AZD07 201 Bingham Avenue Suite 2 Somerton, AZ 85350

Dear Ms. Fernandez:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

The first public meeting will be held at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.</u>

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Maria Gonzalez Yuma County 198 S. Main Street Yuma, AZ 85364

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

The first public meeting will be held at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.</u>

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Congressman Russ Jones 1700 W. Washington Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear Congressman Jones:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

The first public meeting will be held at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.</u>

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable John McCain 2201 East Camelback Road Suite 115 Phoenix, AZ 85016

Dear Honorable McCain:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

The first public meeting will be held at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.</u>

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Colleen McVey La Paz County Community Development 1112 Joshua Avenue Suite 202 Parker, AZ 85344

Dear Ms. McVey:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

The first public meeting will be held at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.</u>

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Congresswoman Lynne Pancrazi 1700 W. Washington Room 324 Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear Congresswoman Pancrazi:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

The first public meeting will be held at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.</u>

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Don Shooter 1700 W. Washington Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear Honorable Shooter:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

The first public meeting will be held at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.</u>

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Elvie R. Hoag Chief, Environmental Branch ACC PMS/CEV 11817 Canon Blvd., Suite 306 Newport News, Virginia 85004-3008

Dear Ms. Hoag:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. James McGinnis Supervisor, Special Investigations Arizona Department of Agriculture, Native Plant Program 1688 West Adams Phoenix, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. McGinnis:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Delfina C. Olivarez Project Manager, Federal Project Unit Arizona Department of Environmental Quality 1110 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Ms. Olivarez:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,


May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Edward Ranger Administrative Counsel Arizona Department of Environmental Quality 1110 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85086-5000

Dear Mr. Ranger:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Henry Darwin Director Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division 1110 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. Darwin:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Rebecca Davidson Project Evaluation Program Supervisor, Habitat Program Arizona Game and Fish Department 5000 W. Carefree Highway Phoenix, Arizona 85004-3008

Dear Ms. Davidson:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Troy Smith Habitat Program Manager Arizona Game and Fish Department 9140 East 28th Street Yuma, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. Smith:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Bryan Bowker Regional Director Bureau of Indian Affairs - Western Regional Office 2600 N. Central Avenue #400 Phoenix, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. Bowker:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Irene Herder Superintendent Bureau of Indian Affairs - Western Regional Office 2600 N. Central Avenue #400 Phoenix, Arizona 23606

Dear Ms. Herder:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Dave Daniels Planning & Environmental Coordinator Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office 2555 East Gila Ridge Road Yuma, Arizona 85364

Dear Mr. Daniels:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Dave Rodriguez Director Environmental Department MCAS Box 99110 Yuma, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Elaine Johnson Refuge Manager Imperial National Wildlife Refuge P.O.Box 72217 12812 N. Wildlife Way Yuma, Arizona 85007

Dear Ms. Johnson:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Susanna Henry Refuge Manager Kofa National Wildlife Refuge Southwest Arizona National Wildlife Refuge Complex 9300 E. 28th Street Yuma, Arizona 94105-3901

Dear Ms. Henry:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Mitch Ellis Complex Manager Southwest Arizona National Wildlife Refuge Complex 9300 E. 28th St. Yuma, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Ellis:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Richard Hays Supervising Border Patrol Agent U.S. Border Patrol 4035 South Avenue A Yuma, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Hays:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Cynthia Hoeft Director of Resource Management Office Bureau of Land Management, Yuma District Office 2555 East Gila Ridge Road Yuma, Arizona 85364

Dear Ms. Hoeft:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Christopher Wallis Director of Resource Management Office U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Yuma Area Office 7301 Calle Aqua Salada Yuma, Arizona 85365-3596

Dear Mr. Wallis:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Wayne Nastri Regional Administrator (ORA-1) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, California 85021

Dear Mr. Nastri :

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Steven L. Spangle Arizona Ecological Services Field Office U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2322 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103 Phoenix, Arizona 85364

Dear Mr. Spangle:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. David Sharpe Chairman Wellton-Mohawk Natural Resources Conservation District c/o Natural Resources Conservation Service 5578 South Avenue 37E Roll, Arizona 85347

Dear Mr. Sharpe:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>.

Sincerely,



May 31, 2011

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Cheryl Lambert District Conservationist NRCS Yuma Service Center 2197 S 4TH AVE, STE 104 Yuma, Arizona 85364

Dear Ms. Lambert:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes will occur on Tuesday, June 14, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. at YPG's Main Administrative Area, in the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Building 6. The first public meeting will also be held at this location, on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364, on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the meeting location on YPG. Your office will be provided with a copy of the draft and final versions of the PEIS for review and comment. Your comments on this proposed action are requested. Comments or questions should be directed to the NEPA Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

Sincerely,

03

June 14, 2011 YUMA PROVING GROUND AGENCY SCOPING MEETING

Name	Agency	Address Include City and Zip Code	Phone #	Email Address
Shery / Christens	n Lagana Ni	ROD 219754 Han	925 317-19. e. quite 104	Shery I christensene
				Azinacalaetine
Elliett Garge Rong	CRIT MUSCIUS	1007 AZ AVE	928-669-8972	CRIT, MUSEUMO Valoo

2003

June 14, 2011 YUMA PROVING GROUND AGENCY SCOPING MEETING

Name	Agency	Address Include City and Zip Code	Phone #	Email Address
Kim Malorey		10709 E34-2,21 Yum A_	328-3771	Kmalone, @ Kmee-ile ro.
Troy Sun th	AGFUS	9140 E 28th SZ, Yuma, 42	728-341-4068	tramithe azsta. sou
Chuck HARPER	UpG. Pro		928-328=2635	Charles. G. Houper Busion mill

June 14, 2011 YUMA PROVING GROUND AGENCY SCOPING MEETING

Name	Agency	Address Include City and Zip Code	Phone #	Email Address
Lesley Walther	zia Engineevina	2575 W. 24th St APt. 134	(NG 928Y 2630	Walther lester a gmil. com
Lisa Swich	LRIT 1	IJJTAZAVE	07286698790	LRIT. MUSUM. Q 44000
				-

306 3

This page intentionally left blank.

June 14, 2011 YUMA PROVING GROUND PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Name	Address Include City and Zip Code	Phone #	Email Address	Add to Mail List (Y/N)
HATCH, CHR.S	972 Halo St, 186, 10mm, AZ 85365	3.28 - 6650	Christepher f. hatch & us army may	

June 15, 2011 YUMA PROVING GROUND PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Name	Address Include City and Zip Code	Phone #	E
Charles Room	1129 Brangus AUE YUMA, AZ 85364	928 750 3649	Charles.r
Nort Cullis	CITYON YUMP, AZ	928 373-5000 x303c	Noah.Cull
Bill Knowles	9140 G 25th SI Yuma 17 55364	922-341-4047	bknow Lr.
JOSEPH BARNET	12435 E PATRICIA OR. YUMA, AZ 75367	928-983-3371	joseph-
(T			

mail Address	Add to Mail List (Y/N)
rer-pe us. army. Ail	yes
R YUMAAR. SOV	Yes.
@ 979 1.900	Yes
barnett C.fus.gov	Y65
- T.	
) f

Welcome to the Yuma Proving Ground

OPEN HOUSE

Scoping Meeting

Please sign in and take your time to view the informational exhibits. Staff (with name tags) are available to answer your questions.

We appreciate your valuable time spent with us this evening. YOUR OPINIONS ARE IMPORTANT. Please complete a comment card before you leave to help guide the direction of this proposed project.

For more information or to express your opinions on this project, please contact: Sergio Obregon National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground IMWE-YMA-PWE 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498 email:ypgnepa@conus.army.mil By phone contact Chuck Wullenjohn at (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday.

What is an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?

The **National Environmental Policy Act** requires federal agencies to prepare an **EIS** to assess the environmental impacts of federal actions that could significantly affect the human environment.*

*The human environment includes...Land, Air, Water, Living Organisms, and Cultural Resources.

NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the social and environmental impacts of federal projects. It also requires that the public be allowed to participate in the decision making process.

NEPA allows for multiple level of analysis with an EIS being the most detailed. One of the initial steps in an EIS is to conduct Scoping Meetings.

What is a Scoping Meeting?

Scoping Meetings provide the opportunity for the public and other government agencies to gather information and provide formal oral or written comments on-the-record. Comments received during the scoping meeting will be included in the official public record along with an official response to each comment. An EIS document describes the effects from the proposed federal action as well as those from alternative actions that were considered. It also presents information on mitigation to reduce any impacts.*

* **An Impact is...** A change or consequence that results from an activity, it can be positive, negative or both. It may be mitigated to lessen or remove the impact.

How Do I Submit Comments?

Comments can be provided in person to the court reporter or in writing via the comment forms provided at this meeting. During the initial scoping period which ends on June 30, 2011, additional comments can be submitted via mail or email to:

> Comments can be submitted to: Sergio Obregon National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground IMWE-YMA-PWE 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498 email:ypgnepa@conus.army.mil

What is the Next Step?

After the scoping period, YPG will consider the public and agency input and prepare the Preliminary Draft PDEIS. Additional opportunities for public involvement will occur during the formal public review period for the Draft PDEIS. This public review period will last 30 days and will include a public hearing for additional public comment. The Final EIS and all comments and responses on the Draft EIS will be made available to the public.

What will this PDPEIS address?

WHAT will this PDPEIS Address?

This Preliminary Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PDPEIS) will address implementation of the Real Property Master Plan, which includes:

- Construction and demolition of facilities and infrastructure
- Changes to testing and training activities
- Changes to testing and training areas

The PDPEIS addresses two types of actions:

- Short-term, well-defined actions that would be implemented without additional NEPA analysis once a decision is made
- Long-term, less well-defined actions that would occur later in time and would receive additional site-specific NEPA analysis prior to project implementation

Why is this a **Programmatic EIS?**

This is a programmatic EIS because some activities are evaluated broadly and will require additional focused NEPA analysis prior to implementation.

The broad analysis in this document will form the basis for Subsequent NEPA analysis through a process called tiering.

NEPA and Social, Economic, and Environmental Issues

Because this is a federal action, the Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic EIS will consider the potential impacts of considered alternatives. YPG will avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential adverse impacts to the extent practicable.

Typical resource areas evaluated include:



Schedule and Opportunities for Public Comment NEPA Process

Federal Environmental Review Process



Project Location



Proposed Action

Activities Under Consideration

Under the Proposed Action, YPG will continue to operate as multipurpose installation that serves a broad customer base. Activities anticipated at YPG include:

- 1. New Construction and Demolition of Facilities and Infrastructure
 - Buildings
 - Runways/Helipads
 - Utilities
- 2. Modified/Increased Testing
 - New sensors and systems
 - Increased range and power of weapons
 - Improvements in vehicle systems
 - Combat vehicles
- 3. Modified/Increased Training
- 4. Weapons Firing/Impact Areas
 - Small Arms/Inert
 - High Explosive
 - Gun Positions





Purpose and Need

Purpose of the Proposed Action

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to enable YPG to continue to meet its military mission by providing adequate facilities and infrastructure for:

- testing military ground and aerial vehicle systems
- testing weapons, ammunition, sensors, and guidance systems
- provide realistic military training
- provide for private industry partnerships

Need for the Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would ensure the readiness of U.S. forces and materiel to meet the demands of hot arid environment theaters around the world. The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into Army/private industry projects.





Natural Resources















Bienvenido a la reunión de exploración del ejército de los Estados Unidos de *Yuma Proving Ground* para la Declaración de Impacto Ambiental Programático

El ejército agradece su asistencia y sus opiniones. Por favor repase los carteles en secuencia y discuta sus preguntas e interés con los miembros del proyecto. Comentarios de ámbito público serán solicitados hasta el 30 de junio de 2011 y pueden entregarse con el taquígrafo de la corte (reportero de la corte) en la estación final. El ejército también aceptará la opinión del público durante todo el desarrollo de la Declaración de Impacto Ambiental Programático (PEIS, por sus siglas en inglés).

Estación # 1 proporciona el formato de la reunión y registración.

Esta hoja de datos pretende ofrecerle a usted un entendimiento de lo que se propone en Yuma Proving Ground (YPG), el porqué su opinión es importante, y cómo guiarse en esta reunión de ámbito público.

Estación # 2 proporciona una visión general del proyecto.

El objetivo de la Acción Propuesta es que YPG siga cumpliendo con su misión militar proporcionando instalaciones adecuadas e infraestructura para probar sistemas y material militar, proporcionar entrenamiento militar realista y prever asociaciones con la industria privada.

Para que YPG continúe preparando a las fuerzas estadounidenses y material que cumpla con las demandas en ambientes áridos y calientes alrededor del mundo, se propone lo siguiente:

- Demolición de estructuras obsoletas
- Construcción de instalaciones e infraestructura
- Modificar o aumentar las pruebas
- Modificar o aumentar el entrenamiento
- Ubicaciones nuevas de disparo de armas
- Expansión de áreas de impacto de municiones

Estación # 3 proporciona información sobre la NEPA y EIS.

El proceso de exploración oficialmente solicita su opinión a las partes interesadas en las actividades previstas. La Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA, por sus siglas en inglés) requiere que las agencias preparen una Declaración de Impacto Ambiental (EIS, por sus siglas en inglés) para evaluar los impactos ambientales de las acciones federales que podrían afectar significativamente el medio ambiente humano. Para YPG, el ejército preparará un EIS programático (PEIS en lugar de un EIS estándar) porque algunas actividades requerirán un análisis más centrado en la NEPA antes de su implementación. Planteará la construcción, demolición, decisiones a corto plazo, las decisiones a largo plazo y cambios a las pruebas y actividades de entrenamiento. Versiones borrador y finales del PEIS estarán disponibles al público para su revisión antes de tomar una decisión.

Estación # 4 se centra en cuestiones de recursos.

El ejército está buscando información sobre cuestiones tales como los recursos culturales, energía y utilidades, residuos peligrosos y materiales peligrosos, uso de la tierra, ruido, seguridad, terreno, vegetación, recursos visuales, vida silvestre y especies en amenaza y peligro de extinción. Otras cuestiones adicionales se incluyen en esta estación.

Estación # 5 proporciona un reportero de la corte para anotar sus comentarios verbales.

Esperamos que esta reunión ayude a aclarar sus preguntas e intereses que le gustaría ver resueltos en el análisis ambiental. Por favor proporcione sus comentarios al reportero de la corte. También puede enviar sus comentarios por escrito por medio de correo o por correo electrónico a:

Sergio Obregon

Coordinador de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground IMWE-YMA-PWE 301 C Street Yuma, AZ 85365-9498 Correo electrónico: <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>

Todos los comentarios que sean recibidos con fecha hasta el día 30 de junio de 2011 recibirán una respuesta en el borrador del PEIS. Para preguntas generales sobre el proyecto, por favor llame a **Sergio Obregon** al (928) 328-2015 de 6:30 AM a 5:00 P.M., del lunes a jueves.



Welcome to the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground

Public Scoping Meeting for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

The Army appreciates your attendance and welcomes your input. Please review the posters in sequence and discuss your questions and concerns with project team members. Public scoping comments will be solicited through June 30, 2011 and can be submitted at this meeting through the court reporter at the final station. The Army will also accept public input throughout the development of the PEIS.

Station #1 provides the meeting format and sign-in.

This fact sheet is intended to provide you with an understanding of what is being proposed at YPG, why your input is important, and how to navigate this open house-style public scoping meeting.

Station #2 provides a project overview.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to enable Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) to continue to meet its military mission by providing adequate facilities and infrastructure to test military materiels and systems, provide realistic military training, and provide for private industry partnerships.

In order for YPG to continue to ready U.S. forces and materiel to meet the demands of hot arid environment theaters around the world, the following is being proposed:

- Demolition of obsolete structures
- Construction of facilities and Infrastructure
- Modified or Increased Testing
- Modified or Increased Training
- New Weapons firing locations
- Expanded Munitions Impact Areas

Station #3 provides NEPA and EIS information.

The scoping process officially seeks input from stakeholders on the intended activities. The National Environmental Policy Act requires agencies to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the environmental impacts of federal actions that could significantly affect the human environment. For YPG, the Army will prepare a programmatic EIS (PEIS rather than a standard EIS) because some activities will require additional focused NEPA analysis prior to implementation. It will address construction, demolition, short-term decisions, long-term decisions, and changes to testing and training activities. Draft and final versions of the PEIS will be made available to the public for review before a decision is made.

Station #4 focuses on resource issues.

The Army is seeking input on issues such as cultural resources, energy/utilities, hazardous materials/hazardous waste, land use, noise, safety, soils, vegetation, visual resources, wildlife, and sensitive species. Additional issues are included at Station #4.

Station #5 provides a court reporter to record

your verbal comments. We hope this meeting helps to clarify your questions and concerns that you would like to see addressed in the environmental analysis. Please provide your comments to the court reporter. Or you may submit written comments by mail or email to:

Sergio Obregon

National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE 301 C Street Yuma, AZ 85365-9498 email: ypgnepa@conus.army.mil

All comments received by June 30, 2011 will receive a response in the Draft PEIS. For general questions about the project, please contact **Chuck Wullenjohn** at (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday.



AFFIDAVIT OF COURT REPORTER

In the matter of:

UNITED STATES ARMY GARRISON YUMA PROVING GROUND PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT RESULTING FROM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REAL PROPERTY MASTER PLAN AT YUMA PROVING GROUND NORTHEAST OF YUMA, ARIZONA.

STATE OF ARIZONA)) ss. COUNTY OF YUMA)

I, MICHELE E. BALMER, Certified Reporter No. 50489 for the State of Arizona, do hereby certify:

- That on June 14, 2011, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., I was present at the public meeting held at the YPG Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Yuma, Arizona, and that no public comment was received;
- 2. That on June 15, 2011, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., I was present at the public meeting held at the Yuma Main Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma, Arizona, and that no public comment was received;

DATED at Yuma, Arizona this 17th day of June, 2011.

Ralmer

MICHELE E. BALMER Arizona Certified Reporter No. 50489

YUMA COURT REPORTERS, LLC 220 South Second Avenue Yuma, Arizona 85364 (928) 782-7591 yumacourtreporters.com
Scoping Report

Introduction

A Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is being prepared by the U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

Scoping meetings were conducted to allow stakeholders and the public to identify significant concerns or issues they have with the Proposed Actions described in the PEIS or to suggest other alternatives to the Proposed Action which should be considered. This report includes a synopsis of the scoping meetings, a listing of the concerns and issues that were raised, an evaluation of those issues, and recommendations for addressing those concerns and issues.

Meeting Synopsis

Four meetings were held as part of the scoping process. The project was presented to potentially interested tribal governments on June 8 as part of a larger tribal meeting at YPG. A scoping meeting was held at 3:00PM at YPG on June 14 for the state and federal agencies and local governmental entities with potential interest in the EIS process. The Arizona Fish and Game Department (FGD) and the Laguna Natural Resource Conservation District (NRCD) also attended the meeting, as well as representatives of the Colorado River Indian Tribe. Two public meetings were held for citizens on June 14 and June 15. Both meetings took place from 6:00-8:00PM. One meeting was conducted on YPG and was open to the public, and one was held at the Yuma public library. Representatives from the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), FGD, and City of Yuma who were unable to attend the June 14 meeting attended the June 15 meeting.

Notifications for the agency meeting were sent via two letters to individual agencies, political representatives, and tribal governments. Notifications to the public occurred via a Notice of Intent published on May 25, 2011, in the Federal Register, a press release in both English and Spanish, and a Public Notice advertisement published in local news publications, including the Yuma Sun Newspaper, Bajo El Sol (Spanish language newspaper), Quartzite Desert Messenger, and the Outpost (YPG base publication). A press release was also distributed to area radio and television outlets.

Summary

Several issues were raised by stakeholders who attended the scoping meetings. At the agency scoping meeting at YPG on June 14 Troy Smith, of the Arizona FGD, mentioned several issues his agency typically considers with projects. These include:

- Public access to hunting areas, or changes to hunting seasons
- Impacts to sensitive habitats such as desert washes, mesquite bosques, dunes, mountains, or big horn sheep habitat
- Cumulative impacts that would occur on a large scale to wildlife over the next 20 years
- Interruptions to the survey periods of sheep and mule deer
- Any activities that might occur in waters used by wildlife
- Any activities that might impact or break linkages of habitat (such as roads)
- Activities that may spread invasive species

• Activities that would impact the ability of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to manage wild horses or burros

Once the Draft EIS is prepared, Arizona FGD would like the opportunity to review the document.

It was noted that BLM is currently managing an experimental population of Sonoran pronghorn which will eventually be released in the YPG vicinity.

Sheryl Christenson, from the Laguna NRCD, indicated several concerns on behalf of her organization. She expressed interest in any construction projects, including utility lines, which may impact farmland adjacent to YPG, minimization of PM-10 for air quality considerations, and dust control measures.

Elliott George Ray, a representative from the CRIT Museum at the Colorado River Indian Tribe, indicated that they would like to review the materials and provide written comments if they identified any concerns.

It was suggested by attendees that the following be included on stakeholder lists for the project going forward:

- The Welton Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District
- The Barry Goldwater Range NRCD
- Nearby wildlife refuges
- Winter visitors who frequent the Quartzite area
- The local Yuma Valley Rod and Gun Club

In addition to the cumulative impacts concerns raised by Arizona FGD, several other projects were discussed which stakeholders attending the meeting thought should be considered for cumulative impacts. They include:

- Proposed solar plants at White Wing Ranch near Palomas Mountains and The Quartzite Solar Project (10 miles north of Quartzite). A draft EIS has recently been published for the project near Quartzite.
- Proposed 500 kV transmission line planned for 2014, to be constructed by APS
- Widening project for Highway 95, which has been taken off the 5-year short-term plan and has been postponed to a 2015-2016 at the earliest but will include a bridge over Fortuna Wash.
- Secure border projects-communication tower projects at various locations along the border.

The public scoping meetings were held on June 14 and 15 at YPG and at the public library. One person attended the meeting on June 14, and four people attended the meeting on June 15. Representatives from the USFWS, FGD, and City of Yuma were among the attendees of the June 15 public meeting.

The City of Yuma requested information on any actions proposed in the PEIS that would extend beyond the current boundaries of YPD or any proposed expansion of the installation. The USFWS representative expressed concern with the lack of a buffer between one of the proposed impact areas in Kofa and the adjacent NWR.

Testimony

Neither the public meeting on June 14 nor the public meeting on June 15 produced any public comments. The court reporter affidavit of the meeting is presented in Appendix A.

Conclusions and Recommendations

No significant issues or concerns were raised by the attendees of the meetings. Where practicable, issues raised by attendees and projects mentioned for potential cumulative impacts were incorporated into the Preliminary Draft PEIS. All attendees expressed interest in receiving a copy of the draft document once it has been prepared. At that time (i.e. once details of the projects are available), additional comments on the project are expected.

Two issues were raised which will require additional consideration by YPG during development of the PEIS:

1). USFWS expressed concern with the lack of buffer between a proposed impact area and the adjacent wildlife refuge. Adjustment of the boundaries of the proposed impact area should be considered.

2). The scoping meeting was held during the summer when many seasonal residents are not present in Quartzite. An effort should be made to hold the next opportunity for formal public comment, the public hearing on the draft document, during the winter.

AFFIDAVIT OF COURT REPORTER

In the matter of:

UNITED STATES ARMY GARRISON YUMA PROVING GROUND PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT RESULTING FROM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REAL PROPERTY MASTER PLAN AT YUMA PROVING GROUND NORTHEAST OF YUMA, ARIZONA.

STATE OF ARIZONA)) SS. COUNTY OF YUMA)

I, MICHELE E. BALMER, Certified Reporter No. 50489 for the State of Arizona, do hereby certify:

- That on June 14, 2011, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., I was present at the public meeting held at the YPG Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, Yuma, Arizona, and that no public comment was received;
- That on June 15, 2011, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., I was present at the public meeting held at the Yuma Main Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma, Arizona, and that no public comment was received;

DATED at Yuma, Arizona this 17th day of June, 2011.

YUMA COURT REPORTERS, LLC 220 South Second Avenue Yuma, Arizona 85364 (928) 782-7591 yumacourtreporters.com

? Balmer

MICHELE E. BALMER Arizona Certified Reporter No. 50489

	- geneg meening ee			
Name	Agency	Address	Phone	Email
Kim Maloney	KMEC Consulting,	10709 E 34 th Pl,	328-3771	kmaloney@kmec-llc.com
	LLC.	Yuma, AZ		
Lesley	Zia Engineering	2575 W. 24 th St	928-XXX-2630	Walther.lesley@gmail.com
Walther		Apt 134		
Troy Smith	AFGD	9140 E 28 th St,	928-341-4068	trsmith@azgfd.gov
		Yuma AZ		
Chuck	YPG PEO		928-328-2635	Charles.G.Harper@us.army.mil
Harper				
Lisa Swick	CRIT Museum	1007 AZ Ave	928-669-8790	CRIT.Museum@yahoo.com
	Colorado River			
	Indian Tribe			
Elliott	CRIT Museum			
George Ray	Colorado River			
	Indian Tribe			
Sheryl	Laguna NRCD			
Christenson				

Appendix B – Agency Meeting – June 14th List of Attendees

Appendix C – Public Meeting – June 14th List of Attendees

Name	Address	Phone	Email
Chris Hatch	972 Halo St, YPG, Yuma,	328-668-	Christopher.f.hatch@us.army.mil
	AZ		

Name	Address	Phone	Email
Charles	1129 Brangus Ave, Yuma	928-750-3649	Charles.ruerup@us.army.mil
Ruerup	AZ		
Noah Cullis	One City Plaza, City of	928-373-5000	Noah.cullins@yuma.az.gov
	Yuma, AZ		
Bill Knowles	9140 E 25 th St, Yuma AZ	928-341-4047	<u>bknowles@az.yuma.gov</u>
Joseph	12435 E Patricia Dr,	928-983-3371	Joseph.barnett@fws.gov
Barnett	Yuma AZ		

Appendix D – Public Meeting – June 15th List of Attendees

Appendix D – Meeting Notice U.S. ARMY YUMA PROVING GROUND NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Chuck Wullenjohn Public Affairs Office Telephone: (928) 328-6189

Yuma, Arizona - The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. The Notice of Intent (NOI) for the PEIS was published in the Federal Register on May 25, 2011.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. Renewable energy initiatives will be discussed in the PEIS, but project-specific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A public meeting will be held on YPG from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm at Building 6, the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, located on the main administrative area off of Imperial Dam Road on Tuesday June 14, 2011. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364 on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 PM. Draft and final versions of the PEIS will be made available to the public for review and comment when completed. The scoping process officially begins with the publication of the NOI in the Federal Register. Public scoping comments will be solicited through June 30, 2011. YPG will also accept public input throughout the NEPA process. All interested parties are invited to attend the public meetings and to submit comments or questions by mail to Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, or e-mail ypgnepa@conus.army.mil. By phone, contact Chuck Wullenjohn at (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday.

EJERCITO DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS DE YUMA PROVING GROUND COMUNICADO DE PRENSA

PARA DIFUSIÓN INMEDIATA

CONTACTO: Chuck Wullenjohn Oficina de Asuntos Públicos Teléfono: (928) 328-6189

Yuma, Arizona - El ejército de los Estados Unidos tiene la intención de preparar una Declaración de Programación de Impacto Ambiental (PEIS, por sus siglas en inglés) en conformidad con la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental (NEPA, por sus siglas en inglés) para la adopción e implementación del Plan Maestro de Propiedad Real (RPMP, por sus siglas en inglés) en Yuma Proving Ground (YPG, por sus siglas en inglés), AZ La PEIS analizará la propuesta de construcción, las pruebas y actividades de capacitación. Todas las acciones bajo consideración estarán dentro de los límites existentes de YPG.

Yuma Proving Ground es un desierto caliente y centro de evaluación esencial para la preparación militar. Abarca más de 1.300 de millas cuadradas con unos 350 días soleados y alrededor de tres pulgadas de lluvia al año. Ingenieros, científicos y personal técnico llevan a cabo pruebas en sus instalaciones de prueba y realizan más de 100 pruebas y evaluaciones en cualquier momento dado. También se discutirán iniciativas de energía renovable en la PEIS, pero el análisis de la NEPA específico del proyecto será necesario antes de la implementación de iniciativas de energía renovable específica.

Se invita al público a participar en el proceso de exploración para esta PEIS. Se programarán dos reuniones de exploración y alcance público después de la publicación de un Aviso de Intención (NOI, por sus siglas en inglés) en el Registro Federal. La notificación de las reuniones se anunciará en los medios locales. Todas las partes interesadas están invitadas a asistir a las reuniones públicas y a enviar comentarios o preguntas por correo a Sergio Obregon, Coordinador de la Ley Nacional de Política Ambiental a U.S Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, o por correo electrónico al <u>ypgnepa@conus.army.mil</u>. Por teléfono, llame a Chuck Wullenjohn al (928) 328-6189 de 6:30 am a 5:00 pm, de lunes a jueves.

El proceso de exploración oficialmente comienza con la publicación de la NOI en el Registro Federal. Se solicitarán comentarios del público durante 30 días después de la publicación o hasta 15 días después de la última reunión, cualquiera que sea la fecha posterior. YPG también aceptará comentarios públicos durante todo el proceso de la NEPA.

-FIN

Affidavit of Publication

STATE OF ARIZONA

COUNTY OF YUMA

CITY OF YUMA

I. Dartens Fire charactering duly sworn on oath now and during all times herein stated, have been the publisher (or authorized representative of Publisher) and designated agent of the publication known as,

Yurne Sun ("Publication"), a newspaper of general circulation in the county of Yuma, State of Arizona, by Newspapers of Southwestern Arizona, Inc.,

And having full knowledge of the facts herein stated as follows

The advertisement for 0.5 Pour c G (ou (arg/Advertiser") was published to the Publication's full circulation as requested by Advertiser on the: 29^{+1} Day of <u>Now</u>, 2011.

'arle By:

Subscribed and sworn to before the This the day of Suite , 20 \\ . ()

P. Reroz Notary Public

Notary Seal:

OFFICIAL SEAL VIRGEN P PEREZ Commissions 7 (Edded Votary Peoder State of Antenna YUBA: COUNTY My Commi Prome Mar. 9, 4013

Casey Anthony's mother, az-boyfriend ustilly, murder trial to raume Tuesdilly, murder ORLANDO, Fia. — The mother of a Florida worm-an accured of killing her summer 2008 death, wiped 2 year old daughter gave a totu' of the family home, during her mother's test including a playhouse built for the toddler and the above-ground pool the defense team claims the girl drowned in

Cindy Anthony testined Saturday at her daughter's murder trial that she and ee went swimming on 15, 2008 - the last day she saw her granddaughter. She said she removed a lad-

Federal Register on May 25, 2011.

during her mother's testi mony Prosecutors contend Casey Anthony sufficiated the girl with duct tape. if convicted, she could be sen-

convicted, she could be sen-tenced to death. Lindy Anthony was not asked directly Saturday whether she thought the young girl drowned. The trial will resume Tuesday in Octande in Orlando.

PUBLIC NOTICE The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare

a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance

with Sections 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA),

to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementations of the

Real Property Master Plan at the Yama Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of

Yuma, Arizona. The Notice of Intent (NOI) for the PEIS was published in the

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art

testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Anny/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG.

Renewable energy initiatives will be discussed in the PEIS, but project-

play on television monitors along the courtroom, where evidence is displayed for the jury media and specta-fors. Anthony eventually interrupted her question-

Loung, 27, cohabits in a Portland, Ore., townhome with her boyfriend but has ing, asking prosecutors to remove the photo. with her boyrrend out has no plans yet to wed, a reflec-tion of the broader cultural shift in the U.S. away from the traditional definition of what it means to be a house-head Married falks now outnumbered: Census data shows them leading less

than half of US households FORTLAND, Ore. hold. Three mornings a week, when Becky Leung gels ready for work, her boy-Orlando. friend is just getting home Through most of her teo-from his overnight job.

DET CHIPME

hold. Data released Thursday by the U.S. Census Bureau shows married couples have found themselves in a new position: They're no longor the majority Ti's a trend that's been creeping along for decades, but in the 2010 Census. mar-ried couples represent 48 percent of all households. That's down from 52 per-cent in the last Census and, or the first time in U.S. hisfor the first time in U.S. his-tory, puts households led by married couples as a plurality.

rality. "I see a lot of people not having the typical 8-to-6 job or couples where one person is employed and one isn't. There's other pri-orities before marriage," Leung said. The flip in the 2010 Cen-sus hannened in 38 states.

sus happened in 32 states. In another seven states, less than 51 percent of house-holds were belined by married couples.

> ъ 1

ter's marriage, she laughs it off. And when she thinks PLAYS NIS GUITAR at borough of New York (American intelligrants about getting married her-self, she worries first about nty indipenous langu Spanish, and are floding U.S. means having to

> Some i cite no Spanis

Speakers indigenou

languages f extra hurd

ASSOCIATED PRES

NEW YORK - Co Agailar needs halp sho too: to the doc when her co-works nail salon call her

A Mexican who has in the U.S. for two she only speaks a v of Moneco, an indu Canadians from the si Organic Puebla and rem in southern ofer "It is hard comm whiterers the all-ye who can born in

Harry Wm

specific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements. A public meeting will be held on YPG from 6:00 to 8:00 PM at Building 6, the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, located on the main administrative area, off of Imperial Dam Road on Tuesday, June 14, 2011. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South

21º Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364 on Wednesday, June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 PM. Draft and final versions of the PEIS will be made available to the public for review and comment when completed. The scoping process officially begins with the publication of the NOI in the Federal Register. Public scoping comments will be solicited through June 30, 2011. YPG will also accept public input throughout the NEPA process. All interested parties are invited to attend the public meetings and to submit comments or questions by mail to Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA FWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, or c-mail ypgncpa@conus.army.mil. By phone. contact Chuck Wullenjohn at (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday.

ongbottom ATTORNEY AT LAW. PLLC "Your Lawyer in the Foothills! Particle Since 1077 General Practitioner ·Estate & Pothers Wills •Tr *Commercial Law *Real Esta Courses and go Guardini Tax Lien Foreclosures

11242 S. Foothills Blud toy wat toy and the (928) 342-0444 = hany.longhomenrillecturing Education Division conducted a formal section 7 consultation under the ESA On November 18, 2008, NMFS issued a Biological Opinion (2008 BiOp) and concluded that the issuance of an IHA is likely to affect, but not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of Steller sea lions. NMFS has also issued an incidental take statement (ITS) for Steller sea lions pursuant to section 7 of the ESA. The ITS contains reasonable and prudent measures for implementing terms and conditions to minimize the effects of this take. NMFS has reviewed the 2008 BiOp and determined that there is no new information regarding effects to Steller sea lions; the action has not been modified in a manner which would cause adverse effects not previously evaluated; there has been no new listing of species or no new designation of critical habitat that could be affected by the action; and the action will not exceed the extent or amount of incidental take authorized in the 2008 BiOp. Therefore, the proposed IHA does not require the reinitiation of Section 7 consultation under the ESA.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

To meet NMFS' NEPA requirements for the issuance of an IHA to PRBO, NMFS prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) in 2007 that was specific to seabird research activities on SEFI, WEI. ANI, and PRNS and evaluated the impacts on the human environment of NMFS[®] authorization of incidental Level B harassment resulting from seabird research in Central California. At that time, NMFS determined that conducting the seabird research would not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment and issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and, therefore, if was not necessary to prepare an environmental impact statement for the issuance of an IHA to PRBO for this activity. In 2008, NMFS prepared a supplemental EA (SEA) titled "Supplemental Environmental Assessment for the Issuance of an Incidental Harassment Authorization to Take Marine Mammals by Harassment Incidental to Conducting Seabird and Pinniped Research in Central California and Environmental Assessment for the Continuation of Scientific Research on Pinnipeds in California Under Scientific Research Permit 373-1868-00," to address new available information regarding the effects of PRBO's seabird and pinniped research activities that may have cumulative impacts to the physical and biological environment. At that time, NMFS concluded that issuance of an IHA for the December

2008 through 2009 season would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment and issued a FONSI for the 2008 SEA regarding PRBO's activities. In conjunction with this year's application, NMFS has again reviewed the 2007 EA and the 2008 SEA and determined that there are no new direct, indirect or cumulative impacts to the human and natural environment associated with the IHA requiring evaluation in a supplemental EA and NMFS, therefore, reaffirms the 2008 FONSI. A copy of the EA, SEA, and the NMFS FONSI for this activity is available upon request (see ADDRESSES).

Dated: May 20, 2011.

James H. Lecky.

Director, Office of Protected Besources, National Marine Fisheries Service. (FR Doc. 2011–12978 Filed 5–24–11: 8:45 am) BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Real Property Master Plan Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, at Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD. ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from adoption and implementation of a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP), including test areas and training activities at Yuma Proving Ground.

ADDRESSES: For questions concerning the RPMP PEIS, please contact Mr. Sergio Obregon, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, AZ 85365-9498. Written comments may be mailed to that address or e-mailed to ypgnepa@conus.army.mil.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Chuck Wullenjohn, Yuma Proving Ground Public Affairs Office, at (928) 328-6189 Monday through Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Mountain Standard Time.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Yuma Proving Ground consists of approximately 840,000 acres of DoDmanaged land in the Sonoran Desert in southwestern Arizona and occupies portions of Yuma and La Paz counties. The mission at Yuma Proving Ground is ensuring the readiness of U. S. forces and materiel to perform in hot arid conditions around the world. This requires rigorous testing of ground and aerial vehicles, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems and realistic training. The U.S. has been engaged in hostile conflicts in environments similar to those found at Yuma Proving Ground, resulting in a need for increased testing of existing and developing military equipment. vehicles, and munitions under these environmental conditions. To meet these needs, the U.S. Army intends to prepare a RPMP PEIS at Yuma Proving Ground to analyze potential impacts from new construction, changes in testing and training, and activities conducted under private industry partnerships. Renewable energy initiatives will also be discussed in the PEIS, but project-specific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives. Alternatives will consist of alternative

siting locations for certain activities within Yuma Proving Ground and different magnitudes of implementation with regard to spatial extent of potential impacts and frequency and duration of specific events. The EIS will also analyze the No Action Alternative, under which no new construction would occur and there would be no changes in testing and training activities conducted at Yuma Proving Ground.

No changes are proposed to activities conducted at off-post areas in Arizona and California that are used for specific testing activities under conditions not found at Yuma Proving Ground. Therefore, these areas would not be considered in the development of alternatives for the RPMP PEIS.

All activities under consideration would be conducted within the boundaries of the installation. Resource areas that may be impacted include air quality, airspace, traffic, noise, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, utilities, land use, and solid and hazardous materials/waste. Impacts to these resources may occur as a result of converting existing land use to support military testing and training or from increasing the scope or magnitude of testing and training activities. The analysis will also consider the potential for cumulative environmental effects.

The public will be invited to participate in the scoping process to provide input on the proposed action and alternatives, which will be evaluated in the PEIS. After publication of the Notice of Intent to prepare the PEIS, the Army will schedule at least two public meetings to provide information about the proposed action and alternatives and to solicit input and feedback from the public on issues to be addressed in the PEIS. Meetings will be announced in local media. The public will also be invited to review and comment on the Draft PEIS when it is released. Comments from the public will be considered before any decision is made regarding implementing the proposed action.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer, [FR Doc: 2011-12914 Filed 5-24-11; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3710-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Public Scoping Meeting and Preparation of Environmental Impact Statement for Luce Bayou Interbasin Transfer Project in Liberty County and Harris County, TX

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD. ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District, has received a permit application for a Department of the Army Permit pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) from the Coastal Water Authority (SWG-2009-00188) for the proposed Coastal Water Authority's Luce Bayou Interbasin Transfer Project located in eastern Liberty County with the 26.5-mile corridor extending southwestward from the Trinity River to a discharge point near the confluence of Luce Bayou with Lake Houston. The primary Federal involvement associated with the proposed action is the discharge or dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including jurisdictional wetlands, and the construction of structures that may affect navigable waters. Federal authorizations for the proposed project would constitute a "major federal action." Based on the potential impacts, both individually and cumulatively, the Corps intends to prepare an Environmental Statement (EIS) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act to render a final decision on the permit

applications. The Corps' decision will be to either issue, issue with modification or deny Department of the Army permits for the proposed action. The EIS will assess the potential social, economic and environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the interbasin conveyance, associated facilities, and apputenances and is intended to be sufficient in scope to address Federal. State and local requirements, environmental issues concerning the proposed action, and permit reviews.

DATES: The scoping period will commence with the publication of this notice. The formal scoping period will end 60 days after the publication of this notice. Comments regarding issues relative to the proposed project should be received.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods: Mail: Jayson M. Hudson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Branch, P.O. Box 1229, Galveston, TX 77553–1229; Fax: (409) 766-3931 or E-mail: layson.m.hudson@usace.army.mil. Emailed comments, including attachments, should be provided in .doc, .docx, .pdf or .txt formats. Documents pertinent to the proposed project may be examined at http:// www.swg.usace.army.mil/reg/eis.asp FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: MI. Jayson Hudson, (409) 766-3108. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Galveston District intends to prepare a DEIS on the proposed Luce Bayou Interbasin Transfer Project which is the proposed transfer of water from the Trinity River in Liberty County to Lake Houston in Harris County, TX. The Coastal Water Authority proposed this project and is the applicant for the Department of the Army permit (DA) SWG-2009-00188.

1. Project Background: The Coastal Water Authority is proposing to convey up to 400 million gallous of water per day (MGD) under gravity in accordance with the City of Houston's existing water rights permit from the Trinity River to Lake Houston, a distance of approximately 26.5 miles. The Trinity River water would be conveyed from the proposed pump station through large diameter pipelines to a sadiment storage and settling basin and then through an earthen canal to outfall at the Lake Houston discharge point. The canal would have side berms and there would be an access road, drainage ditches, and perimeter fencing surrounding the water conveyance canal. The proposed project consists of the following:

 a. A new water pumping station will be constructed on the Trinity River at Capers Ridge approximately 10 miles north of Dayton, TX.

b. Dual, 108-inch diameter force mains will be constructed extending from the Capers Ridge pump station approximately 3.5 miles to the west and southwest to outfall to the

sedimentation settling basin. c. An approximate 20-acre

sedimentation settling and storage basin.

d. An approximate 23.5 mile claylined earthen canal with 4:1 side slopes within a 300-foot easement that would include access roads, berms, chain link perimeter fencing, flow control structures, and metering stations.

e. Box culverts at canal and roadway crossings and multiple bawl-ground siphons constructed to facilitate wildlife movement and maintain existing hydrology along the canal conveyance system.

f. An approximate 10-acre maintenance facility located approximately 6 miles north of Dayton, TX.

g. Discharge structure along the southeastern shoreline of Lake Houston. 2. Scoping and Public Involvement Process: A Public Notice was published on April 19, 2010 to initiate the public scoping process for the proposed project. At that time, based on information provided by the Applicant, a preliminary review indicated that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was not required. However, based on continuing permit assessment and information brought forth during the initial coordination process, areas of potential significant impact on the human environment have been identified. Therefore, the EIS process is being implemented so that the permit application can be fully evaluated and a permit decision can be made. All comments received to date, including those provided for review during the initial scoping process, will be considered by the Galveston District during EIS preparation. The purpose of the EIS scoping meeting is to gather information on the subjects to be studied in detail by the EIS. 3. Purpose and Need. The basic

3. Purpose and Need. The basic purpose of the proposed action is to provide drinking water for the City of Houston and surrounding area. The overall purpose is to provide drinking water utilizing water rights currently held by the City of Houston in the Trinity River. The Corps recognizes that there is a public and private need for drinking water.

4. Alternatives. An evaluation of alternatives to the Applicant's preferred alternative initially being considered includes a No Action alternative, alternatives that would avoid, minimize and compensate for impacts to the aquatic environment within the project right-of-way, alternatives that would avoid, minimize and compensate for



Summit focuses on MRAP tests

Event fosters communication between testers of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles throughout the U.S.

By Mark Schauer

During the worst years of the Iraqi insurgency, the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vchicle was developed to protect American Soldiers from the destructive power of roadside bombs and other improvised explosive devices (IEDs). After extensive testing, the heavily fortified platform with a blast-defusing V-shaped hull was rapidly fielded.

The vehicle's effectiveness resulted in the development of specialized variants, from the route-clearing Buffalo MRAP that uses a long hydraulic claw to dig land mines and IEDs to the MRAP All-Terrain Vehicle (M-ATV), a lighter and more

tested at YPG. The number of variants and the program's status as a joint effort between the Army, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Navy mean the engineers who design and test MRAPs are scattered throughout the country. To facilitate interaction, the MRAP Joint Program Office (JPO) has held an annual engineering summit for the past three years. This year's two day event was held at YPG, and everty MRAP tester in the Combat and Automotive Systems division participated. "They hear about what is

going on within the whole spectrum of the MRAP program, not just the area they are focused in," said Isaac Rodriguez, team leader in YPG's combat and



±....

THE OUTPOST

- NEWS NOTES

U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the real property master plan. The notice of intent for the PEIS was published in the federal register on May 25, 2011.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state-of-the-art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training and to allow flexibility to

enter into legally permissible Army/ the demand and space n

private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. Renewable energy initiatives will be discussed in the PEIS, but project-specific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet

the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A public meeting will be held on YPG, Tuesday, June 14 from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. at Bldg. 6, the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, located on the main administrative area. A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, on Wednesday, June 15, from 6 p.m.to 8 p.m. Draft and final versions of the PEIS will be made available to the public for review and comment when completed. The scoping process officially begins with the publication of the NOI in the federal register.

Public scoping comments will be solicited through June 30, 2011. YPG will also accept public input throughout the NEPA process. All interested parties are invited to attend the public meetings and to submit comments or questions by mail to Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Acr coordinator, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Ariz., 85365-9498, or e-mail ypgnepa@conus.army.mil. By phone, contact Chuck Wullenjohn at (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.



MOVE IN SPECIAL!

Twin Mattress Set - Starting at \$991 Full Mattress Set - Starting at \$1291 Queen Mattress Set - Starting at \$1391

Full Sleigh Bed With FREE Mattress Set - Starting at \$3991 Queen Sleigh Bed With FREE Mattress Set - Starting at \$4291

Microfiber Sofa & Love Seat -Starting at \$3991

JUNE 13, 2011 3

1000

Share Report Abuse Next Blog»

Create Blog Sign In

Desert Messenger, Quartzsite, AZ

from the publisher of Quartzsite's FREE Community Paper Newspaper with local events and entertainment.





Desert Messenger online

CLICK HERE to view the current issue and to sign up for FREE SUBSCRIPTION to receive emails when the next issue becomes available online.

Quartzsite Links

Quartzsite Big Tent RV Shows Quartzsite Business Chamber of Commerce Quartzsite Gem & Wineral Club Quartzsite Library Quartzsite Ibrary Quartzsite Scholars' Academy Quartzsite Scholars' Academy Quartzsite Videos Silly AV: Fizza, Quartzsite Town of Quartzsite, Arizona Tyson Wells Showgrounds

Twitter

Thursday, June 2, 2011

YPG public meetings planned for June 14 & 15

Yuma, Arizona - The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground intends to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) northeast of Yuma, Arizona. The Notice of Intent (NOI) for the PEIS was published in the Federal Register on May 25, 2011.

The project will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems; to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. Renewable energy initiatives will be discussed in the PEIS, but project-specific NEPA analysis will be required prior to implementing specific renewable energy initiatives. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. New construction would include a variety of facilities to meet the demand and space needed to meet mission requirements.

A public meeting will be held on YPG at Building 6, the Desert Breeze Travel Camp Community Center, located on the main

administrative area off of Imperial Dam Road on Tuesday June 14, 2011 from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

A second public meeting will be held at the Yuma Public Library, 2951 South 21st Drive, Yuma AZ, 85364 on Wednesday June 15, 2011 from 6:00 to 8:00 PM.

Draft and final versions of the PEIS will be made available to the public for review and comment when completed. The scoping process officially begins with the publication of the NOI in the Federal Register. Public scoping comments will be solicited through June 30, 2011. YPG will also accept public input throughout the NEPA process.

All interested parties are invited to attend the public meetings and to submit comments or questions by mail to Sergio Obregon, National Environmental Policy Act Coordinator, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground, IMWE-YMA-PWE, 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498, or e-

http://desertmessenger.blogspot.com/2011/06/ypg-public-meetings-planned-for-june-14.html 6/9/2011

Desert Messenger, Quartzsite, AZ: YPG public meetings planned for June 14 & 15

Join the conve	mail ypgnepa@conus.army.mil. By phor (928) 328-6189 from 6:30 AM to 5:00 PA Posted by Shanana "Rain" Golden-Bear at 5:26 PA Labels: public meeting, Quartzsite AZ, ypg, yum	ne, contact Chuck Wullenjohn at M, Monday through Thursday. A Sa a az, Yuma Proving Ground
Blog Archive	A second and the	
▼ 2011 (81)	0 comments:	
▼ June (8)		
Mon. & Tues.	AND CONTRACTOR	
Quartzsite Propane flames up at RV Pit Stop	Post a Comment	
Quartzsite's own Paul Winer gives		
So. Arizona: Seeking Veteran		
Advisory Council advo YPG public meetings planned for		
June 14 & 15		
into weekend		
Quartzsite Council no show for short noticed speci		
Mittry Lake reopened	Comment as: Select profile	
 May (21) April (19) 	Best Comment	
March (12)	Post Comment Preview	
February (12)		
 January (9) 2010 (117) 		
► 2009 (25)		
2008 (6)		
www.DesertMesse		
nger.com		
Quartzsite Newspaper. News, Events, & Entertainment. Download Deadlines, Rate Card, links to other Quartzsite sites! http://www.desertmessenger.co m/	Newer Post Home	<u>Older Post</u>
	Subscribe to: Post Comments (Atom)	
MBA	Followers	
	Follow with Google Friend Connect	G
	Followers (32)	
		se 🎮 👪 👝 🔊
Loaded Web		
LOADED WEB	Se S	📸 🐼 🚳 ன
Bullying	- III III III III III III III III III I	2 2 2 2 2
Awaronocc	Search This Blog	
Drevention month		Search
Frevention month		Coorden

http://desertmessenger.blogspot.com/2011/06/ypg-public-meetings-planned-for-june-14.html 6/9/2011

Desert Messenger, Quartzsite, AZ: YPG public meetings planned for June 14 & 15

About Me



Shanana "Rain" Golden-Bear

Quartzsite, Arizona, United States

Quartzsite newspaper. Just being a human tuning fork, sharing joy and gratitude everywhere I go! Creating a vehicle for the people's voice to be heard in Quartzsite, Arizona and having fun! Contact: "Rain" at desertmessenger7@yahoo.com or call 541-218-2560.

View my complete profile

LeRoy N. Shingoitewa CHAIRMAN

Herman G. Honanie VICE-CHAIRMAN



May 9, 2011

Richard T. Martin, Garrison Manager Attention: Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager IMWE-YMA-PWE Department of the Army, US Army Installation Management Command Headquarters, United States Army Garrison, Yuma 301 C Street Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498

Dear Mr. Martin,

This letter is in response to your correspondences dated April 22 and May 2, 2011, regarding Yuma Proving Ground preparing a programmatic environmental impact statement for the implementation of the Real Property Master Plan, and a consultation meeting scheduled for June 8, 2011. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to prehistoric cultural groups in Arizona, including the Hohokam prehistoric cultural group in southern Arizona. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of prehistoric archaeological sites, and we consider the prehistoric archaeological sites of our ancestors to be "footprints" and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate Yuma Proving Ground's continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has stated that we appreciate that the Yuma Proving Ground is identifying historic properties in potential use areas, and we are interested in consulting on any proposal that has the potential to adversely affect prehistoric cultural resources on the Yuma Proving Ground. We will be unable to send a representative to the June 8th meeting. However, we are interested in receiving copies for review and comment of the revised integrated cultural and natural resource management plans, the programmatic environmental impact statement, and the updates on cultural and natural resource management on these lands.

We appreciate that Yuma Proving Ground is extremely interested in avoiding and not damaging places of tribal concern and significance. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgart at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office at 928-734-3619 or <u>tmorgart@hopi.nsn.us</u>. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully <

Leigh J. Kuwanwisiwma, Director Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

xc: Arizona State Historic Preservation Office



LeRoy N. Shingoitewa CHAIRMAN

Herman G. Honanie VICE-CHAIRMAN

July 5, 2011

Richard T. Martin, Garrison Manager Attention: Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager IMWE-YMA-PWE Department of the Army, US Army Installation Management Command Headquarters, United States Army Garrison, Yuma 301 C Street Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498

Dear Mr. Martin,

This letter is in response to your correspondence dated June 27, 2012, regarding Yuma Proving Ground preparing a programmatic agreement pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act for the implementation of the Real Property Master Plan, and a consultation meeting scheduled for the week of August 20, 2012. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to prehistoric cultural groups in Arizona, including the Hohokam prehistoric cultural group in southern Arizona. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of prehistoric archaeological sites, and we consider the prehistoric archaeological sites of our ancestors to be "footprints" and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate Yuma Proving Ground's continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

In a letter dated May 9, 2011 regarding the Real Property Master Plan, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office stated that we appreciate that the Yuma Proving Ground is identifying historic properties in potential use areas, and we are interested in consulting on any proposal that has the potential to adversely affect prehistoric cultural resources on the Proving Ground. In a letter dated May 7, 2012, we stated that we understood implementation of the Real Property Management Plan would being with individual undertakings that are within previously disturbed areas, and areas that are currently being surveyed.

We will be unable to send a representative to the meeting the week of August 20th. We appreciate that Yuma Proving Ground is extremely interested in avoiding and not damaging places of tribal concern and significance. Regarding the proposed programmatic agreement, we defer to the State Historic Preservation Office and other interested tribes. However, we reiterate that if prehistoric cultural resources are identified that will be adversely affected by project activities, please provide us with a copy of any proposed treatment plans for review and comment. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgart at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office at 928-734-3619 or <u>tmorgart@hopi.nsn.us</u>. Thank you for your consideration.

wanwisiwma, Director ultural Preservation Office

Enclosures: May 9, 2011, May 7, 2012, letters xc: Arizona State Historic Preservation Office



The State of Arizona

GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

5000 W. CAREFREE HIGHWAY PHOENIX, AZ 85086-5000 (602) 942-3000 • WWW.AZGFD.GOV REGION IV, 9140 E. 28TH ST., YUMA, AZ 85365 GOVERNOR JANICE K. BREWER COMMISSIONERS CHAIRMAN, ROBERT R. WOODHOUSE, ROLL NORMAN W. FREEMAN, CHINO VALLEY JACK F. HUSTED, SPRINGERVILLE J.W. HARRIS, TUCSON ROBERT E. MANSELL, WINSLOW DIRECTOR LARRY D. VOYLES DEPUTY DIRECTORS GARY R. HOVATTER BOB BROSCHEID



June 28, 2011

Sergio Obregon NEPA Coordinator U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground IMWE-YMA-PWE 301 C Street Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498

Re: Scoping Comments for the YPG Real Property Master Plan and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Obregon:

The Arizona Game and Fish Department (Department) received your May 31, 2011 letter requesting our participation in the scoping process for the development of a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the implementation of the Real Property Master Plan at the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). Department personnel also participated in the June 15, 2011 agency scoping meeting and the June 16, 2011 public meeting, and we are proving the following comments for your consideration.

Proposed Action

As the Department understands, the PEIS will analyze environmental impacts resulting from the implementation of the Real Property Master Plan. This will allow YPG to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing of military ground and aerial vehicle systems, weapons, munitions, sensors, and guidance systems. It will provide for realistic training, and allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission of YPG. YPG would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action.

Department Recommendations

Given the limited information available regarding the proposed action at this time, we recommend YPG coordinate early and often with the Department throughout the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process to help identify potential impacts to wildlife populations and habitats, and to develop appropriate avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures. Additionally, the Department recommends YPG consider the following scoping issues:

- 1. Analyze potential impacts to vegetation, including mesquite bosques, desert washes, dunes, foothills, mountain ranges, water catchments, and other habitats utilized by wildlife.
- 2. Analyze potential impacts to specific wildlife species, including the Sonoran desert tortoise, mule deer, desert bighorn sheep, Sonoran pronghorn, and other special status species. Access the Department's Environmental On-line Review Tool to help identify special status species that have been identified as occurring in the project vicinity. This On-line Tool contains the best available data through the Heritage Database Management System (HDMS) and can aid in a thorough evaluation of potential impacts to wildlife species¹;
- 3. Analyze potential impacts to hunter access, law enforcement, and wildlife management activities, such as surveys and translocations, which could be impacted by the proposed action.
- 4. Coordinate with other resource management agencies such the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding Clean Water Act issues, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Endangered Species Act issues.
- 5. Ensure the YPG 1997 Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) is comprehensively reviewed and updated to provide programmatic guidance for the conservation, management, and monitoring of the range's natural resources, given the considerable new knowledge of wildlife resources that have been obtained through cooperative studies with YPG, and the change and expansion in testing, training, and other mission activities across the installation over the previous decade.

¹ The Department's HDMS data are not intended to include potential distribution of special status species. Arizona is large and diverse with plants, animals, and environmental conditions that are ever changing. Consequently, many areas may contain species that biologists do not know about or species previously noted in a particular area may no longer occur there. Not all of Arizona has been surveyed for special status species, and surveys that have been conducted have varied greatly in scope and intensity.

Mr. Sergio Obregon 6/28/2011 3

Thank you for the opportunity to provide scoping comments on the development of this PEIS. The Department appreciates your continued coordination and cooperation regarding the conservation and management of wildlife populations, habitats, and wildlife-oriented recreation on YPG. If you have any questions or would like to further discuss our comments, please contact me at 928-341-4068.

Sincerely,

2 G

Troy G. Smith Habitat Program Manager Region IV, Yuma

cc: Josh Avey, Chief, Habitat Branch
 Pat Barber, Regional Supervisor, Region IV
 Laura Canaca, Project Evaluation Program Supervisor, Habitat Branch
 Elaine Johnson, Project Leader, Southwest AZ National Wildlife Refuge Complex
 Kirk Koch, Acting Manager, Yuma BLM Field Office
 Leonard Ordway, Assistant Director, Field Operations Division

AGFD # M11-06152931



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Caroline Antone Cultural Resources Manager Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 West Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85239

Dear Ms. Antone:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We also anticipate inviting you or your representative to participate in Government-to-Government meetings to obtain your feedback on the Proposed Action and alternative actions presented in the PEIS. Following the Government-to-Government consultation identified above, the Army will make the PEIS available to the public for a 45-day review. The Army will continue Government-to-Government consultation throughout this period, as necessary.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Louis J. Manuel, Jr. Chairman Ak-Chin Indian Community Council 42507 West Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85239

Dear Chairman Manuel, Jr.:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We also anticipate inviting you or your representative to participate in Government-to-Government meetings to obtain your feedback on the Proposed Action and alternative actions presented in the PEIS. Following the Government-to-Government consultation identified above, the Army will make the PEIS available to the public for a 45-day review. The Army will continue Government-to-Government consultation throughout this period, as necessary.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Gary Gilbert Cultural Resources Specialist Ak-Chin Indian Community Council 42507 West Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85239

Dear Mr. Gilbert:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We also anticipate inviting you or your representative to participate in Government-to-Government meetings to obtain your feedback on the Proposed Action and alternative actions presented in the PEIS. Following the Government-to-Government consultation identified above, the Army will make the PEIS available to the public for a 45-day review. The Army will continue Government-to-Government consultation throughout this period, as necessary.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

hlimst

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ronald Escobar Secretary Treasurer Chemehuevi Indian Tribe 1990 Palo Verde Blythe, CA 92363

Dear Mr. Escobar:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We also anticipate inviting you or your representative to participate in Government-to-Government meetings to obtain your feedback on the Proposed Action and alternative actions presented in the PEIS. Following the Government-to-Government consultation identified above, the Army will make the PEIS available to the public for a 45-day review. The Army will continue Government-to-Government consultation throughout this period, as necessary.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Charles Wood Chairman Chemehuevi Indian Tribe 1990 Palo Verde Blythe, CA 92363

Dear Chairman Wood:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We also anticipate inviting you or your representative to participate in Government-to-Government meetings to obtain your feedback on the Proposed Action and alternative actions presented in the PEIS. Following the Government-to-Government consultation identified above, the Army will make the PEIS available to the public for a 45-day review. The Army will continue Government-to-Government consultation throughout this period, as necessary.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Sherry Cordova Chairwoman Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 South Veterans Dr Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Chairwoman Cordova:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We also anticipate inviting you or your representative to participate in Government-to-Government meetings to obtain your feedback on the Proposed Action and alternative actions presented in the PEIS. Following the Government-to-Government consultation identified above, the Army will make the PEIS available to the public for a 45-day review. The Army will continue Government-to-Government consultation throughout this period, as necessary.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Jill McCormick Cultural Resources Manager Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 South Veterans Dr Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Ms. McCormick:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.
We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Rul

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Eldred Enas Chairman Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mojave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Chairman Enas:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Auch Mar

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. George Ray Director, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mojave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Mr. Ray:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Lisa Swick Cultural Compliance Technician Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mojave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Ms. Swick:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Dr. Clinton M. Pattea President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community 17661 East Yavapai Road Fort McDowell, AZ 85264

Dear President Pattea:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Karen Ray Language/Cultural Coordinator Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community 17661 East Yavapai Road Fort McDowell, AZ 85264

Dear Ms. Ray:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Gary Loutzenheiser Director of Education Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community 17661 East Yavapai Road Fort McDowell, AZ 85264

Dear Mr. Loutzenheiser:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Otero Director, AhaMaKav Cultural Society Fort Mojave Indian Tribe 500 Merriman Avenue Needles, CA 92363

Dear Ms. Otero:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Rullmet

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Timothy Williams Chairman Fort Mojave Indian Tribe 500 Merriman Avenue Needles, California 92363

Dear Chairman Williams:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Gila River Indian Community 525 West Gu u Ki Sacaton, AZ 85147

Dear Mr. Lewis:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Kield Mbt

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Larry Benallie, Jr. Archaeological Compliance Specialist Gila River Indian Community 525 West Gu u Ki Sacaton, AZ 85147

Dear Mr. Benallie, Jr.:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Gregory Mendoza Governor Gila River Indian Community 525 West Gu u Ki Sacaton, AZ 85147

Dear Governor Mendoza:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma Director, Hopi Cultural Preservation Office Hopi Tribe One Main Street Kykotsmovi, AZ 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwisiwma:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Kulo

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable LeRoy N. Shingoitewa Chairman Hopi Tribe One Main Street Kykotsmovi, AZ 86039

Dear Chairman Shingoitewa:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Terry Morgart Legal Researcher Hopi Tribe One Main Street Kykotsmovi, AZ 86039

Dear Mr. Morgart:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

July Mot

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Keeny Escalanti, Sr. President Quechan Indian Tribe 350 Picacho Road Winterhaven, CA 92283

Dear President Escalanti, Sr.:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Ruh Mant

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. John Bathke Historic Preservation Office Quechan Indian Tribe 350 Picacho Road Winterhaven, CA 92283

Dear Mr. Bathke:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Pauline Jose Chairwoman Cultural Committee Quechan Indian Tribe 350 Picacho Road Winterhaven, CA 92283

Dear Ms. Jose:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Diane Enos Chairwoman Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Chairwoman Enos:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.
We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Kelly Washington Director Cultural Resources Department Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Mr. Washington:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Shane Antone Cultural Resouces Supervisor Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Mr. Antone:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Vernelda Grant Tribal Historic Preservation Officer San Carlos Apache Tribe San Carlos Avenue San Carlos, AZ 85550

Dear Ms. Grant:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Terry Rambler Chairman San Carlos Apache Tribe San Carlos Avenue San Carlos, AZ 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Ned Norris, Jr. Chairman Tohono O'Odham Nation Main Street, Bldg #49 Sells, AZ 85634

Dear Chairman Norris, Jr.:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Peter Steere Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Tohono O'Odham Nation Main Street, Bldg #49 Sells, AZ 85634

Dear Mr. Steere:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Joseph Joaquin Cultural Resources Specialist Tohono O'Odham Nation Main Street, Bldg #49 Sells, AZ 85634

Dear Mr. Joaquin:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable David Kwail Chairman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 West Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Chairman Kwail:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Delores Plunkett Director, Cultural Department Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 West Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Ms. Plunkett:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Chris Coder Archaeologist Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 West Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Ms. Coder:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Judie Piner Preservation & Technology Administrator Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 West Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Ms. Piner:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Honorable Ernest Jones, Sr. President Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear President Jones, Sr.:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 24, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Ogo Directo, Cultural Research Department Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear Ms. Ogo:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Gregory Glassco Compliance Officer Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear Ms. Ogo:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) has prepared a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will allow the Garrison to maintain a facility capable of state of the art testing on military ground, to provide realistic training, and to allow flexibility to enter into legally permissible Army/private industry projects where such projects are compatible with the military mission. Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) would undertake construction and demolition projects (primarily within cantonment areas), continue existing testing and training activities, and expand some testing and training areas and activities within the installation boundaries. No expansion of YPG would result from the proposed action. The purpose of this letter is to provide an update on project milestones and upcoming meetings.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the PEIS is to analyze the environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the RPMP at the USAG YPG northeast of Yuma, Arizona.

A Notice of Intent to prepare a PEIS was published on May 25, 2011 in the Federal Register. Subsequent to this publication, YPG presented the PEIS concept at a Tribal Consultation Meeting at YPG on June 8, 2011. An initial scoping meeting for interested agencies and tribes was conducted on the afternoon of June 14 at YPG's Main Administrative Area, with initial public scoping meetings held later that evening and the following day. Since that time, YPG has been finalizing the RPMP and working to identify reasonable alternatives that would meet mission requirements.

We look forward to meeting with you in the near future and welcome your comments. Please direct comments or questions regarding the PEIS to the NEPA Coordinator, IMYM-PWE, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma, 301 C Street, Yuma AZ 85365-9498, facsimile (928) 328-6696, telephone (928) 328-2015, or email ypgnepa@conus.army.mil, or any questions regarding Section 106 consultation to the Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



LeRoy N. Shingoitewa CHAIRMAN

Herman G. Honanie VICE-CHAIRMAN

May 7, 2012

Richard T. Martin, Garrison Manager Attention: NEPA Coordinator IMYM-PWE; Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager Department of the Army, US Army Installation Management Command Headquarters, United States Army Garrison, Yuma 301 C Street Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498

Dear Mr. Martin,

This letter is in response to your correspondence April 24, 2012, regarding Yuma Proving Ground having prepared a Real Property Master Plan. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to prehistoric cultural groups in Arizona, including the Hohokam prehistoric cultural group in southern Arizona. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of prehistoric archaeological sites, and we consider the prehistoric archaeological sites of our ancestors to be "footprints" and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate Yuma Proving Ground's continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has stated that we appreciate that the Yuma Proving Ground is identifying historic properties in potential use areas, and we are interested in consulting on any proposal that has the potential to adversely affect prehistoric cultural resources on the Yuma Proving Ground. In the enclosed letter dated May 9, 2011, we stated we are interested in receiving a copy for review and comment of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, and the updates on cultural and natural resource management on these lands.

We appreciate that Yuma Proving Ground is extremely interested in avoiding and not damaging places of tribal concern and significance. We understand National Historic Preservation Act consultations on the implementation of Real Property Master Plan will begin with individual undertakings that are within previously disturbed areas, areas that have had previous consultation, and areas that are currently being surveyed. We also understand that a Programmatic Agreement is being drafted for other areas.

Therefore, we look forward to continuing consultation on the implementation of the Real Property Master Plan, including being provided with copies of the draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, draft Programmatic Agreement, and cultural resource survey reports for review and comment. If prehistoric sites are identified that will be adversely affected by project activities, we request consultation on any proposed treatment plans as well. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgart at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office at 928-734-3619 or tmorgart@hopi.nsn.us Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Leigh J. Kuwanwisiwma, Director Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

xc: Arizona State Historic Preservation Office



June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. David Kwail Chairman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Chairman Kwail:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Yavapai-Apache Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations in order to make the trip feasible for you and an additional Tribal representative you designate. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the Palm Garden on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground where the meeting will be held. Follow-up phone calls will be made by Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, to confirm your

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Ms. Delores Plunkett, Yavapai Culture Manager.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Enclosures



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits. 	A. Signature A. Signature Agent Addressee B. Received by (Printed Name) TRACH TEN ALL for 6VA- (20)
1. Article Addressed to:	D. Is delivery address different from item 1?
Chairman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322	3. Service Time
	Certified Mail Express Mail Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D.
	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)
2. Article Number 7007 2560 0002 7836 7891	

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete A. Signature item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. 2 Agent X u Print your name and address on the reverse Addressee so that we can return the card to you. B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece. TRACT TENAKGONOVA or on the front if space permits. D. Is delivery address different from item 1? T Yes 1. Article Addressed to: If YES, enter delivery address below: 1 No Ms. Delores Plunkett Director, Cultural Department Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Rd. 3. Service Type Camp Verde, AZ 86322 Certified Mail Express Mail Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D. 4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) 1 Yes 2. Article Number 7007 2560 0002 7836 7907 (Transfer from service label) RA PS Form 3811, February 2004 Domestic Return Receipt 102595-02-M-1540



June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Terry Rambler Chairman San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the San Carlos Apache Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations in order to make the trip feasible for you and an additional Tribal representative you designate. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the Palm Garden on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground where the meeting will be held. Follow-up phone calls will be made by Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, to confirm your

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Ms. Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Enclosures





14			
SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SE	CTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits. 		A. Signature	
1. Article Addressed to:		D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: No	
Ms. Vernelda Grant Tribal Historic Preservation Officer San Carlos Apache Tribe PO Box O San Carlos, AZ 85550		USPS	
		3. Service Type A Certified Mail Express Mail Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D.	
		4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)	
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)	7007 25	60 0002 7836 7853 QA	
PS Form 3811, February 2004	Domestic Re	turn Receipt 102595-02-M-1540	


June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ned Norris, Jr. Chairman Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Chairman Norris:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Tohono O'Odham Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Mr. Peter Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager





June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. LeRoy N. Shingoitewa Chairman The Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Chairman Shingoitewa:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Hopi Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma, Director of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager





June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Gregory Mendoza Governor Gila River Indian Community P.O. Bòx 97 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Mendoza:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Gila River Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



 2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)
 7010029000174509177
 267

 PS Form 3811, February 2004
 Domestic Return Receipt
 102595-02-M-1540



June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Timothy Williams Chairman Fort Mojave Indian Tribe 500 Merriman Avenue Needles, California 92363

Dear Chairman Williams:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Ms. Linda Otero, Director of the AhaMaKav Cultural Society.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



PS Form 3811, February 2004

Domestic Return Receipt

102595-02-M-1



June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Dr. Clinton M. Pattea President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear President Pattea:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Ms. Karen Ray, Language/ Cultural Coordinator.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin

Garrison Manager



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION		COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mallplece, or on the front if space permits. 1. Article Addressed to: Mr. Clinton M. Pattea President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills. Arizona 85269 		A. Signature X	
		2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)	7007 2560
PS Form 3811, February 2004	Domestic Re	turn Receipt	102595-02-M-1540

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION		CCMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
 Service Type Certified Mail Registered Return Receipt Insured Mail C.O.D. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) 	for Merchandise		
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)	7007 2560	0002 7836 8126	R
PS Form 3811 February 200	1 Domestic Ret	urn Receipt	102505 02 M 15



June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Sherry Cordova Chairwoman Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 S Veterans Dr. Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Chairwoman Cordova:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Cocopah Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Ms. Jill McCormick, Cultural Resources Manager.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager





June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Charles Wood Chairman Wood Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Chairman Wood:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Mr. Ronald Escobar, Secretary-Treasurer.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager





SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits. Article Addressed to: Mr. Romald Escobar. 	A. Signature KAgent X Addresser B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Deliver E rik Courcia Point Point Point Point	
Secretary-Treasurer Chemehuevi Indian Tribe PO Box 1976 Havasu Lake, CA 92363		
	LI Insured Mail LI C.O.D.	
	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) Image: Yes	



June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Keeny Escalanti, Sr. Chairman Quechan Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear President Escalanti:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Quechan Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Mr. John Bathke, Quechan Historic Preservation Officer.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



Received by (Printed Name)

3. Service Type

7007 2560 0002 7836 7792

-EB-Certified Mail

4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)

C Registered

D. Is delivery address different from item 1?

If YES, enter delivery address below:

Express Mail

C.O.D.

Date of Delivery

C Yes

D No

1 Yes

Q

102595-02-M-1540

C

Return Receipt for Merchandise

- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Mr. John Bathke Historic Preservation Officer Quechan Tribe PO Box 1899 Yuma, AZ 85366

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

PS Form 3811, February 2004

Domestic Return Receipt





June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Louis J. Manuel, Jr. Chairman Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Chairman Manuel:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Ak-Chin Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Ms. Caroline Antone, Cultural Resources Manager.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager





June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Diane Enos Chairwoman Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Chairwoman Enos:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Mr. Kelly Washington, Cultural Resources Department Director.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager





SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION		COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits. Article Addressed to: Mr. Kelly Washington Cultural Resources Department Director Salt River Rime Mexicone Indian 		A. Signature A. Signature B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery C. Date of De	
Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale. AZ 85256		3. Service Type Ø Certified Mail Express Mail Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D.	
		4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)	
2. Article Number			

PS Form 3011, February 2004 Domestic Return Receipt

102595-02-M-1540



June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Eldred Enas Chairman Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Chairman Enas:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Colorado River Indian Tribes to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent to Ms. Wilene Fisher, Director of the Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complitem 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the revision that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the maily or on the front if space permits. 	A. Signature
1. Article Addressed to:	D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: No
Mr. Eldred Enas Chairman Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohaye Road	
Parker, AZ 85344	3. Service Type Certified Mail Express Mail Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D.
and the second	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label) 700	07 2560 0002 7836 8096
PS Form 3811, February 2004	Domestic Return Receipt

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits. 	A. Signature X S CEWAS Agent B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery U29	
 Article Addressed to: Ms. Wilene Fisher Director, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum 	D. Is delivery address different from item 1? If YES, enter delivery address below: No	
Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker. Arizona 85344	3. Service Type Certified Mail Express Mail Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D.	
	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)	
(Transfer from service label) 7007 256	AS 5018 JE87 5000 0	

DC Carros 001	-1		the second se
Pa Porm.sAI	1	Fohrmon, 0001	



June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr. President Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear President Jones:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is inviting the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your Tribe and other interested Tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C) USAG YPG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA, RPMP, and its Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are planned for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed.

attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. A copy of this letter is being sent Ms. Linda Ogo, Culture Research Department Director.

With this letter, USAG YPG is inviting your participation in the Section 106 process, and, more specifically, we are seeking your input regarding your knowledge of properties of religious or cultural significance that could be impacted by implementation of the RPMP. I look forward to consulting with you on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, the Real Property Master Plan, and matters of importance to your Tribe. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager





and all and a second			
SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY		
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits. 	A. Signature X (U, FAman Agent B. Received by (Printed Name) W.E. STIPNAMAN C. Date of Delivery		
1. Article Addressed to:	D. Is delivery address different from item 1? U Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: No		
Ms. Linda Ogo Culture Research Department Director Yavapai-Prescott Tribe			
530 East Merritt Street Prescott, AZ 86301	3. Service Type In Certified Mail Express Mail In Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D.		
	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)		
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label) 7007 2560	0002 7836 7945		
PS Form 3811, February 2004 Domestic Return Receipt 102			


June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Katharine Kerr Program Analyst Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Old Post Office Building 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 803 Washington, DC 20004

Dear Ms. Kerr:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is initiating consultation on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C), this letter is our invitation to the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short and long term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your office and interested Native American tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should your office wish to participate. Initial Section 106 consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA and RPMP are scheduled for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed. A framework draft of the PA, to be built upon during consultation, will be mailed several weeks prior to the scheduled date of the meetings.

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for both the PA and the RPMP, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, the Colorado

River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'Odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe.

Please send your response to this invitation to consult and if you plan to attend the consultation meetings via mail, fax, or email to Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, fax: (928) 328-6696, or email: alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the Palm Garden on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground where the meetings will be held. We look forward to consultation with your office on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, using the previously mentioned contact information.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits. Article Addressed to: 	A. Signature X. Agent Addressee B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery D. Is delivery address different from item 1? If YES, enter delivery address below: No
Ms. Kanharine Kerr Program Analyst Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Old Post Office Building 1100 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 803 Washington. DC 20004	3. Service Type Image: Certified Mail Express Mail Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise Insured Mail C.O.D. 4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) Yes
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label) 7007 256	0 0002 7836 8140 QK
PS Form 3811, February 2004 Domestic Ret	turn Receipt 102595-02-M-1540



June 27, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. James Garrison Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer 1300 W. Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Garrison:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is initiating consultation on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short and long term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your office and interested Native American tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C), USAG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA as well as the RPMP and its implementing Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are scheduled for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed. A framework draft of the PA, to be built upon during consultation, will be mailed several weeks prior to the scheduled date of the meetings.

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for both the PA and the RPMP, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, the Colorado

River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'Odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe.

Please let us know if you plan to attend the consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012 via mail, fax, or email to Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, fax: (928) 328-6696, or email: alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the Palm Garden on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground where the meetings will be held. We look forward to consultation with your office on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, using the previously mentioned contact information.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SE	CTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIN	/ERY
 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Alitem 4 if Restricted Delivery is Print your name and address of so that we can return the card Attach this card to the back of or on the front if space permits 	so complete desired. In the reverse to you. the mailpiece, S.	A Signature Agent Addressee B Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery 2 C/2 D Is delivery address different form it on 12 Vol	
1. Article Addressed to: Mr. James Garrison Arizona SHPO 1300 W. Washington Phoenix, AZ 85007		D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes/ If YES, enter delivery address below: No	
		146.01	
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)	7007 2560	0002 7836 8157	6K
PS Form 3811, February 2004	Domestic Ret	urn Beceipt	102505.02.M.1540



June 27, 2012

JUN 2.9 2Lic A H A STATE PARKS/S.H.P.

RECEIVED

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. James Garrison Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer 1300 W. Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Garrison:

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as codified in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations Part 800 (36 CFR 800), the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) is initiating consultation on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground has determined that a PA is an appropriate Program Alternative, as defined in 36 CFR 800.1, for cultural resources management at the Garrison.

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is currently developing a Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) that will detail many short and long term goals of the Garrison. Through the RPMP process, USAG YPG has determined that a PA, developed through consultation with your office and interested Native American tribes, is appropriate. The PA will address preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of the RPMP and other undertakings not captured in the RPMP that may occur, including training exercises, supported component activities, and basic maintenance and repair activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings on the Garrison, including the RPMP short- and long-term plans, a finalized PA would benefit the Garrison if completed during the development of the RPMP.

Signatories to the Section 106 PA will be USAG YPG and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation should they wish to participate. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C), USAG has invited the Advisory Council to participate in the consultation through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meetings to discuss the draft PA as well as the RPMP and its implementing Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement are scheduled for the week of August 20, 2012; at that time, discussions about the goals and intentions of the PA and RPMP will occur. A draft meeting agenda is enclosed. A framework draft of the PA, to be built upon during consultation, will be mailed several weeks prior to the scheduled date of the meetings.

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for both the PA and the RPMP, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'Odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe.

Please let us know if you plan to attend the consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012 via mail, fax, or email to Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, fax: (928) 328-6696, or email: alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil. Enclosed are driving directions from Yuma to the Palm Garden on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground where the meetings will be held. We look forward to consultation with your office on the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, using the previously mentioned contact information.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Thank you for the information. We look forward to reviewing and commenting on the draft PA you your Program alternative. Ann U. Howard 7/3/12 Deputy SHPO



State Historic Preservation Office

Arizona State Parks 1300 W. Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007 www.azstateparks.com

> Richard T Martin Garrison Manager US Army Garrison Yuma 301 C Street Yuma, AZ 85365-9498



Haslei

\$00.450 07/05/2012 Mailed From 85007 US POSTAGE

016H26502971

U

"Managing and Conserving Natural, Cultinal, and Recreational Resources"



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Louis J. Manuel, Jr. Chairman Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Chairman Manuel:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Ak-Chin Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Caroline Antone Cultural Resources Manager Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Ms. Antone:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Ak-Chin Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

FedEx.

Tracking no.: 7938	45403688	Select time format: 12H	1	\
Delivered	Deliv Signed for by	ered F.FLORA		aquintell
Shipment Dates		Destination		YY and
Ship date Jul 30, 201 Delivery date Jul 31, 1	2 2012 10:48 AM	MARICOPA, AZ Signature Proof of De	alivery	Antono
Shipment Options				
Hold at FedEx Locati Hold at FedEx Location	on service is not available for this shipme	int.		
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Priority Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to Reference	Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009	
Shipment Travel H	istory			
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local	istory Scan Time			
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activi	istory Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loca	ation		
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activi Date/Time	istory Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loca Activity	ation	Details	
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 10:48 AM	istory Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loca Activity Delivered	ation Location MARICOPA, AZ	Details	
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 10:48 AM Jul 31, 2012 8:38 AM	istory Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loca Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery	ation Location MARICOPA, AZ TEMPE, AZ	Details	
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 10:48 AM Jul 31, 2012 8:38 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:58 AM	istory Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loca Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility	ation Location MARICOPA, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ	Details	
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 10:48 AM Jul 31, 2012 8:38 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:58 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	istory Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loca Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility	Location MARICOPA, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ	Details	
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 10:48 AM Jul 31, 2012 8:38 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:58 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	istory Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the local Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At destination sort facility	Location MARICOPA, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ	Details	
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 10:48 AM Jul 31, 2012 8:38 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:58 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	istory Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loca Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At destination sort facility Left FedEx origin facility	Location MARICOPA, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ YUMA, AZ	Details	
Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 10:48 AM Jul 31, 2012 6:38 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:58 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	istory Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loca Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility Left FedEx origin facility Picked up	Location MARICOPA, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ YUMA, AZ	Details	

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close 🕄

FedEx.

Detailed Result	S			1
Tracking no.: 793	845371027	Select time format: 1	2H	
Delivered	De Signed fo	livered by: F.FLORA		Manuel
Shipment Dates		Destination		Inl
Ship date Jul 30, 20 Delivery date Jul 31	12 , 2012 10:48 AM	MARICOPA, AZ Signature Proof of	Delivery	ant
Shipment Options	5			
Hold at FedEx Local Hold at FedEx Locatio	tion n service is not available for this ship	ment.		
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Priority Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to Reference	Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH)	
Shipment Travel	History			
Select time zone: Loca	Il Scan Time			
All shipment travel act	vity is displayed in local time for the	location		
Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 10:48 AM	Delivered	MARICOPA, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:38 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	TEMPE, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:10 AM	At local FedEx facility	TEMPE, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		-
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		-
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
1.1 00 0040 0.05 DM	Chinese the formation of the			



TTENTION OF

July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Edward Smith Chairman Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Chairman Smith:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ronald Escobar Secretary Treasurer Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Mr. Escobar:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close

FedEx.

Jul 30, 2012 2:26 PM

Detailed Results

Detailed Results				
Tracking no.: 7938	45568081	Select time format: 12H		_
Delivered	Del Signed for b	ivered y: L.TOMASEK		(millin)
Shipment Dates		Destination		5mi hal
Ship date Jul 30, 201 Delivery date Jul 31,	2 2012 12:25 PM	HAVASU LAKE, CA Signature Proof of Deliver		950
Shipment Options				, in the second s
Hold at FedEx Locati Hold at FedEx Location	ion service is not available for this shipn	nent.		-
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Priority Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to F Reference Y	teceptionist/Front Desk UM-A11-001 BG009	
Shipment Travel H	listory			
Select time zone: Local	Scan Time			5
All shipment travel activi	ity is displayed in local time for the lo	ocation		
Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 12:25 PM	Delivered	HAVASU LAKE, CA	Delivered to address other than recipient	
Jul 31, 2012 12:25 PM	Delivery exception	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ	Customer not available or business closed	
Jul 31, 2012 10:15 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:48 AM	At local FedEx facility	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FodEx origin facility	VIIMA A7		
	Left FedEx origin racinty	TOMA, AL		

Shipment information sent to FedEx

http://www.fedex.com/Tracking/Detail?trackNum=793845568081&ftc_start_url=&backT... 8/14/2012

Page 1 of 1

5milli/ 95cobar

Print page | Close 3

FedEx.

Detailed Results

Tracking		709676017050
Tracking	110	1900/021/200

Delivered

Shipment Dates

Delivered Signed for by: L.TOMASEK

Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 12:25 PM Havasu Lake, CA Signature Proof of Delivery

Select time format: 12H

Destination

Shipment Options

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment.

Shipment Facts

 Service type
 Priority Envelope
 Delivered to

 Weight
 0.5 lbs/.2 kg
 Reference

Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 12:25 PM	Delivered	Havasu Lake, CA	Delivered to address other than recipient	
Jul 31, 2012 12:25 PM	Delivery exception	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ	Customer not available or business closed	
Jul 31, 2012 10:15 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:47 AM	At local FedEx facility	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 2:30 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex		



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Sherry Cordova Chairwoman Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 S Veterans Dr. Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Chairwoman Cordova:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Cocopah Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Jill McCormick Cultural Resources Manager Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 S Veterans Dr. Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Ms. McCormick:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Cocopah Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

McConmick/ Condona

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

FedEx.

Tracking no.: 793845650954	Select time format: 12H
Delivered	Delivered

Shipment Dates

Delivered Signed for by: L.ALIFAI Destination

Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 2:36 PM SOMERTON, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery

Shipment Options

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment.

Shipment Facts

Service type	Standard Envelope	Delivered to	Receptionist/Front Desk	
Weight	0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Reference	YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH)	

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details		
Jul 31, 2012 2:36 PM	Delivered	SOMERTON, AZ			
Jul 31, 2012 9:44 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	YUMA, AZ			
Jul 31, 2012 9:07 AM	At local FedEx facility	YUMA, AZ			
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ			
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	At destination sort facility PHOENIX, AZ			
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	Left FedEx origin facility YUMA, AZ			
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up YUMA, AZ				
Jul 30, 2012 2:34 PM	Shipment information sent to FedEx				

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close 🕄

McCordova

FedEx.

Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM

Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM

Jul 30, 2012 2:33 PM

Left FedEx origin facility

Shipment information sent to FedEx

Picked up

Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 798676243052		Select time format: 12H		
Delivered	Deli Signed for	ivered by: L.ALIFAI		
Shipment Dates		Destination		
Ship date Jul 30, 2 Delivery date Jul 3	012 1, 2012 2:36 PM	SOMERTON, AZ Signature Proof of	Delivery	
Shipment Option	S			
Hold at FedEx Location	ation on service is not available for this shipn	ient.		
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Standard Box 1.0 lbs/.5 kg	Delivered to Reference	Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009	
Shipment Travel	History			
Select time zone: Loc All shipment travel ac	al Scan Time iivity is displayed in local time for the lo	cation		
Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 2:36 PM	Delivered	SOMERTON, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:44 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:07 AM	At local FedEx facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX AZ		

YUMA, AZ

YUMA, AZ



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Eldred Enas Chairman Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Chairman Enas:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Colorado River Indian Tribes to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Wilene Fisher Director, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Ms. Fisher:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Colorado River Indian Tribes to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Print page | Close

FedEx.

Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 7986	376269100	Select time format: 1	2H	
Delivered	Deli Signed for b	vered by: J.GROVE		-
Shipment Dates		Destination		- 1047 V
Ship date Jul 30, 201 Delivery date Jul 31,	2 2012 11:31 AM	PARKER, AZ Signature Proof of	Delivery	Er Cher
Shipment Options				- VO
Hold at FedEx Location	ion service is not available for this shipm	ent.		
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Priority Pak 1.0 lbs/.5 kg	Delivered to Reference	Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009	
Shipment Travel H	listory			
Select time zone: Local	Scan Time			
All shipment travel activ	ity is displayed in local time for the lo	cation		
Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 11:31 AM	Delivered	PARKER, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 10:10 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	LAKE HAVASU CI	TY, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 9:47 AM	At local FedEx facility	LAKE HAVASU CI	TY, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 2:35 PM	Shipment information sent to Fe	edEx		

Enus/ Fisher

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

FedEx.

Tracking no.: 793845704351

Delivered

Delivered Signed for by: J.GROVE

Shipment Dates

Destination PARKER, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery

Delivered to

Reference

Select time format: 12H

Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 11:31 AM

Shipment Options

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment.

Shipment Facts

 Service type
 Priority Envelope

 Weight
 0.5 lbs/.2 kg

7.2 Kg

Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details
Jul 31, 2012 11:31 AM	Delivered	PARKER, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 10:10 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 9:49 AM	At local FedEx facility	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 2:39 PM	Shipment information sent to FedEx		



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Clinton M. Pattea President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear President Pattea:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Karen Ray Language/Cultural Coordinator Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear Ms. Ray:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.
Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Print page | Close

FedEx.

Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 7986	76404680	Select time format: 12H		<u></u>
Delivered	Deliv Signed for by:	vered T.STEWART		12 ttpa
Shipment Dates		Destination		Falle
Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2	2 2012 10:00 AM	Fountain Hills, AZ Signature Proof of Deliven	y	RAY
Shipment Options				
Hold at FedEx Location	on service is not available for this shipme	ent		
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Priority Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to F Reference Y	Receptionist/Front Desk /UM-A11-001 BG009	
Shipment Travel Hi	story			
Select time zone: Local S All shipment travel activit	Scan Time y is displayed in local time for the loc	cation		
Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 10:00 AM	Delivered	Fountain Hills, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:44 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	SCOTTSDALE, AZ		7
Jul 31, 2012 7:31 AM	Delivery exception	SCOTTSDALE, AZ	Incorrect address	
Jul 31, 2012 7:26 AM	At local FedEx facility	SCOTTSDALE, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA AZ		
our ou, zonz niter m	ricked up	. China a rain		

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM

Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM

Jul 30, 2012 2:44 PM

FedEx.

Tracking no.: 798	676360985	Select time format: 1	12H	
Delivered	Si	Delivered gned for by: D.ISAAC		
Shipment Dates		Destination		
Ship date Jul 30, 20 Delivery date Jul 31,	12 2012 11:15 AM	Fountain Hills, A Signature Proof of	Z Delivery	
Shipment Options				
Hold at FedEx Locat Hold at FedEx Location	tion n service is not available for t	his shipment.		
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Priority Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to Reference	Shipping/Receiving YUM-A11-001 BG009	
				~
Shipment Travel H	History			
Select time zone: Local	I Scan Time			
All shipment travel activ	vity is displayed in local time	for the location		
Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 11:15 AM	Delivered	Fountain Hills, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:16 AM	On FedEx vehicle for	delivery SCOTTSDALE, AZ	Z	
Jul 31, 2012 7:33 AM	At local FedEx facility	SCOTTSDALE, AZ	Z	
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort fac	ility PHOENIX AZ		

YUMA, AZ

YUMA, AZ

Left FedEx origin facility

Shipment information sent to FedEx

Picked up

Rayl Patteg



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Timothy Williams Chairman Fort Mojave Indian Tribe 500 Merriman Avenue Needles, California 92363

Dear Chairman Williams:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Otero Director, AhaMaKav Cultural Society Fort Mojave Indian Tribe P.O. Box 5990 Mohave Valley, Arizona 86440

Dear Ms. Otero:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close 3

FedEx. Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 798676441905

Delivered

Shipment Dates

Delivered Signed for by: C.EVANSTON

Destination

Delivered to

Reference

Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 2:14 PM NEEDLES, CA Signature Proof of Delivery

Receptionist/Front Desk

YUM-A11-001 BG009

Select time format: 12H

Shipment Options

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment.

Shipment Facts

 Service type
 Priority Envelope

 Weight
 0.5 lbs/.2 kg

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 2:14 PM	Delivered	NEEDLES, CA		
Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:48 AM	At local FedEx facility	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 2:51 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex		

Williams/ Gteru

Page 1 of 1

Williams/ 6tero

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 793845821254		Select time format: 12H
Delivered	D Signed for t	elivered sy: C.EVANSTON
Shipment Dates		Destination
Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 2:14 PM		NEEDLES, CA Signature Proof of Delivery
Shipment Options		
Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not ava	ilable for this shi	pment.
Shipment Facts		

Service type	Priority Pak	Delivered to	Receptionist/Front Desk	
Weight	1.0 lbs/.5 kg	Reference	YUM-A11-001 BG009	

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details
Jul 31, 2012 2:14 PM	Delivered	NEEDLES, CA	
Jul 31, 2012 10:12 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 9:47 AM	At local FedEx facility	LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 2:50 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex	

http://www.fedex.com/Tracking/Detail?trackNum=793845821254&ftc_start_url=&backT... 8/14/2012

FedEx.



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Gregory Mendoza Governor Gila River Indian Community P.O. Box 97 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Mendoza:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Gila River Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Gila River Indian Community P.O. Box 2140 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Mr. Lewis:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Gila River Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Print page | Close 🕄

Detailed Results

FedEx

Tracking no.: 793845861280 Select time format: 12H

Delivered

Shipment Dates

Delivered Signed for by: M.ESPINOSA

Destination

Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 10:28 AM SACATON, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery

Shipment Options

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment.

Shipment Facts

and the second second				
Service type	Priority Box	Delivered to	Shipping/Receiving	
Weight	1.0 lbs/.5 kg	Reference	YUM-A11-001 BG009	

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 10:28 AM	Delivered	SACATON, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:02 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	TEMPE, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:10 AM	At local FedEx facility	TEMPE, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 2:53 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex		

Lewis/ Mendoza

Lewis/Mendoza

Print page | Close 🕄

FedEx.

Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 793845884167 Select time format: 12H

Delivered

Shipment Dates

Delivered Signed for by: M.ESPINOSA

Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 10:28 AM SACATON, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery

Destination

Shipment Options

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment.

Shipment Facts

Service type	Priority Envelope	Delivered to	Shipping/Receiving	
Service type	Filonity Envelope	Delivered to	Shipping/Receiving	
Weight	0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Reference	YUM-A11-001 BG009	

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 10:28 AM	Delivered	SACATON, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:02 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	TEMPE, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:09 AM	At local FedEx facility	TEMPE, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 2:55 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex		



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. LeRoy N. Shingoitewa Chairman Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Chairman Shingoitewa:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Hopi Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma Director, Hopi Cultural Preservation Office Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwisiwma:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Hopi Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Shing !! Kuwan...

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

FedEx.

Tracking no.: 798676530072	Select time format: 12H
Delivered	Delivered Signed for by: B.WILLIAMS
Shipment Dates	Destination
Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 12:25 PM	Kykotsmovi Village, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery
Shipment Options	

Shipment Facts

Service type	Priority Envelope	Delivered to	Mailroom	
Weight	0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Reference	YUM-A11-001 BG009	

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details
Jul 31, 2012 12:25 PM	Delivered	Kykotsmovi Village, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 9:48 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	FLAGSTAFF, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 9:20 AM	At local FedEx facility	FLAGSTAFF, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 2:59 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex	

http://www.fedex.com/Tracking/Detail?trackNum=798676530072&ftc_start_url=&backT... 8/14/2012

Print page | Close 🕄

Detailed Results

FedEx.

Tracking no.: 793845897064

Delivered

Delivered Signed for by: B.WILLIAMS

Shipment Dates Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Destination

Delivered to

Reference

Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 12:25 PM

Kykotsmovi Village, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery

Mailroom

YUM-A11-001 BG009

Select time format: 12H

Shipment Options

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment.

Shipment Facts

Service type Priority Envelope Weight 0.5 lbs/.2 kg

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details
Jul 31, 2012 12:25 PM	Delivered	Kykotsmovi Village, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 9:48 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	FLAGSTAFF, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 9:23 AM	At local FedEx facility	FLAGSTAFF, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 2:56 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex	

Shing. 1 Kuwan.

1



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Keeny Escalanti, Sr. President Quechan Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear President Escalanti:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Quechan Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. John Bathke Historic Preservation Officer Quechan Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear Mr. Bathke:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Quechan Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Print page | Close

FedEx.

Tracking no.: 79384	\$5947029	Select time format: 12H		
Delivered	Deliv Signed for by	ered W.BROWN		Vel ti
Shipment Dates		Destination		Detat land
Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2	012 11:35 AM	WINTERHAVEN, C. Signature Proof of De	A. Ilivery	Da 6660 (a
Shipment Options				
Hold at FedEx Location	on service is not available for this shipme	ent.		
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Priority Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to Reference	Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009	
Shipment Travel Hi	story			
Select time zone: Local S	Scan Time			
All shipment travel activit	y is displayed in local time for the loc	ation		
Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 11:35 AM	Delivered	WINTERHAVEN, CA		
Jul 31, 2012 9:43 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:07 AM	At local FedEx facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
14 20 2012 1-48 DM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
JUI 30, 2012 1.40 PM				

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 798676564519	Select time format: 12H
Delivered	Delivered Signed for by: W.BROWN
Shipment Dates	Destination
Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 11:35 AM	WINTERHAVEN, CA Signature Proof of Delivery
Shipment Options	

Shipment Facts

		Don'tor ou to	Receptionistrion Desk	
Weight 1.0 lbs/.5 kg Reference YUM-A11-001 BG009	1.0 lbs/.5 kg	Reference	YUM-A11-001 BG009	

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details
Jul 31, 2012 11:35 AM	Delivered	WINTERHAVEN, CA	
Jul 31, 2012 9:43 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 9:07 AM	At local FedEx facility	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 3:02 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex	

http://www.fedex.com/Tracking/Detail?trackNum=798676564519&ftc_start_url=&backT... 8/14/2012

Bolgscalandi

FedEx.



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Diane Enos Chairwoman Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Chairwoman Enos:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Kelly Washington Cultural Resources Department Director Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Mr. Washington:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

Tracking	no.:	798676575516
----------	------	--------------

Delivered

Shipment Dates

Delivered Signed for by: T.ALBIN

Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 1:03 PM

SCOTTSDALE, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery

Select time format: 12H

Shipment Options

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment

Shipment Facts

Service type	Standard Envelope	Delivered to	Shipping/Receiving
Weight	0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Reference	YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH)

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 1:03 PM	Delivered	SCOTTSDALE, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:19 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	SCOTTSDALE, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 7:22 AM	At local FedEx facility	SCOTTSDALE, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		_
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 3:03 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex		

Washington/ Enos



Destination

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close

FedEx. De

Contraction of Co			/
Detailed Results			
Tracking no.: 7986	76590045	Select time format: 12H	
Delivered	Deliv Signed for b	ered y: T.ALBIN	(DOSN (Ma)
Shipment Dates		Destination	6005
Ship date Jul 30, 201 Delivery date Jul 31,	2 2012 1:03 PM	SCOTTSDALE, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery	27
Shipment Options			
Hold at FedEx Locati Hold at FedEx Location	on service is not available for this shipme	unt.	
Shipment Facts			
Service type Weight	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to Shipping/Receiving Reference YUM-A11-001 BG009	
Shipment Travel H	ictory		
Line Acrossing to the second second second	isiony		
elect time zone: Local	Scan Time		
Select time zone: Local	Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loc	ation	
elect time zone: Local Il shipment travel activi Date/Time	Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loca Activity	ation Location Details	
elect time zone: Local II shipment travel activ Date/Time ul 31, 2012 1:03 PM	Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered	ation Location Details SCOTTSDALE, AZ	· · ·
elect time zone: Local II shipment travel activi Date/Time ul 31, 2012 1:03 PM ul 31, 2012 8:19 AM	Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery	ation Location Details SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ	
elect time zone: Local II shipment travel activi Date/Time ul 31, 2012 1:03 PM ul 31, 2012 8:19 AM ul 31, 2012 7:27 AM	Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility	ation Location Details SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ	
ielect time zone: Local II shipment travel activ Date/Time Iul 31, 2012 1:03 PM Iul 31, 2012 8:19 AM Iul 31, 2012 7:27 AM Iul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility	ation Location Details SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ	
ielect time zone: Local III shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 1:03 PM Jul 31, 2012 8:19 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:27 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At destination sort facility	alion Location Details SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ	
Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 1:03 PM Jul 31, 2012 8:19 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:27 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At destination sort facility Left FedEx origin facility	ation Location Details SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ YUMA, AZ PHOENIX, AZ	
Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 1:03 PM Jul 31, 2012 7:27 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Scan Time ty is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At destination sort facility Left FedEx origin facility Picked up	ation Location Details SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ SCOTTSDALE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ YUMA, AZ YUMA, AZ	

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Terry Rambler Chairman San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the San Carlos Apache Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager


July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Vernelda Grant Tribal Historic Preservation Officer San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Ms. Grant:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the San Carlos Apache Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

As stated in the previous letter, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

FedEx.

Distriction international	46021785	Select time format: 12	4	/
Delivered	Deliv Signed for by:	ered T.SHORTEN		pupler
Shipment Dates		Destination		Yame
Ship date Jul 30, 2013 Delivery date Jul 31, 3	2 2012 2:37 PM	SAN CARLOS, AZ Signature Proof of D	alivery	a with
Shipment Options				Grav
Hold at FedEx Locati Hold at FedEx Location	on service is not available for this shipme	nt.		
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Priority Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to Reference	Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009	
Shipment Travel H	istory			
Select time zone: Local	Scan Time			
Select time zone: Local :	Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc	ation		
Select time zone: Local 3	Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered	Location	Details	
Select time zone: Local : Ill shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 2:37 PM Jul 31, 2012 9:44 AM	Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered	Location SAN CARLOS, AZ	Details	
elect time zone: Local : Ill shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 2:37 PM Jul 31, 2012 9:44 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:54 AM	Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility	Location SAN CARLOS, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ	Details	
Select time zone: Local : All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 2:37 PM Jul 31, 2012 9:44 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:54 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM	Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility	Location SAN CARLOS, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ	Details	
Select time zone: Local : All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 2:37 PM Jul 31, 2012 9:44 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:54 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At destination sort facility	Location SAN CARLOS, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ	Details	
Select time zone: Local : All shipment travel activi Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 2:37 PM Jul 31, 2012 9:44 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:54 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At destination sort facility Left FedEx origin facility	Location SAN CARLOS, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ YUMA, AZ	Details	
Select time zone: Local : All shipment travel activi Jul 31, 2012 2:37 PM Jul 31, 2012 9:44 AM Jul 31, 2012 7:54 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility Left FedEx origin facility Picked up	Location SAN CARLOS, AZ TEMPE, AZ TEMPE, AZ PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ YUMA, AZ YUMA, AZ	Details	

Rombler/ Grant

Print page | Close

FedEx.

Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 798676644542	Select time format: 12H	
Delivered	Delivered Signed for by: J.NORMAN	
Shipment Dates	Destination	
Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 2:51 PM	SAN CARLOS, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery	
Shipment Options		

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment.

Shipment Facts

Service type	Priority Envelope	Delivered to	Receptionist/Front Desk	
Weight	0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Reference	YUM-A11-001 BG009	

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details
Jul 31, 2012 2:51 PM	Delivered	SAN CARLOS, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 9:44 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	TEMPE, AZ	
Jul 31, 2012 8:06 AM	At local FedEx facility	TEMPE, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ	
Jul 30, 2012 3:09 PM	Shipment information sent to FedEx		



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ned Norris, Jr. Chairman Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Chairman Norris:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Tohono O'Odham Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

As stated in the previous letter, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

NOVVIS

Print page | Close

Detailed Results

FecEx.

Jetalleu Kest	111.5	2.00.00 (A.T. 10.0)		
Tracking no.: 7	98676675200	Select time format: 12	2H	_
Delivered		Delivered Signed for by: F.JUAN		
Shipment Dates		Destination		
Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 12:39 PM		SELLS, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery		
Shipment Optic	ons			
Hold at FedEx Lo Hold at FedEx Loca	cation tion service is not available fo	r this shipment.		
Shipment Facts	5			
Service type Weight	Priority Envelope 1.0 lbs/.5 kg	Delivered to Reference	Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009	

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 12:39 PM	Delivered	SELLS, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:29 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	TUCSON, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:04 AM	At local FedEx facility	TUCSON, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 5:38 AM	At destination sort facility	TUCSON, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 5:04 AM	Departed FedEx location	MEMPHIS, TN		
Jul 31, 2012 12:46 AM	Arrived at FedEx location	MEMPHIS, TN		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 3:12 PM	Shipment information sent to Fed	Ex		



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Peter Steere Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Mr. Steere:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Tohono O'Odham Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

As stated in the previous letter, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close

.

_

FedEx.

Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM

Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM

Jul 30, 2012 3:14 PM

Left FedEx origin facility

Shipment information sent to FedEx

Picked up

Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 793	846097610	Select time format: 12H		
Delivered		Delivered or by: P.STEERE		
Shipment Dates		Destination		
Ship date Jul 30, 20 Delivery date Jul 31	12 , 2012 12:55 PM	SELLS, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery		
Shipment Options				
Hold at FedEx Loca Hold at FedEx Location	tion n service is not available for this sh	ipment.		
Shipment Facts				
Service type Weight	Priority Envelope 2.0 lbs/.9 kg	Delivered to Reference	Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009	
Shipment Travel I	History			
Select time zone: Loca	l Scan Time			
All shipment travel acti	vity is displayed in local time for the	elocation		
Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 12:55 PM	Delivered	SELLS, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:29 AM	On FedEx vehicle for deliver	TUCSON, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 8:00 AM	At local FedEx facility	TUCSON, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 5:38 AM	At destination sort facility	TUCSON, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 5:04 AM	Departed FedEx location	MEMPHIS, TN		
14 24 2042 40 40 AM	Arrived at FedEx location	MEMPHIS TN		

YUMA, AZ

YUMA, AZ

Steeve



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. David Kwail Chairman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Chairman Kwail:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Yavapai-Apache Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

As stated in the previous letter, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Delores Plunkett Director, Cultural Department Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Ms. Plunkett:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Yavapai-Apache Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

As stated in the previous letter, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close 🕄

FedEx.

Detailed Results Plunkett/ Kwail Tracking no.: 798676711326 Select time format: 12H Delivered Delivered Signed for by: M.FOX Shipment Dates Destination Ship date Jul 30, 2012 CAMP VERDE, AZ Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 10:01 AM Signature Proof of Delivery Shipment Options Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment Shipment Facts Service type Standard Envelope Delivered to Receptionist/Front Desk YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH) Weight 0.5 lbs/.2 kg Reference Shipment Travel History Select time zone: Local Scan Time All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location Date/Time Activity Location Details Jul 31, 2012 10:01 AM CAMP VERDE AZ Delivered Jul 31, 2012 9:29 AM On FedEx vehicle for delivery CAMP VERDE, AZ Jul 31, 2012 9:02 AM At local FedEx facility CAMP VERDE, AZ Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM At local FedEx facility PHOENIX, AZ Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM PHOENIX, AZ At destination sort facility Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM Left FedEx origin facility YUMA, AZ Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM Picked up YUMA, AZ Jul 30, 2012 3:15 PM Shipment information sent to FedEx

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close

FedEx. Detailed Results

Tracking no.: 798676724289 Select time format: 12H

Delivered

Shipment Dates

Delivered Signed for by: M.FOX

Destination

Ship date Jul 30, 2012 Delivery date Jul 31, 2012 10:01 AM CAMP VERDE, AZ Signature Proof of Delivery

Shipment Options

Hold at FedEx Location Hold at FedEx Location service is not available for this shipment.

Shipment Facts

Service type	Standard Envelope	Delivered to	Receptionist/Front Desk	
Weight	0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Reference	YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH)	

Shipment Travel History

Select time zone: Local Scan Time

All shipment travel activity is displayed in local time for the location

Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details	
Jul 31, 2012 10:01 AM	Delivered	CAMP VERDE, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:29 AM	On FedEx vehicle for delivery	CAMP VERDE, AZ		
Jul 31, 2012 9:02 AM	At local FedEx facility	CAMP VERDE, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 7:28 PM	At local FedEx facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	At destination sort facility	PHOENIX, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Left FedEx origin facility	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Picked up	YUMA, AZ		
Jul 30, 2012 3:16 PM	Shipment information sent to FedEx			

Plunkett/ Kwail



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr. President Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear President Jones:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

As stated in the previous letter, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



July 30, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Ogo Culture Research Department Director Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear Ms. Ogo:

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. We are pleased to provide you with the enclosed copies of a final report and a draft agreement document that we welcome your input on during the consultation meetings. Another package of more information materials for the meetings will follow shortly.

The enclosed final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona," is the culmination of nearly two years of research, fieldwork, and documentation of a major prehistoric trail that crosses YPG's Cibola Range. Although YPG has finalized the report, we now begin the difficult task of determining how to best preserve this valuable cultural resource in a manner that is compatible with Tribal desires and the Army Mission. We hope you can bring some creative ideas to our discussions concerning the Colorado-Gila Trail at the upcoming meeting and future forums.

The agreement document enclosed with this letter is a new draft of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for which consultation was started but not finalized when the undertaking was initiated in 2000. The associated Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area (ECSMA) consultation timeline, cultural resources report, and Environmental Assessment are included on a CD for your reference. Although extensively discussed in the past, we recognize that many new stakeholders may have additional contributions, which we hope to hear at the upcoming consultation meetings.

As stated in the previous letter, U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Jone 5/090

Print page | Close 3

FedEx.

Tracking 110 7550	346132009	Select time format: 12H	
Delivered	Deliv Signed for by: Sign	ered nature not required	
Shipment Dates		Destination	
Ship date Jul 30, 201 Delivery date Jul 31,	2 2012 12:18 PM	PRESCOTT, AZ Proof of Delivery	
Shipment Options			
Hold at FedEx Locat Hold at FedEx Location	ion service is not available for this shipme	ent.	
Shipment Facts			
		145 CL 106 A	
Service type Weight	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to Reference	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH)
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory	Delivered to Reference	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH)
Select time zone: Local	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time	Delivered to Reference	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH)
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc	Delivered to Reference	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH)
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity	Delivered to Reference ation	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH) Details
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 12:18 PM	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered	Delivered to Reference ation Location PRESCOTT, AZ	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH) Details Left at front door. Package delivered to recipient address release authorized
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 12:18 PM	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery	Delivered to Reference ation Location PRESCOTT, AZ PRESCOTT VALLEY, AJ	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH) Details Left at front door. Package delivered to recipient address release authorized Z
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 12:18 PM Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM Jul 31, 2012 9:12 AM	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility	Delivered to Reference ation Location PRESCOTT, AZ PRESCOTT VALLEY, A: PRESCOTT VALLEY, A:	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH) Details Left at front door. Package delivered to recipient address release authorized Z Z
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 12:18 PM Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM Jul 31, 2012 9:12 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility	Delivered to Reference ation <u>Location</u> PRESCOTT, AZ PRESCOTT VALLEY, A: PRESCOTT VALLEY, A: PHOENIX, AZ	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH) Details Left at front door. Package delivered to recipient address release authorized Z
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 12:18 PM Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM Jul 31, 2012 9:12 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility	Delivered to Reference ation Location PRESCOTT, AZ PRESCOTT VALLEY, A: PRESCOTT VALLEY, A: PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH) Details Left at front door. Package delivered to recipient address release authorized Z
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 12:18 PM Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility Left FedEx origin facility	Delivered to Reference	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH) Details Left at front door. Package delivered to recipient address release authorized Z
Service type Weight Shipment Travel H Select time zone: Local All shipment travel activ Date/Time Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM Jul 31, 2012 9:12 AM Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg listory Scan Time ity is displayed in local time for the loc Activity Delivered On FedEx vehicle for delivery At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility At local FedEx facility Left FedEx origin facility Picked up	Delivered to Reference ation Location PRESCOTT VALLEY, A: PRESCOTT VALLEY, A: PHOENIX, AZ PHOENIX, AZ YUMA, AZ YUMA, AZ	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH) Details Left at front door. Package delivered to recipient address release authorized Z

Page 1 of 1

Print page | Close

End	E.
reo	EX.

Jul 31, 2012 10:11 AM

Jul 31, 2012 9:12 AM

Jul 30, 2012 7:31 PM

Jul 30, 2012 6:38 PM

Jul 30, 2012 5:36 PM

Jul 30, 2012 1:48 PM

Jul 30, 2012 3:20 PM

On FedEx vehicle for delivery

At local FedEx facility

At local FedEx facility

At destination sort facility

Left FedEx origin facility

Shipment information sent to FedEx

Picked up

Detailed Results	S		
Tracking no.: 798	676767947	Select time format: 12	н
Delivered	Signed	Delivered for by: Signature not required	
Shipment Dates		Destination	
Ship date Jul 30, 20 Delivery date Jul 31,	12 , 2012 12:18 PM	PRESCOTT, AZ Proof of Delivery	
Shipment Options			
Hold at FedEx Location	tion n service is not available for	this shipment.	
Service type Weight	Standard Envelope 0.5 lbs/.2 kg	Delivered to Reference	Residence YUM-A11-001 BG009 (ARCH)
Shipment Travel H	History		
Select time zone: Loca	I Scan Time		
All shipment travel activ	vity is displayed in local time	e for the location	
Date/Time	Activity	Location	Details
Jul 31, 2012 12:18 PM	Delivered	PRESCOTT, AZ	Left at front door. Package delivered to recipient address - release authorized

PRESCOTT VALLEY, AZ

PRESCOTT VALLEY, AZ

PHOENIX, AZ

PHOENIX, AZ

YUMA, AZ

YUMA, AZ

Jores/090



Preserving America's Heritage

August 1, 2012

Mr. Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager Department of the Army U.S. Army Installation Management Command Headquarters, United States Army Garrison, Yuma 301 C Street Yuma, AZ 85365-9498

Ref: Development of a Operational Activities Section 106 Programmatic Agreement Yuma Proving Ground La Paz and Yuma Counties, Arizona

Dear. Mr. Martin:

On July 2, 2012, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) received your invitation for our participation in the development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities at Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The ACHP appreciates the opportunity to participate in the development and revision of real property master plans and operational activities and the development of PAs to implement these activities. We are interested, however, in YPG's goals for the PA and recommend that YPG refrain from providing a draft PA to consulting parties until all parties have an opportunity understand the installation's intentions and discuss a plan for proceeding with development of the PA. After this discussion, we will notify you within 15 days of our decision on participation.

While we will not be able to attend the meeting planned for August 21-22 in person, we request that YPG make arrangements for our participation via teleconference.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Katharine R. Kerr at (202) 606-8534 or via e-mail at kkerr@achp.gov.

Sincerely,

Caroline D. Hall Assistant Director Office of Federal Agency Programs Federal Property Management Section

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 803 • Washington, DC 20004 Phone: 202-606-8503 • Fax: 202-606-8647 • achp@achp.gov • www.achp.gov

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 803 • Washington, DC 20004



 neopost
 FIRST-CLASS MAIL

 08/02/2012
 \$00.45°

 USPOSTAGE
 ZIP 20004

0411 11207227

Richard T. Martin, Garrison Manager Department of the Army U.S. Army Installation Management Command

Headquarters, U. S. Army Garrison, Yuma 301 C Street Yuma, AZ 85365-9498



LeRoy N. Shingoitewa CHAIRMAN

Herman G. Honanie VICE-CHAIRMAN

August 6, 2012

Richard T. Martin, Garrison Manager Attention: Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager IMWE-YMA-PWE Department of the Army, US Army Installation Management Command Headquarters, United States Army Garrison, Yuma 301 C Street Yuma, Arizona 85365-9498

Dear Mr. Martin,

This letter is in response to your correspondence dated July 30, 2012, regarding Yuma Proving Ground preparing a Memorandum of Agreement pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act for the implementation of the Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area, an enclosed *Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range*, and a consultation meeting scheduled for the week of August 20, 2012. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to prehistoric cultural groups in Arizona, including the Hohokam prehistoric cultural group in southern Arizona. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of prehistoric archaeological sites, and we consider the prehistoric archaeological sites of our ancestors to be "footprints" and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate Yuma Proving Ground's continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

As we stated in our July 5, 2012, letter regarding the Real Property Master Plan, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office we will be unable to send a representative to the meeting the week of August 20th. However, we reiterate that appreciate that the Yuma Proving Ground is identifying historic properties in potential use areas, and we are interested in consulting on any proposal that has the potential to adversely affect prehistoric cultural resources.

We have reviewed the enclosed *Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range* that identifies the prehistoric trail AZ R:11:62 (ASM), 55 other National Register eligible prehistoric sites, and over 500 isolated occurrences along it. Because Hopi Clans migrated in prehistoric times and traveled in historic times, we appreciate trails as an important site type. We understand portions of the trail fall within the Mohave Drop Zone and other areas subject to disturbance and appreciate Yuma Proving Ground's difficult task in preserving this valuable cultural resource. Richard T. Martin August 6, 2012 Page 2

We have also reviewed the enclosed Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area consultation timeline, cultural resources report and Environmental Assessment.

Regarding the proposed Memorandum of Agreement for the Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area, we defer to the State Historic Preservation Office and other interested tribes. However, we reiterate that if prehistoric cultural resources are identified that will be adversely affected by project activities, please provide us with a copy of any proposed treatment plans for review and comment.

We appreciate that Yuma Proving Ground is extremely interested in avoiding and not damaging places of tribal concern and significance. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgart at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office at 928-734-3619 or tmorgart@hopi.nsn.us. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfulk h. Kuwanwisiwma, Director Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

xc: Arizona State Historic Preservation Office



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Louis J. Manuel, Jr. Chairman Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Chairman Manuel,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Ak-Chin Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Caroline Antone Cultural Resources Manager Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Ms. Antone,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Ak-Chin Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Edward Smith Chairman Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Chairman Smith,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ronald Escobar Secretary Treasurer Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Mr. Escobar,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Sherry Cordova Chairwoman Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 S Veterans Dr. Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Chairwoman Cordova,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Cocopah Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Jill McCormick Cultural Resources Manager Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 S Veterans Dr. Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Ms. McCormick,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Cocopah Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Eldred Enas Chairman Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Chairman Enas,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Colorado River Indian Tribes to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Wilene Fisher Director, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Ms. Fisher,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Colorado River Indian Tribes to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Clinton M. Pattea President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear President Pattea,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Karen Ray Language/Cultural Coordinator Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear Ms. Ray,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager


August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Timothy Williams Chairman Fort Mojave Indian Tribe 500 Merriman Avenue Needles, California 92363

Dear Chairman Williams,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Otero Director, AhaMaKav Cultural Society Fort Mojave Indian Tribe P.O. Box 5990 Mohave Valley, Arizona 86440

Dear Ms. Otero,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Gregory Mendoza Governor Gila River Indian Community P.O. Box 97 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Mendoza,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Gila River Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Gila River Indian Community P.O. Box 2140 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Mr. Lewis,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Gila River Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. LeRoy N. Shingoitewa Chairman Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Chairman Shingoitewa,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Hopi Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma Director, Hopi Cultural Preservation Office Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwisiwma,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Hopi Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Keeny Escalanti, Sr. President Quechan Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear President Escalanti,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Quechan Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. John Bathke Historic Preservation Officer Quechan Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear Mr. Bathke,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Quechan Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Diane Enos Chairwoman Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Chairwoman Enos,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Kelly Washington Cultural Resources Department Director Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Mr. Washington,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Terry Rambler Chairman San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the San Carlos Apache Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Vernelda Grant Tribal Historic Preservation Officer San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Ms. Grant,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the San Carlos Apache Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ned Norris, Jr. Chairman Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Chairman Norris,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Tohono O'Odham Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Peter Steere Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Mr. Steere,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Tohono O'Odham Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. David Kwail Chairman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Chairman Kwail,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Yavapai-Apache Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Delores Plunkett Director, Cultural Department Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Ms. Plunkett,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Yavapai-Apache Nation to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr. President Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear President Jones,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



August 9, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Ogo Culture Research Department Director Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear Ms. Ogo,

The United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) recently invited the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe to consult on a Yuma Proving Ground Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational and maintenance activities through a letter dated June 27, 2012. Included with that invitation were information and a draft agenda concerning Section 106 consultation meetings the week of August 20, 2012. Enclosed are copies of potential stipulations for the draft PA for operations and maintenance at YPG, a Real Property Management Plan (RPMP) project list, an outline of the Environmental Impact Statement, and regional overview maps of the project locations. We welcome your input on these documents during the consultation meetings and in the coming months. This is the final packet of information materials for the meetings.

The enclosed RPMP project list details many short- and long-term goals of the Garrison. Some projects on the list are proposed in locations that are either extensively disturbed or are the sites of previous Section 106 consultations, some are proposed in previously undisturbed areas, and others are merely in the conceptual stage. We encourage you to bring questions and comments on any of these locations to the meetings the week of August 20, where we will have several people present who are familiar with the installation and proposed sites. Those projects subject to the Section 106 consultation process will be covered by the proposed PA, along with other undertakings not captured in the RPMP. Several hours of the meeting will be devoted to getting your input on the proposed PA stipulations.

As stated in the previous two letters, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations and Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, will be contacting you to confirm your attendance and assist with travel arrangements if arrangements have not already been made. If the Tribe cannot send a representative to the meeting, we will make other consultation arrangements with your office. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager





PRESCOTT + INDIAN + TRIBE

September 04, 2012

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager Yuma Proving Grounds 301 C Street Yuma, AZ 85365-9498

Dear Mr. Martin:

Thank you for your July 30, 2012 correspondence which contained a copy of the draft Yuma Proving Ground (YPG) Programmatic Agreement (PA) for operational activities and a copy of the final report entitled "Archaeological Inventory and Historic Context of the Colorado-Gila Trail in the Cibola Range of the United States Army Proving Ground, La Paz County, Arizona."

We appreciate your office's efforts to keep us updated on the PA, and we note that Tribes who sign on as Concurring Parties will be consulted on the mitigation of adverse effects to historic properties within the proposed Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area. We support the proposed establishment of preservation areas to protect prehistoric trail segments and archaeological sites as well as the annual reporting and monitoring of these areas and resources.

In the Zia Engineering report you provided, we agree with Spier (1933:295) regarding the close similarities between the prehistoric Patayan and the Yuman speakers related by Spanish Chroniclers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in southwestern Arizona demonstrating that they are the same culture group.

The ceramic assemblage comprising approximately 95 percent Patayan II-III ceramics and approximately 5 percent Patayan 1 ceramic types was excellently done and should help define the ceramic period defined by the Patayan. Your history of Lower Colorado River ceramic studies is particularly helpful for researchers working in this field.

Please note on the Concurring Parties signature page of the draft PA that Ernest Jones, Sr., is the President and not Chairman of the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. We are pleased you provided us a printed copy of the 'Colorado-Gila Trail' report for our archives and reference. Please forward a copy of the final PA for our Tribe to review when it is complete.

Sincerely.

Linda Ogo Culture Research Department Director

530 E. MERRITT PRESCOTT, AZ 86301-2038 Phone 928-445-8790 FAX 928-778-9445



PRESCOTT + INDIAN + TRIBE 530 E. MERRITT PRESCOTT, AZ 86301-2038

12

V A

14

Richard T. Martin Yuma Proving Grouns 301 C Street Yuma, AZ 85365-9498



Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA Chairman

Clement A. Price, Ph.D. Vice Chairman

John M. Fowler Executive Director



Preserving America's Heritage

October 17, 2012

Honorable John McHugh Secretary of the Army 1400 Defense Pentagon Washington, DC 20301-1400

Ref: Development of a Operational Activities Section 106 Programmatic Agreement Yuma Proving Ground La Paz and Yuma Counties, Arizona

Dear Secretary McHugh:

In response to a notification from United States Army Garrison, Yuma, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) will participate in consultation to develop a Programmatic Agreement in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 800.14(b)(3) for operational activities at Yuma Proving Ground. Our decision to participate in this consultation is based on the *Criteria for Council Involvement in Reviewing Individual Section 106 Cases*, contained within our regulations. The criteria are met for this proposed undertaking because there are questions regarding policy and interpretation of our regulations.

Section 800.6(a)(1)(iii) of our regulations requires that we notify you, as the head of the agency, of our decision to participate in consultation. By copy of this letter, we are also notifying Mr. Richard T. Martin, Garrison Manager, of this decision.

Our participation in this consultation will be handled by Ms. Katharine R. Kerr who can be reached at (202) 606-8534 or via e-mail at kkerr@achp.gov. We look forward to working with your agency and other consulting parties to consider alternatives to this undertaking that could avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential adverse effects on historic properties and to reach a Programmatic Agreement.

Sincerely,

1. Amules

John M. Fowler Executive Director

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 803 • Washington, DC 20004 Phone: 202-606-8503 • Fax: 202-606-8647 • achp@achp.gov • www.achp.gov



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Louis J. Manuel, Jr. Chairman Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Mr. Manuel:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Ms. Caroline Antone. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I am also sending a copy of this letter and the enclosures to Ms. Antone.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

DOUMA

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Edward Smith Chairman Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Mr. Ronald Escobar. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I also thank the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe for sending Mr. Escobar to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Mr. Escobar.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

pulitimat

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Eldred Enas Chairman Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Mr. Enas:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Ms. Wilene Fisher-Holt. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I would also like to thank the Colorado River Indian Tribes for sending Mr. Howard Magill to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Ms. Fisher-Holt.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Dr. Clinton M. Pattea President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear Mr. Pattea:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Ms. Karen Ray. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Ms. Ray.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Chlimo

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Timothy Williams Chairman Fort Mojave Indian Tribe 500 Merriman Avenue Needles, California 92363

Dear Mr. Williams:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Ms. Linda Otero. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I would also like to thank the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe for sending Ms. Otero to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Ms. Otero.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Gregory Mendoza Governor Gila River Indian Community P.O. Box 97 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Mr. Mendoza:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I would also like to thank the Gila River Indian Community for sending Mr. Lewis and Mr. Larry Benallie, Jr. to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Mr. Lewis.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard F. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. LeRoy N. Shingoitewa Chairman Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Shingoitewa:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Mr. Kuwanwisiwma.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Keeny Escalanti, Sr. President Quechan Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear Mr. Escalanti:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Mr. John Bathke. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I would also like to thank the Quechan Tribe for sending Mr. Bathke, Mr. Manfred Scott, and Ms. Willa Scott to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Mr. Bathke.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have
specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Terry Rambler Chairman San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Mr. Rambler:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Ms. Vernelda Grant. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Ms. Grant.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ned Norris, Jr. Chairman Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Mr. Norris:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Mr. Peter Steere. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I would also like to thank the Tohono O'Odham Nation for sending Mr. Joseph Joaquin and Mr. Jefford Francisco to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Mr. Steere.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. David Kwail Chairman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Mr. Kwail:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Ms. Gertrude Smith. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I would also like to thank the Yavapai-Apache Nation for sending Ms. Smith, Ms. Reba Franco, and Ms. Judie Piner to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Ms. Smith.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr. President Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear Mr. Jones:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Ms. Linda Ogo. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I would also like to thank the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe for sending Mr. Monty Jackson and Ms. Spring Jones to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Ms. Ogo.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Sherry Cordova Chairwoman Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 S Veterans Dr. Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Ms. Cordova:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Ms. Jill McCormick. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I would also like to thank the Cocopah Indian Tribe for sending Ms. McCormick to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Ms. McCormick.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard À Martin Garrison Manager



October 25, 2012

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Diane Enos Chairwoman Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Ms. Enos:

Thank you for taking the time to participate, or sending a representative to participate on your behalf, in the United States Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) National Historic Preservation Act/National Environmental Policy Act consultation meeting held on August 21-23, 2012. I hope the information provided aids in your understanding of potential impacts that the Yuma Proving Ground Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) projects and routine management activities at the facility may have on historic properties. An unedited transcript, as recorded by the professional stenographer who was present the first two days of the meeting, is enclosed in portable data format (*.pdf) on a compact disk. Please let me know if you would like a printed copy of the transcript; it will be sent only upon request due to its four binder volume. A short summary of the meeting is also enclosed.

Throughout the Section 106 consultation, I will continue to correspond with you and your designated Section 106 tribal representative, Mr. Kelly Washington. If you designate a new Section 106 representative, please let us know so that we can include them in all future correspondence. I would also like to thank the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community for sending Mr. Jacob Butler to represent your tribal interests at the recent consultation meeting. A copy of this letter and the enclosures are also being mailed to Mr. Washington.

As stated in previous correspondence and during the consultation meeting, USAG YPG is developing a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and (iv) to address both the routine management of YPG and the potential effects from RPMP projects, some of which cannot be fully determined prior to the release of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). USAG YPG and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be the required signatories on this agreement. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has also confirmed that they will participate as a signatory.

USAG YPG has considered tribal comments and feedback received thus far and is preparing an initial draft PA. We plan to distribute this initial draft to all consulting parties at the end of October. I request that you review the initial draft PA and provide comments, questions, suggested revisions, edits, and other input within thirty calendar days in order to maintain the planned schedule. USAG YPG will revise the draft PA incorporating feedback and aim to provide a second draft PA in mid-January for further review and comment. At that time, we may consider having a second meeting or telephone conference. At any time during the process, however, please feel free to request additional meetings or conference calls if you wish to have specific discussions about the RPMP undertakings or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects from these and future undertakings. Our goal is to have a draft final PA ready in March 2013 for the final review process with tribal councils. The required signatories would execute the final PA before the end of September 2013. We hope that by providing this proposed timeline at this early stage, everyone can be prepared to work together on scheduling to meet the goal of a signed PA and a final PEIS in the fall of 2013.

On a separate yet interdependent schedule, we plan to release the draft RPMP PEIS to the public for comment in January/early February 2013, with public hearings in March 2013. In order to incorporate your comments on the RPMP and its environmental impacts into the draft PEIS prior to public release, I encourage you to have your feedback regarding the list of RPMP projects distributed at the August meeting sent to us by November 16, 2012. Also, please note that cultural resources will be addressed in cultural resources sections within the body of the PEIS and will not have a separate cultural resources technical report that requires your review. The Section 106 PA will address the process to resolve potential effects to historic properties from the RPMP undertakings, making it imperative that the PA be executed prior to the issuance of the PEIS Record of Decision in the fall of 2013.

Thank you again for your tribe's participation in the August consultation meeting. We look forward to continuing the consultation process, concluding in a Section 106 PA that allows YPG to fulfill its mission while respecting historic properties and other cultural resources significant to the tribes. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager Dr. Meg McDonald, Environmental Sciences Division (IMYM-PWE), 301 C Street, Yuma, Arizona 85365-9495, or by phone (928) 328-2520, fax (928) 328-6696, or email at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



S: 11 February 2013

IMYM-ZA

8 January 2013

MEMORANDUM FOR Headquarters, Installation Management Command, (G4 – Dave Giffin), 2405 Gun Shed Road, Ft Sam Houston, TX 78234-1223

SUBJECT: TASKER 121013652 – Request for Legal, Resources Management, and Technical Review of the Draft Programmatic Agreement for Operations, Maintenance, and Development of Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona.

1. I am requesting legal, resources management, and cultural resources review of the enclosed draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) concurrent with USAG YPG consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), 14 consulting federally recognized Native American tribes, and other consulting parties. Potential stipulations for this draft PA were discussed in detail during a consultation meeting on August 22, 2012. Representatives of eight of the 14 consulting tribes were in attendance at the meeting and representatives of the SHPO (Ann Howard, Deputy SHPO), ACHP (Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section), and Army Environmental Command (Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian) also participated via teleconference.

2. Due to the critical nature of upcoming Mission activities that will be facilitated by execution of the PA, I request comments and concurrence from your office by February 11, 2013.

3. The point of contact for this action is Meg McDonald, IMYM-PWE, (928) 328-2520, alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil.

2 Encls

- 1. Draft Programmatic Agreement
- 2. Yuma Proving Ground concurrence records
- CF: Ted Grabowski, IMCN-E (w/encls) Karl Kleinbach, IMAE-TS (w/encls)

RICHARD T. MARTIN Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. John M. Fowler Executive Director Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 1100 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 803 Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mr. Fowler:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Advisory Council on June 27, 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG); your office responded affirmatively via letter dated October 17, 2012 (enclosed). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 federally recognized Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for the PA, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation , and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe. An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Representatives of eight of the 14 consulting tribes attended the

meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy SHPO, Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, and Katharine Kerr, of your office, also participated via teleconference.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Rul Mat

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. James Garrison Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer 1300 W. Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Garrison:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with your office on June 27, 2012 (SHPO 2012-0655[105730]) for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C), USAG YPG invited the ACHP to participate in the consultation through a letter dated June 27, 2012; the ACHP responded affirmatively via letter dated October 17, 2012 (enclosed). Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 federally recognized Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for the PA, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation , and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe. An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Representatives of eight of the 14

consulting tribes attended the meeting. Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, ACHP, Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, and Ann Howard, of your office, also participated via teleconference.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin

Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Louis J. Manuel, Jr. Chairman Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Chairman Manuel:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Ak-Chin Indian Community on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Ms. Caroline Antone, Cultural Resources Manager, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

July most

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Edward Smith Chairman Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Chairman Smith:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Mr. Ronald Escobar, Secretary Treasurer, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012; Mr. Ron Escobar represented the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe at the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Sherry Cordova Chairwoman Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 S Veterans Dr. Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Chairwoman Cordova:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Cocopah Indian Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Ms. Jill McCormick, Cultural Resources Manager, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012; Ms. Jill McCormick represented the Cocopah Indian Tribe at the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Rell Mart

.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Eldred Enas Chairman Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Chairman Enas:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Colorado River Indian Tribes on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Ms. Wilene Fisher-Holt, Director, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012; Mr. Howard Magill, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum, represented the Colorado River Indian Tribes at the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Dr. Clinton M. Pattea President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear President Pattea:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Ms. Karen Ray, Language/Cultural Coordinator, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Ruht

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Timothy Williams Chairman Fort Mojave Indian Tribe 500 Merriman Avenue Needles, California 92363

Dear Chairman Williams:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Ms. Linda Otero, Director, AhaMaKav Cultural Society, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

1. Il MA

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Gregory Mendoza Governor Gila River Indian Community P.O. Box 97 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Mendoza:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Gila River Indian Community on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012; Mr. Lewis and Mr. Larry Benallie represented the Gila River Indian Community at the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. LeRoy N. Shingoitewa Chairman Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Chairman Shingoitewa:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Hopi Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma, Director, Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Keeny Escalanti, Sr. President Quechan Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear President Escalanti:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Quechan Indian Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Ms. Willa Scott, Chairwoman, Culture Committee, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012; Mr. John Bathke and Mr. Manfred Scott represented the Quechan Indian Tribe at the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager


January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Diane Enos Chairwoman Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Chairwoman Enos:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Mr. Kelly Washington, Cultural Resources Department Director, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012; Mr. Jacob E. Butler represented the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community at the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Terry Rambler Chairman San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the San Carlos Apache Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Ms. Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ned Norris, Jr. Chairman Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Chairman Norris:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Tohono O'Odham Nation on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Mr. Peter Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012; Mr. Joseph Joaquin and Mr. Jefford Francisco represented the Tohono O'Odham Nation at the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Enclosures

.



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. David Kwail Chairman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Chairman Kwail:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Yavapai-Apache Nation on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Ms. Gertrude Smith, Director, Yavapai Cultural Department, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012; Ms. Smith, Ms. Reba Franco, and Ms. Judie Piner represented the Yavapai-Apache Nation at the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr. President Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear President Jones:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). At this time I am extending an invitation to you to sign the PA as a concurring party. The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 calendar days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to Ms. Linda Ogo, Culture Research Department Director, for review and comment.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

.

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Caroline Antone Cultural Resources Manager Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Ms. Antone:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Ak-Chin Indian Community on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Louis J. Manuel , Jr., Chairman, Ak-Chin Indian Community, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

IMas

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ronald Escobar Secretary-Treasurer Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Mr. Escobar:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Charles Wood, Chairman, Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Ruldment

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Jill McCormick Cultural Resources Manager Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 S Veterans Dr. Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Ms. McCormick:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Cocopah Indian Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Sherry Cordova, Chairwoman, Cocopah Indian Tribe, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Wilene Fisher-Holt Director, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Ms. Fisher-Holt:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Colorado River Indian Tribes on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Eldred Enas, Chairman, Colorado River Indian Tribes, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Karen Ray Language/Cultural Coordinator Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear Ms. Ray:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Clinton M. Pattea, President, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Otero Director, AhaMaKav Cultural Society Fort Mojave Indian Tribe P.O. Box 5990 Mohave Valley, Arizona 86440

Dear Ms. Otero:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Timothy Williams, Chairman, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Gila River Indian Community P.O. Box 2140 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Mr. Lewis:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Gila River Indian Community on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Gregory Mendoza, Governor, Gila River Indian Community, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma Director, Hopi Cultural Preservation Office Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwisiwma:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Hopi Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable LeRoy N. Shingoitewa, Chairman, Hopi Tribe, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Ruh Tryot

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Willa Scott Chairwoman, Quechan Cultural Committee Quechan Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear Ms. Scott:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Quechan Indian Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Keeny Escalanti , Sr., President, Quechan Indian Tribe, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Rul IMS

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Kelly Washington Cultural Resources Department Director Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Mr. Washington:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Diane Enos, Chairwoman, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Mat

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Enclosures

.



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Vernelda Grant Tribal Historic Preservation Officer San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Ms. Grant:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the San Carlos Apache Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Terry Rambler, Chairman, San Carlos Apache Tribe, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Peter Steere Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Mr. Steere:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Tohono O'Odham Nation on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Ned Norris , Jr., Chairman, Tohono O'Odham Nation, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Gertrude Smith Director, Cultural Department Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Ms. Smith:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Yavapai-Apache Nation on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable David Kwail, Chairman, Yavapai-Apache Nation, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Enclosures

.


January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Linda Ogo Culture Research Department Director Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear Ms. Ogo:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe on June 27, 2012 for a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA. A copy of the PA is also being sent to the Honorable Ernest Jones , Sr., President, Yavapai-Prescott Tribe, for review and comment, with an invitation to sign as a concurring party.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Ann Howard, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, Federal Property Management Section, ACHP, and Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, also participated via teleconference.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



January 8, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Karla Petty Division Administrator, Arizona Division Arizona Department of Transportation 4000 North Central Avenue, Suite 1500 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Dear Ms. Petty:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes on June 27, 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment as a consulting party; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 federally recognized Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for the PA, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation , and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe. An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Representatives of eight of the 14 consulting tribes attended the

meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy SHPO, Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, and Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, ACHP, also participated via teleconference.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Kull Int

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Carol Brooks Curator, Arizona Historical Society Rio Colorado Division, Yuma 240 S. Madison Ave. Yuma, Arizona 85364

Dear Ms. Brooks:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes on June 27, 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment as a consulting party; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 federally recognized Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for the PA, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe. An initial Section 106

government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Representatives of eight of the 14 consulting tribes attended the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy SHPO, Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, and Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, ACHP, also participated via teleconference.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Jon Shumaker Archaeologist, Archaeological Services Natural Resources Department Arizona Public Service Company P.O. Box 53933, M.S. 3872 Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3933

Dear Mr. Shumaker:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes on June 27, 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment as a consulting party; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 federally recognized Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for the PA, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation,

the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe. An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Representatives of eight of the 14 consulting tribes attended the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy SHPO, Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, and Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, ACHP, also participated via teleconference.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. John MacDonald Manager, Yuma Field Office Bureau of Land Management 2555 East Gila Ridge Road Yuma, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. MacDonald:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes on June 27, 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment as a consulting party; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 federally recognized Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for the PA, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe. An initial Section 106

government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Representatives of eight of the 14 consulting tribes attended the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy SHPO, Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, and Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, ACHP, also participated via teleconference.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



REPLY TO ATTENTION OF Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Derrick Moe Western Area Power Administration Desert Southwest Region P.O. Box 6457 Phoenix, Arizona 85005-6457

Dear Mr. Moe:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes on June 27, 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). The draft PA for operations, maintenance, and development at YPG is enclosed for your review and comment as a consulting party; we are requesting responses within 35 days of receipt in order to consolidate comments during late February, distribute a second draft, and schedule a teleconference or other requested consultation meetings during late March. Both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. A copy of the 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA is also enclosed. Copies of the draft PA and sensitivity model are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in Attachment C of the PA.

The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 federally recognized Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for the PA, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Indian Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe. An initial Section 106

government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Representatives of eight of the 14 consulting tribes attended the meeting. Ann Howard, Deputy SHPO, Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, and Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, ACHP, also participated via teleconference.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. James Garrison Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer 1300 W. Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Garrison:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground initiated consultation with your office on June 27, 2012 (SHPO 2012-0655[105730]) for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA. incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA. The enclosed draft PA addresses preferred management strategies for historic properties that may be affected by implementation of undertakings that may occur, including basic maintenance, repair, and development activities, training exercises, and supported component activities. Although the USAG YPG goal of the PA is to establish consultation procedures for the broader spectrum of typical undertakings, execution of the PA is essential prior to signing of the Record of Decision for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission activities that is currently in development in order to resolve effects to cultural resources.

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1)(i)(C), USAG YPG invited the ACHP to participate in the consultation through a letter dated June 27, 2012; the ACHP responded affirmatively via letter dated October 17, 2012 (enclosed). Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), USAG YPG has invited 14 federally recognized Native American tribes to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process for the PA, including the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Community, the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Quechan Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Nation , and the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe. An initial Section 106 government-to-government consultation meeting to discuss potential draft PA stipulations was held on August 22, 2012. Representatives of eight of the 14 consulting tribes attended the meeting. Katharine Kerr, Program Analyst, ACHP, Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian, Army Environmental Command, and Ann Howard, of your office, also participated via teleconference.

We have scheduled a meeting on the morning of April 17, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground to discuss the enclosed second draft of the PA. The meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If your office cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. John M. Fowler Executive Director Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 1100 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 803 Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mr. Fowler:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Advisory Council on June 27, 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG); your office responded affirmatively via letter dated October 17, 2012. Enclosed for your review and comment is a second draft PA; both a paper copy and an electronic copy in Microsoft Word are enclosed to facilitate your review. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled a meeting on the morning of April 17, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground to discuss the enclosed second draft of the PA. The meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If your office cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Karla Petty Division Administrator, Arizona Division Arizona Department of Transportation 4000 North Central Avenue, Suite 1500 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Dear Ms. Petty:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes in June of 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). We sent the first draft of the PA for your review and comment in January. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are enclosed to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are enclosed on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2011 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, the ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled consultation meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuna Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. If you cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



.

April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Carol Brooks Curator, Arizona Historical Society Rio Colorado Division, Yuma 240 S. Madison Ave. Yuma, Arizona 85364

Dear Ms. Brooks:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes in June of 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). We sent the first draft of the PA for your review and comment in January. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are enclosed to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are enclosed on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2011 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, the ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled consultation meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. If you cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Jon Shumaker Archaeologist, Archaeological Services Natural Resources Department Arizona Public Service Company P.O. Box 53933, M.S. 3872 Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3933

Dear Mr. Shumaker:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes in June of 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). We sent the first draft of the PA for your review and comment in January. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are enclosed to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are enclosed on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2011 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, the ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled consultation meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. If you cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. John MacDonald Manager, Yuma Field Office Bureau of Land Management 2555 East Gila Ridge Road Yuma, Arizona 85365

Dear Mr. MacDonald:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes in June of 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). We sent the first draft of the PA for your review and comment in January. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are enclosed to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are enclosed on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2011 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, the ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled consultation meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. If you cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Derrick Moe Western Area Power Administration Desert Southwest Region P.O. Box 6457 Phoenix, Arizona 85005-6457

Dear Mr. Moe:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and 14 consulting Native American tribes in June of 2012 for development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). We sent the first draft of the PA for your review and comment in January. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are enclosed to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are enclosed on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2011 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the SHPO, the ACHP, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled consultation meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuna Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. If you cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

If you have any comments, please address your correspondence to Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Louis J. Manuel, Jr. Chairman Ak-Chin Indian Community 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Chairman Manuel:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Ak-Chin Indian Community in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Ms. Caroline Antone, Cultural Resources Manager, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Edward Smith Chairman Chemehuevi Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1976 Havasu Lake, California 92363

Dear Chairman Smith:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Mr. Ronald Escobar, Secretary Treasurer, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Sherry Cordova Chairwoman Cocopah Indian Tribe 14515 S Veterans Dr. Somerton, Arizona 85350

Dear Chairwoman Cordova:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Cocopah Indian Tribe in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Ms. Jill McCormick, Cultural Resource Manager, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Wayne Patch Chairman Colorado River Indian Tribes 26600 Mohave Road Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Chairman Patch:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Colorado River Indian Tribes in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Ms. Wilene Fisher-Holt, Director, Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Dr. Clinton M. Pattea President Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation P.O. Box 17779 Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear President Pattea:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Ms. Karen Ray, Language/Cultural Coordinator, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Timothy Williams Chairman Fort Mojave Indian Tribe 500 Merriman Avenue Needles, California 92363

Dear Chairman Williams:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Ms. Linda Otero, Director, AhaMaKav Cultural Society, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Gregory Mendoza Governor Gila River Indian Community P.O. Box 97 Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Mendoza:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Gila River Indian Community in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Mr. Barnaby V. Lewis, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. LeRoy N. Shingoitewa Chairman Hopi Tribe P.O. Box 123 Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Chairman Shingoitewa:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Hopi Tribe in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma, Director, Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.incdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T: Martin

Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Keeny Escalanti, Sr. President Quechan Indian Tribe P.O. Box 1899 Yuma, Arizona 85366

Dear President Escalanti:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Quechan Indian Tribe in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Ms. Willa Scott, Chairwoman, Culture Committee, and Ms. Arlene Kingery, Historic Preservation Officer, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Ms. Diane Enos Chairwoman, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 10005 East Osborn Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear Chairwoman Enos:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Mr. Kelly Washington, Cultural Resources Department Director, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Terry Rambler Chairman San Carlos Apache Tribe P.O. Box O San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the San Carlos Apache Tribe in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Ms. Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ned Norris, Jr. Chairman Tohono O'Odham Nation P.O. Box 837 Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Chairman Norris:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Tohono O'Odham Nation in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Mr. Peter Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. David Kwail Chairman Yavapai-Apache Nation 2400 W. Datsi Road Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Chairman Kwail:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Yavapai-Apache Nation in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Ms. Gertrude Smith, Director, Yavapai Cultural Department, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager



April 1, 2013

Environmental Sciences Division

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr. President Yavapai-Prescott Tribe 530 East Merritt Street Prescott, Arizona 86301

Dear President Jones:

U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground (USAG YPG) initiated consultation with the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe in June of 2012 for a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) for Yuma Proving Ground and sent a first draft of the PA in January of 2013 for your review and comment. Enclosed with this letter is a second draft of the PA, incorporating comments received to date. Both paper and electronic copies are included to facilitate your review and comment. All comments received on the first draft are included on compact disk (CD). The 2011 archaeological sensitivity model mentioned in the PA and the transcript from the August 22, 2012 tribal consultation meeting discussion of potential PA stipulations are also included on the CD. I am also sending a copy of the PA and this letter to Ms. Linda Ogo, Culture Research Department Director, with enclosures, for review and comment. All materials are being mailed concurrently to the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, all consulting federally recognized tribes, and other consulting parties listed in the PA.

We have scheduled meetings for April 17 and 18, 2013, in Building 308 on the Main Administrative Area of Yuma Proving Ground; the morning of April 17 will be devoted to discuss the enclosed draft PA. Discussion at the meeting will include our proposed timeline for completion of the PA. The April 17 meeting agenda and a map to Building 308 are also enclosed. As noted in our invitation letter of February 26, USAG YPG is able to assist with travel expenses and accommodations; please contact Dr. Meg McDonald, Cultural Resources Manager for details. If the tribe cannot send a representative, the enclosed agenda has teleconferencing instructions. Any comments you send via mail or email prior to the meeting will be presented at the meeting; as importantly, we welcome your comments in person or via telephone during the meeting if you cannot send comments prior to the meeting.

I look forward to consulting with you on the enclosed Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, Dr. Meg McDonald, at alison.m.mcdonald.civ@mail.mil or (928) 328-2520. Thank you for your interest in and support of U.S. Army Garrison Yuma Proving Ground's cultural resources program.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Martin Garrison Manager

Appendix B Activities Conducted Under the No Action Alternative This page intentionally left blank.
TABLE B-1No Action Alternative Activities in the Laguna RegionYuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^a
	Training Drop Zones (DZs)
Phillips Drop Zone (DZ) 751	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing, operational testing/training, and equipment drop testing
Phillips Reverse DZ 752	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing, operational testing/training, and equipment drop testing
Cox Field DZ 396	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: Manned airdrops only, parachute training for Golden Knights, and MFFS
Unma	anned Aircraft Systems (UAS) and Aviation Test Facilities
CDH	Manned aircraft systems and UAS testing and training
Laguna Army Airfield	Manned aircraft operations (testing and training), UAS performance testing and training
Cobra Flats Helipad	Aircraft Systems testing; Forward Area Arming and Refuel Point (FARP); Military Training Area Complex: MWD obedience and explosives scent training, mounted and dismounted patrolling, land navigation, tactical military exercises, bivouac shelter, communications training, physical fitness training, tactical vehicle driver training on existing trails, airmobile training, limited demolitions/explosives/pyrotechnics training, field fortifications/fighting positions training, and tactical vehicle maintenance
K-9 Village and West LA Village	UAS performance testing, Intelligence; Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; Light Maneuver Training Area (LTA) for dismounted patrolling; on- and off-road wheeled vehicle maneuver; military working dog training; land navigation; bivouac and base camps set-up and operation; Military Operations in Urban Terrain testing and training; and field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices
Site 2	UAS performance testing; Intelligence; Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; Light Maneuver Training Area (LTA) for dismounted patrolling; on- and off-road wheeled vehicle maneuver; land navigation; Military Training Area Complex: military working dog obedience and explosives scent training, mounted and dismounted patrolling, land navigation, tactical military exercises, bivouac shelter, communications training, physical fitness training, tactical vehicle driver training on existing trails, airmobile training, limited demolitions/explosives/pyrotechnics training, field fortifications/fighting positions training, helicopter rearming and refueling, and tactical vehicle maintenance; and field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices
Contraves C Contraves D	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing and optical tracking; Aircraft Systems: laser testing/training and optical tracking; Telemetry Receiver/Transmitter stations, Radar System operations
	Vehicle Test Courses
Hot Weather Test Complex	Testing of vehicle system Level and driveline components and of stability, handling, response and control. Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDTE) for performance and reliability testing of military wheeled and tracked vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Joint Use Test Complex	Vehicle performance and reliability testing
Laguna Paved (Paved	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and

TABLE B-1No Action Alternative Activities in the Laguna RegionYuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^a
Dynamometer Course)	equipment
Ride Dynamics	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of suspension on military wheeled and tracked vehicles
Mud Dynamometer Course	RDTE of military wheeled and tracked vehicles and assessment of mud terrain for mobility and performance
Laguna Road Mud	RDTE of performance and reliability testing military wheeled and tracked vehicles and assessment of mud terrain for mobility and performance
Laguna Level Gravel	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Laguna Level Trails West	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Laguna Level Trails East	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Laguna Hilly Trails	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Kofa Level Gravel	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Muggins Dust Course	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Middle East Course	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment; driver/convoy training
Patton Level Gravel	RDTE for performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Paved Longitudinal Grade and Side Slopes	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked military vehicles
Patton Hilly Gravel	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Patton Hilly Trail	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Patton Level Trail	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Sand Dynomometer Course	RDTE of performance and reliability testing wheeled and tracked military vehicles; assessment of soft sand terrain for mobility and performance
Sand Slopes	RDTE of performance and reliability testing wheeled and tracked military vehicles; assessment of soft sand terrain for mobility and performance
Vapor Lock Wash	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
Patton Wash	RDTE of performance and reliability testing wheeled vehicles; assessment of fluid- transport systems using water only

TABLE B-1
No Action Alternative Activities in the Laguna Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^a
Patton Off-Road	RDTE of performance and reliability testing for high mobility/harsh terrain wheeled vehicles
Fording Basin	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked military vehicles; driver/convoy training
Muggins Mesa Area	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of military vehicles, sensors, and equipment
2% Sustained Speed Slope (U.S. Highway 95 [US 95])	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked military vehicles
1-5% Sustained Speed Slope (Martinez Lake Road)	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked military vehicles
Ride Dynamics (RMS, Pothole, Bump)	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked military vehicles
Fuel Transfer Area	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of vehicles and equipment for fuel transfer rate, fuel transport, and fluid transport
Airfield Delivery Loading Ramp	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked military vehicles; assessment of ride handling, and air transportability of vehicle
Curb Impact Course	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked military vehicles; assessment of urban terrain/rubble mobility/performance
C-130 Air Transportability Testbed	RDTE; assessment of air transportability of military vehicles and Military equipment
Urban Rubble	RDTE of performance and reliability testing wheeled and tracked military vehicles; assessment of urban terrain/rubble mobility/performance
Vertical Steps	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked vehicles; assessment of mobility/performance
Winch Test/Tiedown Facility	RDTE of military equipment, assessment of winch performance and tie-down fixtures
Bridging Devices	RDTE of military bridge-laying equipment, assessment of reliability and performance
V-Ditch and Obstacle Area	RDTE of wheeled vehicles and tracked vehicles; assessment of mobility/performance
Tilt Table	RDTE of wheeled vehicles and tracked vehicles; assessment of safety and stability
Roll-on/Roll-off Ramps	RDTE and assessment of transportability of military vehicles and Military equipment
Military Operations on Urban Terrain (MOUT)	RDTE of wheeled vehicles; assessment of mobility/performance in urban terrain

TABLE B-1No Action Alternative Activities in the Laguna RegionYuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^a
	Operational Training and Testing
Site 4	LTA for dismounted patrolling; wheeled vehicle maneuver (on- and off-road); military working dog training; land navigation; bivouac and base camps; Military Operations in Urban Terrain; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training
Hill 630 Area and Training Area Bravo	LTA for dismounted patrolling; wheeled vehicle maneuver (on- and off-road); military working dog training; land navigation; bivouac and base camps; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training
FOB Site	Base Camp Operations consisting of troop holding (bivouac); administrative functions; ammunition holding; fueling operations; motor pool operations; maintenance operations; food service operations; communications sites; mounted or dismounted security patrols; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training services; miscellaneous training
CALA Pad	Training for aircraft (fixed and rotary wing) refueling operations; aircraft armament arming and operations, fuel, and ordnance holding areas; dismounted and mounted security patrols bivouac and base camps; mission support vehicle traffic; communications sites; air traffic control operations; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training
Coyote Den	Military Training Area Complex: military working dog obedience and explosives scent training, mounted and dismounted patrolling, land navigation, tactical military exercises, bivouac shelter, communications training, physical fitness training, tactical vehicle driver training on existing trails, airmobile training, limited demolitions/explosives/pyrotechnics training, field fortifications/fighting positions training, helicopter rearming and refueling, and tactical vehicle maintenance
IRCC Tank Maintenance and Storage Ramada compound	Tactical vehicle staging area; maintenance operations
Geodetic GNSS/GPS Reference Station Network (GRSN) - North UAV (see locations in Cibola and Kofa)	GPS Receiver locations
Existing Road Infrastructure in Laguna Range	Equipment moving logistics, moving targets, and sensor arrays
Middle East Course/Muggins Mountain	LTA for dismounted patrolling; wheeled vehicle maneuver (on- and off-road); military working dog training; land navigation; bivouac and base camps; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training
Radar Site 3	Mine and demolition charge testing, fire control; direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; nonlethal weapons; smoke and obscurants: effectiveness and generation; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: temporary sensor positions, surveillance systems

TABLE B-1 No Action Alternative Activities in the Laguna Region Yuma Proving Ground

3	
Activity Area	Activities ^a
Meteorological and Simulations Facilities, Various Locations	Mission support: real-time meteorological data

^a Throughout the YPG Ranges there are numerous fixed sites that are used for a variety of purposes. Some were originally designed to support radar or optical instrumentation, camera sites, pads for equipment emplacement, landing pads, observation posts for visual observers, firing points, GPs, and impact areas. All of these sites also are used, as needed, to support UAS testing, to include temporary installation and employment of UAS launch/recovery systems, GCSs, command and control infrastructure, and refueling operations. UAS testing may include optical tracking (ground or aerial), laser rangefinder, and laser designator operations. Tests are conducted at these areas on ground- or tower-mounted sensors, balloon- or aerostat-mounted sensors, electro-optical sensors, infrared sensors, radar sensors, and unattended ground sensors, as well as wireless communications. These areas are also used for establishment of temporary firing positions to conduct ground weapons firing into approved impact areas, including small arms, shoulder-fired arms, mortars, rockets, RPGs, AT-4 LAWs, and other direct fire weapons.

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE B-2
No Action Alternative Activities in the Cibola Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a, b}
Munitions	Impact Areas/Munitions Support/UAS
Prospect Square	Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; Air/Missile Defense Systems; Bombing
Rocket and Gun Horizontal (CRV-7)	Direct-fire systems: rockets, guns, small arms, munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Indirect fire systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems; rocket and gun integration on manned and UAS platforms; flares and nonlethal weapons
North Pad	Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; aircraft armaments and armament system integration rotary – firing; Training activities.
Rocket Alley	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing; Direct- fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; rocket integration on UAS platforms
Site 6A	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing
Site 7B	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing
Site 9	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance:
Site 10	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing; Direct- fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; missiles/rockets: line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons, UAS performance testing and training
Site 10 Missile Test Facility	Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; missiles/rockets: line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons
Site 12	Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing, UAS performance testing and training
Site 12A	UAS performance; Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance
Site 14	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing; Direct- fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; missiles/rockets: line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal

TABLE B-2
No Action Alternative Activities in the Cibola Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a, b}
	weapons
Red Hill Road (Errant Hellfire Target)	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing; Direct- fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; missiles/rockets: line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons
Middle Mountain	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing; Direct- fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; missiles/rockets: line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons
South Pad	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing and rotary - firing; direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; missiles/rockets: line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons; Training activities
West Gun	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration rotary-firing; Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; missiles/rockets: line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons
Moving Target Indicator (MTI) Road (includes West Target Road)	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration rotary - firing; direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; missiles/rockets: line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons
CM 4 and CM 5.5	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing; Direct- fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; missiles/rockets: line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons; smoke and obscurants: effectiveness and generation; Aircraft Systems: laser testing; UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing
CM 1	Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; Air/Missile Defense Systems; Aircraft Systems: laser testing; UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing
OP-9 Combined Arms Live Fire Exercise (CALFEX) Range	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing; Direct- fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and

Activity Area	Activities ^{a, b}
	acceptance; line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons; smoke and obscurants: effectiveness and generation; live fire training activities
North Pad Crew Served Weapon (CSW) Range	Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; line-of-sight missiles; nonlethal weapons; smoke and obscurants: effectiveness and generation; live fire training activities
Graze Multi-Purpose Range Complex (MPRC)	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration rotary-firing; Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; nonlethal weapons; smoke and obscurants: effectiveness and generation; live fire training activities; one sub- range within the Graze MPRC, Grenade and Light Demo Range, is used for limited explosive containing munitions
Long Range Artillery Impact Areas (LRA 5 - LRA 7)	Aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing; Mine and demolition charge testing, fire control; direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; nonlethal weapons; smoke and obscurants: effectiveness and generation; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: temporary sensor positions, surveillance systems
Long Range Munitions	Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, long range precision guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; nonlethal weapons; smoke and obscurants: effectiveness and generation; aircraft armaments and armament systems integration firing; gun positions: fixed sites with some level of permanent infrastructure used for munitions performance and acceptance. The gun positions would also support test associated data collection and instrumentation activities.
Convoy Live Fire Range	Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; Training for mounted multiple vehicle gunnery (various caliber) - including smoke, riot control agents, and pyrotechnics; vehicle maneuver on roads and trails within Prospect Square Impact Area; live fire training activities
Stinger Pole Target Range	Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; Training for firing of man portable and vehicle mounted air defense missiles and machine guns from stationary and moving positions; launch and recover drone target aircraft; bivouac and base camps; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training

TABLE B-2 No Action Alternative Activities in the Cibola Region Yuma Proving Ground

TABLE B-2
No Action Alternative Activities in the Cibola Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a, b}
Cibola Direct Fire Range	Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Ammunition RDTE; Weapon Systems RDTE; small arms; Indirect-fire Systems, mortars, artillery, guided munitions; weapons systems; munitions performance and acceptance
Moving Target Range	Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance
Gauna Peak	UAS - Weapons Integration, performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing, laser testing
Horizontal Impact Area	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance
Compact Automatic Centroid Tracking Instrumentation System (CACTIS) Target Board	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing
Maverick Target	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing, target acquisition [Currently Destroyed]
Detection and Recognition Target Arrays (DET/REC)	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing, target acquisition
Near Bar/Far Bar Radar Test Area	Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance: sensor testing and optical tracking, target acquisition architectures
MPS-25 Radar	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing and equipment drop testing
GBOSS	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing, target acquisition
IDAS Sensor Site	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing and optical tracking; Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance
Persistent Surveillance System Test Area (west of La Posa DZ)	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; Direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance
Sidewinder Sensor Site	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing
Satellite Reference Station 1	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; UAS performance
Satellite Reference Station 2	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; UAS performance

TABLE B-2No Action Alternative Activities in the Cibola RegionYuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a, b}
	Drop Zones
Mohave Circular DZ 147	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing, operational testing/training, and equipment drop testing; Explosive drops
Robby∖La Posa DZ 1053	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing, operational testing/training, and equipment drop testing
Sidewinder Circular DZ 090	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing, operational testing/training, and equipment drop testing; UAS performance, operations; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; helicopter assault operations; dismounted patrolling using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents and other training devices; wheeled vehicle operations (on-and off-road)
Corral Circular DZ 392	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing, operational testing/training, and equipment drop testing; Explosive drops
Ironwood Circular DZ	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing, operational testing/training, and equipment drop testing; Explosive drops (licensed for depleted uranium drops)
Los Angeles Circular DZ 1128	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing, operational testing/training, and equipment drop testing; Helicopter assault operations; UAS operations; dismounted patrolling using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents and other training devices; wheeled vehicle operations (on-and off-road)
Tyson DZ	Air Delivery System/Airdrop: manned drop testing, operational testing/training, and equipment drop testing
	UAS and Aviation Facilities
C-17 Landing Strip	UAS: weapons integration, performance; electronic countermeasures: IEDs; Direct Fire Systems (Nonmissile/Rocket): munitions performance and acceptance; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; Fixed and rotary wing assault training; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing
Tyson Dirt Landing Zone	Fixed and rotary wing assault training
Site 8 UAV Complex	UAS: weapons integration, performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: long-range sensor testing, munitions firing support; direct Fire Systems (Nonmissile/Rocket): munitions performance and acceptance; Aircraft Systems: FARP; Indirect Fire Weapons Systems: mortars, munitions performance and acceptance; UAS/UAV training operations
Site 8A	UAS testing; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: munitions firing support
Joint UAS Facility (North UAV Complex)	UAS: weapons integration, performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: long-range sensor testing, munitions firing support, aerostat emplacement; direct Fire Systems (Nonmissile/Rocket): munitions performance and acceptance; Aircraft Systems: FARP; Indirect Fire Weapons Systems: mortars, munitions performance and acceptance; UAS/UAV training operations; direct and indirect weapons firing, and small arms

TABLE B-2
No Action Alternative Activities in the Cibola Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a, b}
4-K Helipad	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: long-range sensor testing; FARP; Training for FARP
IRCC Helipad	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing; FARP; direct and indirect weapons firing, lasing, and small arms
Airborne Detection Area	Engineering Equipment: mine detection and neutralization capabilities; demolition/munitions; Training for FARP
Comanche Flats (Helipad)	UAS performance; Lot Acceptance Testing; Training for FARP, fuel and ordnance holding areas: dismounted and mounted security patrols; mission support vehicle traffic; communications sites; air traffic control operations; Military Training Area Complex: MWD obedience and explosives scent training, mounted and dismounted patrolling, land navigation, tactical military exercises, bivouac shelter, communications training, physical fitness training, tactical vehicle driver training on existing trails, airmobile training, limited demolitions/explosives/pyrotechnics training, field fortifications/fighting positions training, and tactical vehicle maintenance; Field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training; direct and indirect weapons firing, missiles, rockets, guns, and small arms
40-ft Dropsite	Impact Performance Testing: drop testing of munitions from heights of up to 40-ft.
Site 10 Missile Test Facility	UAS: weapons integration, performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: long-range sensor testing, munitions firing support; direct Fire Systems (Nonmissile/Rocket): munitions performance and acceptance; Aircraft Systems: FARP; Indirect Fire Weapons Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, munitions performance and acceptance; UAS/UAV training operations
ECUT Pad	Intelligence; Surveillance and Reconnaissance: aerostat platform and sensor technology testing and training; Naval Air Systems Command - Skybus program
Alpha Pad (PGSS Site) Bravo Pad (PGSS Site) Charlie Pad (PGSS Site) RUS Pad (PTDS Site) OP Puma Pad West II Pad LA Pad	Intelligence; Surveillance and Reconnaissance: aerostat platform and sensor technology testing and training

TABLE B-2
No Action Alternative Activities in the Cibola Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a, b}
Z-12	Mine and demolition charge testing, fire control; direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder-fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; supports ground and aerial firing in conjunction with Middle Mountain Road Impact Area; nonlethal weapons; smoke and obscurants: effectiveness and generation; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: temporary sensor positions, surveillance systems; UAS: weapons integration, performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: long-range sensor testing, munitions firing support; direct Fire Systems (Nonmissile/Rocket): munitions performance and acceptance; Aircraft Systems: FARP; Indirect Fire Weapons Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, munitions performance and acceptance; UAS/UAV training operations
Site 16	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: long-range sensor testing, laser testing
Site 18	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing
Site 9	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing, munitions firing support
Electronic Common Use Test (ECUT) area	UAS: weapons integration and performance
Simulated Minefield	UAS: weapons integration and performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing
Aerostat Mooring Site	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing, weapons integration
Phoenix UAS Site	UAS: weapons integration, performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: long-range sensor testing, munitions firing support; direct Fire Systems (Nonmissile/Rocket): munitions performance and acceptance; Aircraft Systems: FARP; Indirect Fire Weapons Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, munitions performance and acceptance; testing and training
	Vehicle Test Courses
Cibola Lake Mud Course	RDTE of wheeled and tracked vehicles, assessment of mud terrain for mobility and performance
Rock Ledge Course	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of vehicles, sensors, and equipment; driver/convoy training
Cibola Mile Post 72 Dust Course	RDTE of performance testing of wheeled and tracked military vehicles: equipment in a heavy sand/dust environment; assessment of weapon system performance
Desert March	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of vehicles, sensors, and equipment; driver/convoy training
BTE Course	Light Maneuver Area for training of dismounted patrolling, wheeled vehicle maneuver (on- and off-road), military working dog, land navigation, bivouac and base camps; Field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training

TABLE B-2No Action Alternative Activities in the Cibola RegionYuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a, b}
Phoenix Site (straight test road with facility)	Automotive vehicles: performance and reliability testing
Tire Bruise and US 95 (from Imperial Dam Road, guns, to MP 92)	RDTE of wheeled vehicles: assessment of wheel/tire performance on rough terrain
	JERC Sites
JERC I	UAS performance; Engineering Equipment: mine detection and neutralization capabilities, demolition/munitions; Electronic countermeasures: IEDs; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: target acquisition architectures (sensors/radars), sensor testing and optical tracking; Aircraft Systems: laser testing/training and optical tracking; Automotive Vehicles: system level and driveline components, electrical system/software performance, stability, handling, response & control, turret and weapons system; Light Maneuver Area for dismounted patrolling, wheeled vehicle maneuver (on and off road), military working dog training, land navigation, bivouac and base camps; Field Training Exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training
Joint Test Tunnels Range (JTTR) - located within JERC I	Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: target acquisition architectures (sensors/radars); unmanned ground vehicles
JERC II	UAS performance; Extreme natural environments; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: target acquisition architectures (sensors/radars), sensor testing and optical tracking; Aircraft Systems: laser testing/training and optical tracking; Light Maneuver Area for dismounted patrolling, wheeled vehicle maneuver (on- road), military working dog training, land navigation, bivouac and base camps; Field Training Exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training
JERC III	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: target acquisition architectures (sensors/radars), sensor testing and optical tracking; Aircraft Systems: laser testing/training and optical tracking; Engineering Equipment: mine detection and neutralization capabilities, demolition/munitions; Electronic countermeasures: IEDs; extreme natural environments; Light Maneuver Area for dismounted patrolling, wheeled vehicle maneuver (on-road), military working dog training, land navigation, bivouac and base camps, field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training
Gun Posi	tions/Operational Training and Testing
Middle Mountains	Light Maneuver Area for dismounted patrolling, wheeled vehicle maneuver (on- and off-road); military working dog training; land navigation; bivouac and base camps; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training

TABLE B-2
No Action Alternative Activities in the Cibola Region
Yuma Proving Ground

ruma rioting creana	
Activity Area	Activities ^{a, b}
Castle Dome FOB Site	Base Camp Operations consisting of troop holding (bivouac); administrative functions; ammunition holding; fueling operations; motor pool operations; maintenance operations; food service operations; communications sites; mounted or dismounted security patrols; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training services); miscellaneous training
Geodetic GNSS/GPS Reference Station Network (GRSN) - Sub- Station F, Bldg 2067, Bldg 3699 (see locations in Laguna and Kofa)	GPS Receiver locations
Existing Road Infrastructure in Cibola Range	Equipment moving logistics, moving targets, and sensor arrays
Firefinder Compound, Radar Site 1, Radar Site 2, Radar Site 3, and the Counter-Fire Compound	Base stations for testing counter battery radar systems; include hard power; instrumentation shelters; telecommunications infrastructure; concrete pads for the radar systems and associated work areas
Meteorological and Simulations Facilities, Various Locations	Mission support: real-time meteorological data
Large Multi Purpose Environmental Chamber (LMPEC)	Environmental chambers are used to expose vehicles and equipment to extreme temperatures and varying levels of humidity
CM9 East GP Cibola Target Boundary GP Site 16 GP CM9 West GP C17 North GP C17 South (South) GP Mound C GP CM1 West GP La Posa DZ GP Mound C Archer GP Site 8 GP West Target Road GP BM1072 GP Excalibur SW GP LADZ GP Site 18 GP Rocket Alley Excalibur GP LADZ East GP SW GP (~CM3)	Indirect Fire Systems: Fixed sites with some level of permanent infrastructure used for munitions performance and acceptance; ammunition and weapons systems RDTE, Indirect-Fire systems such as artillery, howitzers, and mortars. Direct fire systems, tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, armored personnel carriers, with medium and large caliber weapons and missiles. Rockets (foreign and domestic), missiles, surveillance systems and Radar systems may also be utilized. The areas also support test associated data collection and instrumentation activities.

^a Throughout the YPG Ranges there are numerous fixed sites that are used for a variety of purposes. Some were originally designed to support radar or optical instrumentation, camera sites, pads for equipment emplacement, landing pads, observation posts for visual observers, firing points, GPs, and impact areas. All of these sites also are used, as needed, to support UAS testing, to include temporary installation and employment of UAS launch/recovery systems, GCSs, command and control infrastructure, and refueling operations. UAS testing may include optical tracking (ground or aerial), laser rangefinder, and laser designator operations. Tests are conducted at these areas on ground- or tower-mounted sensors, balloon- or aerostat-mounted sensors, electro-optical sensors, infrared sensors, radar sensors, and unattended ground sensors, as well as wireless communications. These areas are also used for establishment of temporary firing positions to conduct ground weapons firing into approved impact areas, including small arms, shoulder-fired arms, mortars, rockets, RPGs, AT-4 LAWs, and other direct fire weapons.

^b Not all Activity Areas appearing in the table appear on the Existing Activities Figures.

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE B-3No Action Alternative Activities in the Kofa RegionYuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a,b, c}
	Munitions Impact Areas
Alpha Impact Area Bravo Impact Area Charlie Impact Area Echo Impact Area Foxtrot Impact Area Splinter Impact Area Ramsdell Ranch Impact Area East Smart Weapons Test Range- (SWTR) Impact Area West SWTR Impact Area East Impact Area	Multi-purpose, multi-use impact areas used to support diverse test activities that require the firing of air-to-ground, ground-to-ground, ground-to-air munitions, projectiles, missiles, mortar cartridges, mines, demolition charges, flares, or the dispensing of chaff or other countermeasures. Weapon systems can vary from man-fired to large caliber. Munition types can vary and can include high explosive, illumination, smoke training-practice, white phosphorous, red phosphorous, submunitions, inert fill, DU (in DU licensed area). Munitions fired into these areas can be ballistic or guided when fired/released. Weapons used against targets at this site are ground fired/launched, or aerially fired/launched. When required, targets are used during testing, ranging from vehicles (stationary and/or moving) to targets constructed of common construction materials (metal, wood, masonry, etc). Unimproved gun positions and sensor/instrumentation sites are established/used within these areas as required. The sites support testing of items such as, but not limited to mines, munitions, submunitions, surveillance systems, demolition charges, howitzers, artillery systems, tanks, mortars, trucks (military and commercial), radar systems, detectors (vehicle mounted, manned, unmanned, remotely operated), networked sensor and weapon systems, combat vehicles, etc. Final hazard classification and Insensitive Munition testing is also conducted and can include tests such as bullet impact, fast cookoff, sympathetic detonation, fragment impact, shaped charge impact, arena detonation, etc. The areas also support test associated data collection and instrumentation activities. Mobility and limited maneuver is also conducted and can involve military convoys, "shoot and scoot" scenarios, forward observation operations, lasing, rangefinding, etc.
Pyrotechnics Evaluation Range Impact Demo Site Sonoran Demolition Range Sonoran Deflagration Site (SDS) /Kofa Deflagration Site (KDS) Big Bird Impact Sparker Impact Height of Bursting Scoring Impact Zulu Impact South Improved Conventional Munitions Impact Brez Impact XM785 HE Impact Mullins Impact Lima Impact XM753 Impact Extended HE Short Impact Extended HE Short Impact Extended HE Long Impact Romeo Impact Adam Impact Eve Impact M753 Impact Eve Impact M753 Impact Eve Impact	Smaller, more specialized, multi-use impact areas used to support test activities as described for the larger multi-use impact areas.

TABLE B-3No Action Alternative Activities in the Kofa RegionYuma Proving Ground

Yuma Proving Ground	
Activity Area	Activities ^{a,b, c}
Brown Field Impact M785 Impact Variable Time Impact Jammer Impact East Impact Kruger Impact Ramsdell Ranch Impact Excalibur Target Array	
Gun Positions, Develo	pmental Test and Demonstration/Experimentation Areas
MCD	Engineering Equipment: testing: mines, mine detection and neutralization capabilities, demolition/munitions.
Mine Field Area (Old Mine)	Engineering Equipment: Munitions performance and acceptance, outdoor long term storage evaluations of munitions and equipment
Countermine Test and Training Range (includes R2311)	Engineering Equipment: mine detection and neutralization capabilities, demolition/munitions; Electronic countermeasures: IEDs; UAS performance
Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Detection Range	Engineering Equipment: mine detection and neutralization capabilities, demolition/munitions; Electronic countermeasures: IEDs
Combat Systems Firing Range	Direct fire systems, tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, armored personnel carriers, medium and large caliber weapons. Direct fire munitions performance and acceptance, fire control. Indirect fire systems, mortars, artillery, howitzers medium and large caliber weapons. Indirect fire performance and acceptance, fire control. Aircraft Armaments, inert fire only. Reliability and performance testing of combat vehicles, c4ISR sensors, counter-IED systems and training devices, laser rangefinder, far target locators, RDTE, performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked vehicles, suspensions and fire control. Training for tank tables, infantry squad battle course, scout squad attack course, infantry platoon battle course, firing and crew certification of attack helicopters.
Combat Systems Maneuver Range	Direct Fire Systems: Off and on road maneuvers of tracked and wheeled combat vehicles, inert fire only, Infantry/Cavalry Unit Training (Up to 160 Soldiers, 24 Combat Vehicles; Maximum 12 Active at One Time, and 15 Support Vehicles); Company on Company Exercises (Double Cavalry Unit Training); infantry/cavalry bivouac; night testing; use of smoke and obscurants; RDTE of weapon systems/vehicles in operational maneuver environment
Red Bluff Firing Range	Same uses as Combat Systems Firing Range
White Phosphorous Detonation Area	Demolition, testing and detonation of White Phosphorous munitions
SPH Maneuver Area	Indirect Fire Systems: combat vehicle system operation, firing, and or driving for testing or operational testing to support system evaluations. Maneuver Area for combat wheeled or tracked vehicles, maneuver (on-road); field training exercises; miscellaneous training; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance

TABLE B-3
No Action Alternative Activities in the Kofa Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a,b, c}
GP 26500R GP 4221Z GP 3835Z GP 21A GP 21 GP 19.1 GP 15 GP 13A GP 12 GP 8 GP 5 GP 4 GP 2	Indirect Fire Systems: Fixed sites with some level of permanent infrastructure used for munitions performance and acceptance; ammunition and weapons systems RDTE, Indirect-Fire systems such as artillery, howitzers, and mortars. Direct fire systems, tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, armored personnel carriers, with medium and large caliber weapons and missiles. Rockets (foreign and domestic), missiles, surveillance systems and Radar systems may also be utilized. The areas also support test associated data collection and instrumentation activities.
GP 17A GP 20	Indirect & Direct Fire Systems: Munitions performance and acceptance; Ammunition and Weapons Systems RDTE, Indirect-Fire systems such as artillery, howitzers, and mortars. Direct fire systems, tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, armored personnel carriers, medium and large caliber weapons. Ground fired rockets and missiles surveillance systems and Radar systems. Includes use of DU firing into Licensed DU impact area.
Unimproved GPs	Indirect Fire Systems: Various throughout KFR, sites used to support, test on an as needed basis such as munitions performance and acceptance; Ammunition and Weapons Systems RDTE, Indirect-Fire systems such as artillery, howitzers, and mortars. Direct fire systems, tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, armored personnel carriers, medium and large caliber weapons. Ground fired rockets and missiles surveillance systems and Radar systems. The areas also support test associated data collection and instrumentation activities
Observation Towers, Observation Points, Bunkers	Indirect Fire Systems: Various throughout KFR, sites used to support, test on an as needed basis such as munitions performance and acceptance; Ammunition and Weapons Systems RDTE, Indirect-Fire systems such as artillery, howitzers, and mortars. Direct fire systems, tanks, infantry fighting vehicles, armored personnel carriers, medium and large caliber weapons. Ground fired rockets and missiles surveillance systems and Radar systems. The areas also support test associated data collection and instrumentation activities
Crusader Complex	Indirect Fire Systems: Fixed Site with multiple buildings primarily used to support test operations occurring at GP 3835Z and GP 4221Z. The areas also support test associated data collection and instrumentation activities
Airborne Detection Ranges	Engineering Equipment: Area designated for surveillance and sensor system RDTE. Surveillance and sensor systems can be ground based (vehicle mounted, handheld, etc) or air based (fixed wing, rotary wing or aerostat). Targets and clutter are emplaced and surveyed throughout the areas as required.
SWTR	Engineering Equipment: Munitions performance and acceptance; Ammunition and Weapons Systems RDTE. Ground launched scatterable munitions, vehicle engagements, ground sensors, combat vehicle test lanes for tactical vehicle engagements.

TABLE B-3No Action Alternative Activities in the Kofa RegionYuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a,b, c}	
Twin Peaks/North Boundary Road	Direct Fire Systems: RDTE of combat vehicles; C4ISR, sensors, and training devices; laser rangefinders and far-target locators	
S-15/CRAM area Radar Site 1 Radar Site 2 Radar Site 3 Firefinder Compound Counterfire Compound	Mine and demolition charge testing, fire control; direct-fire Systems (nonmissile/rocket): munitions performance and acceptance, shoulder- fired weapons (nonmissile/rocket), small arms systems, fire control; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance; nonlethal weapons; smoke and obscurants: effectiveness and generation; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: temporary sensor positions, surveillance systems	
Vehicle Test Courses		
Middle East Course	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of vehicles; driver/convoy training	
Kofa Dust Course	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of wheeled and tracked military vehicles and equipment in a heavy sand/dust environment	
Pole Line Road and Firing Front Road (between GP 15 and GP 20)	RDTE of performance and reliability testing of vehicles, sensors, and equipment	
Combat Systems Firing Range Bump Course	RDTE performance testing of suspension and fire control systems for wheeled and tracked military vehicles	
	UAS and Aviation Facilities	
Contraves D Contraves E Contraves F Contraves G Contraves H Contraves I Contraves J Hog Hill	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing and optical tracking; Aircraft Systems: laser testing/training and optical tracking; Telemetry Receiver/Transmitter stations, Radar System operations	
Tower 48	Used as radar, sensor, relay, telecom and data transmittal sites to host and support testing and operation of various intercept weapon systems that are networked together with a variety of sensors designed to work as a system. Rotary wing aircraft refueling operations; UAS performance	
Tower 49	UAS performance	
Tower L	UAS performance	
Tower 31	Meteorology station, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: instrumentation test support	
Tower M	Meteorology station, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: instrumentation test support	
Twin Peaks	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing and optical tracking; Aircraft Systems: laser testing/training and optical tracking; Telemetry Receiver/Transmitter stations, Radar System operations	

TABLE B-3
No Action Alternative Activities in the Kofa Region
Yuma Proving Ground

Activity Area	Activities ^{a,b, c}	
Windy Hill	UAS performance; Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance: sensor testing and optical tracking; Aircraft Systems: laser testing/training and optical tracking; Telemetry Receiver/Transmitter stations, Radar System operations; Forward Observer operations	
Operational Testing and Training		
SWTR Site Muggins Mountains (Middle East Course) Tower 71 Scams Flats	Light Maneuver Area for dismounted patrolling; wheeled vehicle maneuver (on- and off-road); military working dog training; land navigation; bivouac and base camps; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke, pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; -miscellaneous training	
Echo Pad Delta Pad SWTR Pad	Intelligence; Surveillance and Reconnaissance: aerostat platform and sensor technology testing and training	
Howitzer Movement Area	Maneuver Area for combat wheeled or tracked vehicles, maneuver (on-road); field training exercises; miscellaneous training; Indirect Fire Systems: mortars, artillery, guided munitions, weapons systems, munitions performance and acceptance	
East Impact (in addition to impact area)	Training for demolitions, rapid runway repair, and airfield damage repair; small arms training; bivouac and base camp training; mounted and dismounted security patrols; field training exercises using blanks, simulated munitions, smoke pyrotechnics, riot control agents, and other training devices; miscellaneous training; Rotary wing aircraft refueling operations	
Geodetic GNSS/GPS Reference Station Network (GRSN) - East Kofa (see locations in Laguna and Cibola)	GPS Receiver locations	
Existing Road Infrastructure in Kofa Range	Equipment moving logistics, moving targets, vehicle convoy, and sensor arrays	
Meteorological and Simulations Facilities, Various Locations	Mission support: real-time meteorological data	
Other Test Support Areas		
Ammunition Preparation Facilities	Indirect & Direct Fire Systems: permanent facilities for assembly, inspection, preparation and staging of munitions.	
Environmental Simulation Facilities	Indirect & Direct Fire Systems: various facilities, munition RDTE for subjecting munitions to a variety of simulated mechanical and environmental conditions (vibration, climatic, drop, GP5, LMPEC, x-ray, etc)	
Ammunition Storage Facilities	Array of ammunition storage magazines and associated security and logistic infrastructure	

^a Throughout the YPG Ranges there are numerous fixed sites which are used for a variety of purposes. Some were originally designed to support radar or optical instrumentation, camera sites, pads for equipment emplacement, landing pads, observation posts for visual observers, firing points, GPs, and impact areas. All of these sites are also used, as needed, to support conduct of UAS testing, to include temporary installation and employment of UAS launch/recovery systems, GCS, command and control infrastructure, and refueling operations. Testing includes optical tracking (ground or aerial), laser range finder and laser designator

operations. Sensor tests are conducted at these areas to include ground or tower mounted, balloon or aerostat mounted electro-optical, infrared, radar, unattended ground sensors and wireless communications. These areas are also used for establishment of temporary firing positions to conduct ground weapons firing into approved impact areas, including small arms, shoulder-fired, mortars, rockets, RPGs, AT-4 LAW, and other direct fire weapons.

^b Described impact areas not appearing on maps are part of larger consolidated impact area.

^c Not all Activity Areas appearing in the table appear on the Existing Activities Figures.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix C Quick Look Answers This page intentionally left blank.

E-1: Air Quality Quick Look Questions (Section 3.2)

1. Is the installation located completely, or partially, in a designated nonattainment area or maintenance area relative to compliance with national ambient air quality standards NAAQS?

Yes Section 3.2

A portion of Yuma County is currently in nonattainment (moderate) for the 24-hour NAAQS for PM10. This nonattainment area includes the southwestern corner of Laguna. Data indicate that the entire county has moved into attainment with the 24-hour PM10 standard; however, USEPA has not approved the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) Yuma County PM10 Maintenance Plan and this area remains classified as nonattainment.

The proposed activities would be implemented in Yuma County. With the exception of 10 proposed activities in the southwestern corner of the Laguna Region, all of the proposed activities would be implemented in an attainment area for all criteria pollutants. The 10 proposed activities in the southwestern corner of the Laguna Region would be implemented in the Yuma County moderate PM10 nonattainment area. The area is currently in attainment for the other criteria pollutants.

A signed Record of Non-Applicability certifying that "All activities associated with the Proposed Action in the nonattainment area would be below the conformity threshold value for PM10" has been prepared for the 10 proposed activities that would be implemented in the PM10 nonattainment area.

2. Will the Proposed Action emit a criteria pollutant and/or hazardous air pollutants during its construction and/or operational phase?

Yes Sections 3.2 and 3.9

The proposed activities would cause minor, short-term adverse impacts on air quality due to construction. These impacts would not be expected to occur past the construction phase. All construction emissions would likely be local, limited to the duration of the construction, and would not have a lasting impact on ambient air quality. During construction, air quality impacts could occur from dust carried offsite and combustion emissions from construction equipment.

The 10 proposed activities in the PM10 nonattainment area would be below the conformity threshold value for PM10 during both the construction and operating phases. YPG would require use of BMPs during construction to reduce or eliminate fugitive dust emissions.

2a. Will such emissions exceed "de minimus" standards, as designated in federal or state air quality regulations? *No*

Section 3.2

Construction emissions would be short term and are not expected to cause a violation of any applicable NAAQS. Minor permanent sources of air emissions would be created by the proposed activities, including building heating units and water heaters; however, these small sources would result in no more than a "de minimis" impact on air quality

3. Are there any sensitive receptors of air pollutant effects associated with the installation (examples of such receptors include forests, agricultural crops, threatened or endangered plant or animal species, and human beings with breathing difficulties or other respiratory illnesses)?

No

Construction, generator emissions would be localized and away from residential and natural areas; while, mobile sources of emissions would be minor compared to the area vehicle emissions burdens in each air quality region.

4. Are there wide variations in the monthly and/or seasonal patterns of atmospheric dispersion conditions at the installation?

Yes Section 3.2

During the morning hours, temperature inversions occur at YPG due to topography that contribute to poor air quality. In the summer, wildfires can cause smoky periods that affect both visibility and air quality.

5. Within the last 5 years, has the installation been subject to Notices of Violations (NOVs) or fines relative to Clean Air Act requirements?

No Section 3.2

6. Are there any concerns that federal and state source-oriented permits may not be up to date, and are there any specified conditions not being met?

No Section 3.2

YPG is classified as a major source of air contaminants and is required to obtain a Title V permit. Currently, YPG operates under ADEQ Title V permit # 43492, dated June 17, 2010. The permit will expire on June 17, 2015. YPG is required to certify compliance with each term or condition of the Title V permit semiannually and to report air emissions to annually to ADEQ.

7. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed? *No*

The Proposed Action has demonstrated general conformity and would not contribute to a violation of NAAQS.

E-2: Airspace Management Quick Look Questions (Section 3.3)

1. Are existing airspace designations (e.g., SUAs, MOAs, MTRs, etc.) previously established for the installation currently subject to overutilization?

No, there are no current problems with over-utilization of designated airspace areas.

2. Are there concerns with overcrowding of regional airspace or additional restrictions on existing air corridors?

No, concerns over airspace overcrowding have not been expressed during public scoping meetinas.

Section Appendix A - public scoping portion.

3. Are there non-military uses of the current airspace, and are conflicts being articulated? Yes. Private and commercial flights may obtain permission to use the airspace when it is not in use for military purposes. However, no conflicts are being articulated. Sections 2.1.1.4 and 3.3.

4. Will the Proposed Action cause a more than marginal increased use of existing airspace?

No. Section 3.3

5. Are future actions by non-military and other military entities expected, and would they cause impacts on airspace resources? No.

Section 3.3

6. Will the Proposed Action require new airspace designations or expansions in existing restricted airspace?

No. None of the alternatives under consideration would alter the structure of airspace compared to the No Action alternative. Section 3.3

Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?

No. No significant cumulative impacts would be expected.

E-3: Cultural Resources Quick Look Questions (Section 3.4)

1. Is there an inventory of historic buildings?

Yes. Section 3.4.1.3. YPG ICRMP.

1a. Are the buildings 50 years of age or older?

This question is not answered in the text, but it is not necessary. There are no NRHP-eligible structures on YPG.

1b. Is the building eligible to be on the National Register? *No. Section 3.4.1.3. There are no NRHP-eligible structures on YPG.*

1c. Is the building included in a Programmatic Agreement, Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that would govern work items (repair, replace, modernize, demolish) in the building? *NA*

1d. Is the building a contributing resource in a National Register-eligible or listed Historic District or Cultural Landscape? *NA*

1e. Is the building a National Historic Landmark or located in a National Historic Landmark District?

1f. Is the building located near or in the viewshed of a National Register-eligible or listed Historic Property, Historic District, Cultural Landscape, or archeological site? *NA*

1g. Is the building located on or near a National Register-eligible or listed archeological site? *NA*

1h. Is the building located in or near a National Historic Preservation Act-eligible Native American traditional cultural property site, sacred site (American Indian Religious Freedom Act), or Native American burial area? *NA*

2. Has the area been surveyed for cultural resources?

Yes. Portions of the Proposed Action locations have been surveyed for buildings, archaeology and TCPs. For activities that would be located outside of previously surveyed areas, YPG would

assess the potential for impacts to significant cultural resources prior to implementation of the activity in accordance with the evaluation procedures specified in the ICRMP.

Sections 3.4.1.3. and 3.4.2.3.

3. Are prehistoric sites present?

Yes. Section 3.4.1.3. Surveys have identified 1,924 archaeological sites at YPG (historic and prehistoric).

3a. Have these sites been evaluated for National Register eligibility?

Some have been evaluated. Based on cultural resource surveys conducted to date, several historic districts and thematically related parts of YPG have been identified. These locations contain sites that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. Section 3.4.1.3.

3b. Are any sites eligible for listing on the National Register?

Some. Locations with sites that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP include:

- White Tanks Management Area in the northern part of East Arm, which consists of 46 archaeological sites within a 2,069-ac area.
- Camp Laguna, which consists of the remains of General Patton's IV Armored camp along Laguna Road west of US 95.
- Direct Fire Range near the Muggins Mountains, which consists of 54 sites in 5 distinct locations within a 5,652-ac area.
- Ammunition Storage, Handling, and Testing Facilities, which consist of 20 sites in 4 distinct patterns within a 2,223-ac area.
- Extended Combat Systems Maneuver Area, which consists of 161 sites within a 9,902-ac area in the south-central portion of YPG.
- Red Bluff Range Combat Systems Maneuver Area, which consists of 96 sites within a 5,434-ac area in the south-central portion of YPG.

Other areas could contain potentially eligible sites associated with the Mojave Tanks, Mojave Wash, and Yuma Wash.

Section 3.4.1.3.

3c. Are the sites contributing resources to an eligible or listed District or Cultural Landscape?

Some. See question #3b above. Section 3.4.1.3.

4. Is the project located in or near a Native American cemetery, traditional cultural property, or sacred site?

Yes. White Tanks is considered a TCP by affiliated Native American tribes and it is likely that other notable site complexes (such as Mohave Tanks) or prominent physiographic landmarks

(such as Castle Dome) would be considered TCPs. To date, no ethnographic studies for the identification, distribution, and density of TCPs have been undertaken on YPG.

Section 3.4.1.4.

5. Has the area of the proposed project been surveyed for archeological resources?

Not all areas. Section 3.4.1.3. Surveys have been conducted on approximately 247.5 square miles, which represent approximately 19 percent of the YPG area. An additional 18.4 square miles are scheduled to be surveyed in 2011 and 2012. For activities that would be located outside of previously surveyed areas, YPG would assess the potential for impacts to significant cultural resources prior to implementation of the activity in accordance with the evaluation procedures specified in the ICRMP.

5a. Are there prehistoric or historic sites present in the area?

Yes. Surveys have identified 1,924 archaeological sites at YPG. Most of the identified sites occur on terraces and ridges, followed by sites at water sources and within wash areas..

Section 3.4.1.3.

5b. Have the sites been studied/evaluated?

Some. Section 3.4.1.3.

5c. Is the site 50 years of age or older?

Yes. The sites are associated with prehistoric use. Section 3.4.1.3.

5d. Is the site on or eligible for listing on the or on the National Register?

Some. See question #3b above. Section 3.4.1.3.

5e. Is the site associated with a significant event?

The text does not go into this level of detail and it is not necessary based on the location of the components of the Proposed Action.

5f. Is the site a contributing resource in a National Register-eligible or listed Historic District or Cultural Landscape?

Some. See question #3b above. Section 3.4.1.3.

6. Is the site located in or near a Native American cemetery, traditional cultural property, or sacred site?

Certain activities may occur near sacred or traditional Native American sites. None would occur in them. Section 3.4.1.3.

6a. Is there an MOA in place that applies to the proposed project area?

This question is not answered in the text. However, an MOA for archaeology is identified in the ICRMP. Impacts to areas with known cultural resources would not occur under the Proposed Action.

7. Has the installation identified all federally recognized Indian tribes that are culturally affiliated with the area?

Yes. Tribal representatives have been contacted as part of the outreach for preparation of the PEIS, this is addressed in Section 7.0 and also is addressed in the ICRMP.

8. Has the area of the Proposed Action been surveyed for funerary objects, sacred sites, or objects of cultural patrimony (objects of ongoing historical, traditional, or cultural importance central to the Native American tribal organization)?

Some areas have been surveyed. Section 3.4.1.4. The text does not identify whether any identified sites are sacred or not. There is at least one identified TCP and it is assumed there are others.

Some areas where proposed activities would occur have been surveyed. Activities that would occur in areas where surveys have not been conducted would be subject to site-specific NEPA evaluation and analysis tiered from this PEIS. As part of developing the site-specific NEPA analysis, appropriate surveys, consultation, and mitigation would be implemented prior to undertaking such an activity.

8a. Are the resources mentioned above present in the area of the Proposed Action? Yes. Sections 3.4.1.3 and 3.4.1.4 cover TCPs.

8b. N/A Have the resources been studied and summaries of these collections prepared? Some have been studied, yes, but these previous studies and collections are not mentioned in the text.

Some areas where activities would occur have been surveyed and resources in those areas have been studied and described. Activities that would occur in areas where surveys have not been conducted would be subject to site-specific NEPA evaluation and analysis tiered from this PEIS. As part of developing the site-specific NEPA analysis, appropriate surveys, consultation, and mitigation would be implemented prior to undertaking such an activity. Any resources discovered would be studied and summarized.

8c. Have these summaries been provided to lineal descendants and culturally affiliated Native American tribal organizations that may wish to request repatriation of such objects

Yes, as appropriate.

8d. Will the resources that are found within area of potential effect (APE) require consultation with Native American tribes?

Possibly. Section 3.4.1.1 refers to initial consultation with the tribes. SHPO consultation is mentioned in 3.4.2.4, but has not yet occurred.

Activities that would occur in areas where surveys have not been conducted would be subject to site-specific NEPA analysis tiered from this PEIS. As part of developing the site-specific NEPA analysis, appropriate surveys, consultation, and mitigation would be implemented prior to undertaking such an activity. If resources that warrant tribal consultation are discovered in this process, appropriate tribal consultation would occur.

9. Is it likely that unevaluated resources will be found in the area of Proposed Action?

Yes. However, activities that would be implemented under the Proposed Action in areas that have not yet been evaluated for cultural resources would not be implemented without additional evaluation of the proposed locations. Section 3.4.2.3.

10. Are activities (construction, maintenance, or use of the range) conducted as part of the Proposed Action likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the resource?

No adverse impacts are expected. However, because not all areas have been surveyed, there would be a potential to cause an impact if a survey revealed a resource and relocation of the project in question was not possible.

11. Will the Proposed Action have the likelihood of altering Native American access to any identified sacred sites?

No. No activities are proposed in areas that would cause disruption to access to identified sacred sites.

12. Is the project located in or near an Alaska Native burial ground, traditional cultural property, or sacred site?

No.

13. Would the Proposed Action result in significant impact to any cultural resources?

No adverse impacts are expected. However, because not all areas have been surveyed, there would be a potential to cause an impact if a survey revealed a resource and relocation of the project in question was not possible. Section 3.4.2.3.

14. Does the Proposed Action affect any cultural resources that have not been evaluated for National Register eligibility?

No. See question #13. Section 3.4.2.3.

14a. If YES, do those cultural resources warrant an evaluation, possibly including consultation with other parties?

NA.

15. Are any resources covered by previously existing resource Programmatic Agreements or MOAs?

The proposed activities would not affect any known resources covered by an existing PA or MOA.

16. Are there other potential impacts to cultural resources that individually or collectively could result in significant cumulative effects?

Activities that would occur in areas that have been previously surveyed would not affect cultural resources and would have no potential for cumulative impacts. The inadvertent discovery policy is referenced for appropriate situations, should they arise, and would be implemented should an inadvertent discovery be made.

Activities that would occur in areas where cultural resources surveys have not been conducted would be subject to site-specific NEPA analysis tiered from this PEIS that would address potential cumulative impacts.

As part of developing the site-specific NEPA analysis, appropriate surveys, consultation, and mitigation would be implemented prior to undertaking such an activity.

E-4: Energy Quick Look Questions (Section 3.5)

1. Will the Proposed Action result in more than a marginal increase in demand for regional energy and utility resources?

No. Because much of the proposed new construction would provide new services rather than replacement, a net increase in energy demand would be expected. However, because of the efficient design requirements, the impact on regional utility use would be minor to moderate and within the capacity of the existing infrastructure. Section 3.5

2. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?

No. There are six reasonably foreseeable projects analyzed for cumulative effect that relate to energy and communications. These projects include development of renewable energy sources in the southern part of Kofa through use of an EUL with private business, a 100-megawatt solar-powered electrical generation facility approximately 10 miles north of Quartzite, Arizona in La Paz County, an additional solar power facility proposed at White Rim Ranch (size and location of the project are unknown at this time), construction of a 500 kV transmission line in 2014 by Arizona Public Service, construction of an East Kofa Operations Center (size and location of the project are unknown at this time), and construction of communication towers at various locations along the U.S. and Mexico border.

E-5: Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice Quick Look Questions (Sections 3.6 and 3.14)

1. Has the local region of influence (ROI) undergone any major changes in economic activity or population in the last 10 years?

Yes. The Yuma metropolitan area was the third fastest growing metropolitan area in the country between 1990 and 2000. Section 3.14

1a. Will the Proposed Action contribute to this ongoing trend?

No, YPG is located in an undeveloped portion of Yuma and La Paz counties; there are limited permanent residential areas in proximity to YPG. Martinez Lake, Arizona has a small permanent population. Senator's Wash is a reservoir that is primarily used a recreation area. In addition there are transient campgrounds, RV parks and resorts in nearby communities such as Quartzite. Land uses adjacent to YPG are primarily undeveloped open space and sparsely populated area where the land ownership includes BLM, USFWS, state and private entities, including agricultural interests.

Sections 3.6 and 3.10.1.4, 3.14.

2. Is the community undergoing rapid growth?

Yes. See question #1.Section 3.14

2a. Is the community seeing reduction in growth?

No Section 3.14

2b. Does the Proposed Action add to that trend or does it reduce (mitigate) that trend? No, the Proposed Action does not affect regional growth. Section 3.14

3. Are political stresses evident over the use of community lands or services infrastructure? *No Sections 3.12 and 3.14, Appendix A*

4. Would the Proposed Action result in any significant impacts to any resource areas? *No Sections 3.6 and 3.14*

5. Does the Proposed Action have a disproportionate adverse impact on minority populations?

No Section 3.6
6. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed? *No. No significant socioeconomic impacts are predicted.*

E-6: Fire Management Quick Look Questions (Section 3.7)

1. Would the Proposed Action increase the potential for wildland fire starts?

Yes. Areas cleared for testing and training would provide conditions favorable to the spread of invasive plants which would be more likely to spread wildfire. Sections 3.7 and 3.18

2. Does the Proposed Action involve development of new facilities or firing ranges that could pose a fire risk?

Yes. New impact areas would be created, increasing the area exposed to ignition opportunities (e.g. live fire). Section 3.7

3. Does the Proposed Action increase the level of intensity of military activity in the area?

Yes. The frequency of testing and number locations used for military activities would increase. Section 3.7 and 3.18

4. Does the affected area contain high levels of flammable vegetative "fuels"?

Yes. While native vegetation of the Sonoran Desert is not well-adapted to wildfire, areas on YPG with invasive species present are more susceptible to fire. Section 3.7 and 3.18

5. Has fire management been an issue in the past in the area?

Yes. In early October 2005 a wildfire that originated on YPG burned more than 30,000 ac, including 26,000 ac on Kofa. Section 3.7 and 3.18

6. Will fire risk be significantly increased?

No. Fire risk is not anticipated to increase significantly. YPG is continuing to address the spread of invasive plants though the INRMP and restoration of disturbed areas though the ITAM. These programs should minimize any potential increase in fire risk. Section 3.7 and 3.18

7. Has past activity in this area increased fire risk?

Yes. Disturbances to some areas have contributed to the spread of more combustible invasive vegetation.

Section 3.7

8. Would future development and other activity occur in the area as a result of the Proposed Action that would increase the fire risk?

No. Please see question #6. Section 3.7 **9. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?** *No Section*

E-7: Geology Quick Look Questions (Section 3.8)

1. Are activities proposed that would alter existing geological formations? No, *there are no activities that would alter existing geologic formations.* Section 3.8

2. Do existing geological conditions constrain construction or activities? *No Section 3.8*

Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed? No.

E-8: Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Wastes Quick Look Questions (Section 3.9)

1. Will the Proposed Action occur on an existing installation?

Yes. All components of the Proposed Action will occur within the boundaries of YPG. Section 3.9

2. Are all aspects of the Proposed Action covered by a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plans (SPCCP)?

Yes. A Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan and an Installation Spill Contingency Plan cover all hazardous materials used and stored at YPG. The ISCP and the SPCCP provide information on the storage and handling of petroleum-based products, hazardous substances, and appropriate response actions in the event of fire, explosion, or release of hazardous substances and wastes. The SPCCP includes an inventory of hazardous materials, storage and containment requirements (primary and secondary), and monitoring information.

Section 3.9

3. Have project proponents taken steps to eliminate the use and potential release of hazardous materials?

Yes. Overall, environmental programs at YPG use management actions to minimize use of hazardous substances and reduce resulting waste streams. Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) have been investigated and clean-up removal actions have been conducted. Monitoring is conducted and containment has been installed around the open-burn/open detonation management unit. Renovations of residences and other buildings are gradually eliminating lead-based paint and asbestos containing materials from buildings at YPG.

In addition, the Proposed Action contains components that would reduce the risk of release including construction of new POL storage facilities or improvements to existing POL storage facilities and replacement of portable generators with hard power lines.

Section 3.9

4. Are there any existing regional concerns related to chemical contamination of groundwater or surface water?

Yes. The area experiences naturally high levels of arsenic in groundwater.

There are MCOCs associated with testing and SWMUs are present on YPG. However, contamination is localized and contained within YPG boundaries. There are no regional concerns.

Sections 3.9 and 3.20

5. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?

Yes. However, the only cumulative effects anticipated are associated with expected yet unknown future evolution of testing and training at YPG

E-9: Land Use Quick Look Questions (Section 3.10)

1. Is the Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) for the installation more than five to ten years old and, if so, is the RPMP subject to current updating/modification efforts.

The PEIS is being prepared for implementation of the first RPMP. Section 1.2. and 3.10.

2. Are Land Use Controls utilized within the RPMP?

The PEIS is being prepared for implementation of the first RPMP. Section 1.2. and 3.10

3. Is there extensive useage of on-post lands for recreational (e.g. hunting and/or fishing) purposes?

Yes. YPG is closed to the public and outdoor recreational opportunities are limited. Hunting is the primary recreational activity on YPG. In coordination with AGFD, five recreational hunting areas have been established in portions of YPG where safety constraints were not an issue and where hunting would not interfere with the military mission of the installation.

Section 3.12.1

4. Has a recent (last five to 10 years) Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) been conducted via a collaborative effort between the installation and nearby towns and cities?

No.

5. Is there continuing cooperation and collaboration regarding land usage between the installation and local and regional governmental agencies and other stakeholder groups? Yes. A draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that would include YPG, Yuma County, the Cities of Yuma, San Luis, and Somerton, the Town of Wellton, and MCAS Yuma is under consideration to establish coordination among the parties regarding land use consistency with military facilities.

Section 3.10.2

6. Are there any historical or current conflicts between the installation and various governmental agencies, and/or stakeholder groups relative to on-post or off-post land usage?

No. Land uses adjacent to YPG are primarily undeveloped open space and sparsely populated area where the land ownership includes BLM, USFWS, state and private entities, including agricultural interests.

7. Is there any evidence of current or anticipated encroachment or urban sprawl that might have implications relative to on-post land usage?

No. Land uses adjacent to YPG are primarily undeveloped. Rezoning requests for additional residential development on the south side of YPG are increasing, but zoning for residential development in that area is limited to 1- to 2-ac suburban ranch parcels.

Section 3.10.1.4.

8. Will the proposed action(s) require on-post land use classification changes that exceed plus or minus five percent?

No. The components of the Proposed Action would occur in areas currently designated for those activities.

Section 3.10.2

9. Will the proposed action(s) require land acquisitions and/or disposal of excess lands?

No.

10. Is there an existing sustainability program for the installation, and does it address sustainability considerations in site selections?

No. Although sustainability is factored into development and siting of projects, there is not a formal sustainability program.

Range sustainability on YPG is managed through the ITAM program, which is implemented to maintain conditions that realistically simulate conditions in other desert regions for operational testing and training activities.

11. Does the installation currently have contiguous buffer zones or conservation easements?

No. YPG does not have designated buffer zones. However, due to its size testing and training do not occur near the borders of the post.

E-10: Noise Effects Quick Look Questions (Section 3.11)

1. Will the Proposed Action create noise zones (Zones 1, 2, or 3) that will extend off the installation?

No, there would be no changes to the designated noise zones on YPG, pending the CHPPM noise study scheduled to be completed in fall 2011. Section 3.11

2. Does the Proposed Action increase the level or intensity of military activity?

Yes. The locations where testing and training occur would expand. The amount of testing and training is expected to increase. Section 3.11

3. Does the Proposed Action include the use of noisier equipment (or munitions) than that historically used at the proposed site(s)?

No. The Proposed Action does not specify equipment noisier than what is currently used for testing and training. The frequency and locations of use would increase. Section 3.11

4. Are there any human populations or populations of sensitive animal species within the noise zones?

No. The noise zones are contained within the YPG boundary. Section 3.11

5. Has the adjacent civilian community (nearest the location of the Proposed Action) complained about any noise associated with past or ongoing activities?

Yes. YPG receives complaints about airplane overflight noise. However, all of these issues have all been attributable to aircraft operating from MCSA Yuma rather than aircraft from YPG. Complaints also have been received regarding operation of UASs within established YPG airspace. Because noise from these operations does not exceed the established levels for the designated noise contour, YPG has not altered operations in response to these complaints.

Section 3.11

6. Are there local or regional controversies over noise levels at the installation that would indicate the need for a cumulative effects analysis?

No. Section 3.11

7. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?

No. Although an increase in testing and training activities would occur under the Proposed Action, noise levels outside installation boundaries would not likely increase substantially as a result.

E-11: Recreation Quick Look Questions (Section 3.12)

1. Are activities proposed that would alter or eliminate recreational opportunities?

Yes. The Proposed Action includes components that would convert greenspace to xeriscape areas, resulting in the loss of greenspace and the creation of a different type of passive recreation. Section 3.12

2. Would recreational opportunities be substantially reduced as a result of the Proposed Action?

No Section 3.12

2. Would access to recreational opportunities be substantially reduced or restricted as a result of the Proposed Action? *No* Section 3.12

Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed? No.

E-12: Safety Quick Look Questions (Section 3.13)

1. Are activities proposed that would create off-post safety issues?

No. All components of the Proposed Action would occur within the boundary of YPG Section 3.13

2. Would safety risks to YPG personnel or DoD contractors be substantially increased as a result of the Proposed Action?

No. The types of activities conducted at YPG would not change following implementation of the proposed action. Section 3.13

2. Would new safety procedures need to be developed to address components of the Proposed Action?

No. Existing safety procedures are sufficient. Section 3.13

Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed? No.

E-13: Soils and Desert Pavement Effects Quick Look Questions (Section 3.15)

1. Does the Proposed Action involve a new range or maneuver area, or does it extend beyond the existing boundaries of either?

Yes. The project involves new and expanded impact areas, operational testing, and training areas. These new areas would be located throughout YPG. Section 3.15

2. Are there sensitive downstream land uses, and has sedimentation/pollution been a downstream issue in the past?

No. Downstream land uses are primarily agricultural. Water guality issues in downstream waters are not associated with sedimentation. Section 3.10

3. Will desert pavement be significantly impacted?

Yes. The locations proposed for new and expanded impact areas, operational testing areas and training area contain desert pavement. BMPs would be implemented where practicable and the ITAM followed to reduce impacts.

Section 3.15

4. Would the Proposed Action result in a significant impact to soil resources?

Yes. Construction activities would result in the permanent covering or compacting of soils. Testing and training activities would cause localized disturbances to desert soils. Due to the slow recovery of the desert ecosystem, these disturbances would be long term impacts. The YPG ITAM program and management programs in the INRMP would be used to avoid and minimize impacts where practicable.

Section 3.15

5. Does the Proposed Action fall within an area covered by an existing soil survey? Yes. There is a draft NRCS soil survey for the county.

Section 3.15

6. Would implementation of the Proposed Action jeopardize soil stability and increase erosion potential beyond the construction and stabilization period?

Yes. Testing and training activities would cause ongoing localized disturbances to desert soils. In addition, construction of TGPs would result in periodic clearing and compaction of soils and locations throughout YPG. Due to the slow recovery of the desert ecosystem, these disturbances would be long term impacts. The YPG ITAM program and management programs in the INRMP would be used to avoid and minimize impacts where practicable. Section 3.15

7. Are the proposed sites effectively managed as part of an installation Integrated Training Area Management/Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance (ITAM/LRAM) program?

Yes. Range sustainability on YPG is managed through the ITAM program, which is implemented to maintain conditions that realistically simulate conditions in other desert regions for operational testing and training activities.

Section 3.15

8. Does the proposed Action increase the level of intensity of military activity on military lands?

Yes. The locations for testing and training activities would increase and those activities are predicted to increase in frequency over time. Section 3.15

9. Are there other potential impacts to soil resources that individually or collectively could result in significant cumulative effects?

No. The potential for other actions to interact with the activities of the Proposed Action with regard to impacts to soils would be limited to the potential for increased erosion off-post as a result of Proposed Action activities. Other soils impacts resulting from the Proposed Action would be confined within the boundaries of YPG. Appropriate construction BMPs and post-construction stormwater controls would be implemented to minimize the potential for off-post impacts from increased runoff resulting from Proposed Action activities. Section 3.15

10. Are there proposed sites that are highly eroded and characterized by gullies and/or poor vegetative cover?

No Sections 3.9 and 3.15

11. Are there sensitive soils within the proposed project that would require additional stabilization measures from the Proposed Action beyond standard best management practices (BMPs)?

No. Highly erodible soils are present at YPG. However, additional stabilization measures would not be required. Mitigation measures for those areas would include, but would not be limited to, planning to avoid disturbance of highly erodible soils, construction BMPs to minimize the potential for onsite erosion, construction and post-construction stormwater controls, and continued implementation of the ITAM program and the INRMP. Section 3.15

12 Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?

Yes. Please see Section 3.15 for a discussion of soils impacts at YPG. Cumulative effects to soils beyond the boundaries of YPG are not expected.

E-14: Biological Resources Quick Look Questions (Sections 3.16, 3.18, 3.20, 3.21)

Threatened and Endangered Species

1. Has the installation been surveyed for the presence of federal- or state-listed threatened or endangered species (TES)?

Yes. YPG has been partially surveyed, mainly in areas of previous development. Section 3.16.1

1a. Did the survey reveal the presence of any federal- or state-listed TES?

Yes. . The southwestern bald eagle is occasionally observed on YPG. The American peregrine falcon occurs on YPG as an occasional migrant. The Desert Tortoise (Sonoran population) has been observed in East Arm and in Cibola of YPG. The California leaf-nosed bat is one of the most commonly observed bats on the installation. The desert rosy boa, parish onion, and Kofa Mountain barberry are known to occur in the Kofa NWR adjacent to YPG. The loggerhead shrike is a resident species on YPG. The desert burrowing owl, wild horses and wild burros are known to occur on YPG.

Section 3.16.1

2. Are there any proposed species that may be placed on the TES list in the future? Yes. Yuma and La Paz Counties contain species that are currently listed as candidate species including the Desert Tortoise and Sprague's Pipit. Section 3.16.1

3. If TES have been found, has the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) been consulted? *No. Formal consultation has not been necessary.*

4. Does the installation have an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP)?

Yes Section 3.16, 3.18, and 3.21

5. Does the installation have an Endangered Species Management Plan (ESMP)?

No. TES species are managed under the INRMP.

6. What is the viability, size, and distribution of the TES?

The only federally listed species likely to occur on YPG includes the Sonoran population of desert tortoise. There is a low density population of desert tortoise in the Cibola Region of YPG. Primary habitat for the desert tortoise includes most of Cibola Region, a small portion of Kofa, and the northern portion of the East Arm.

Other sensitive species found on or with potential to occur on YPG include the banded gila monster, California leaf-nosed bat, cave myotis, Kofa mountain barberry, loggerhead shrike,

Mohave fringe-toed lizard, western burrowing owl, and parrish onion. Salvage restricted plants that could occur on YPG include desert barrel cactus, parrish onion, senita, and straw-top cholla. Sensitive species may include BLM sensitive, USFS sensitive or state-protected species.

The banded gila monster is not known to, but likely occurs on YPG. This species prefers washes and rocky hillsides. Size, viability, and distribution of the population is not known.

The California leaf-nosed bat and cave myotis are known to occur on YPG. The pocketed freetailed bat most likely roosts and forages on YPG, but is not confirmed on YPG. These species forage throughout the desert scrub of YPG and roost in caves, crevices, and mines. The size of bat populations on YPG is unknown.

Kofa Mountain Barberry is known to occur in nearby Kofa NWR. This species could occur on YPG and prefers bottoms of deep, shady rocky canyons. Size, viability and distribution of the species is not known.

Loggerhead shrike are commonly seen throughout YPG, particularly perched on fence posts. The size and viability of this species is not known.

A Mohave fringed-toed lizard population occurs only in a sand dune area in the north Cibola Region. The population appears to be stable, though the size is unknown.

Western burrowing-owl are known to occur on YPG. This species would likely occur in grasslands areas of YPG, which is limited. However, the size, viability, and distribution of this species is unknown on YPG.

The parrish onion is known to occur in the Kofa NWR. The size, viability, and distribution of this species on YPG is unknown.

The size, viability, and distribution of salvage restricted plants that could occur on YPG, including the desert barrel cactus, parrish onion, senita, and straw-top cholla, is unknown. Section 3.16

7. What pertinent factors adversely affect the TES?

Direct impacts from removal and disturbances to desert scrub habitat. Direct impacts from incidental mortality of TES due to testing and training activities. Disruption of wildlife habits and reproduction from physical and noise disturbances as a result of testing and training activities. Section 3.16

8. Is the critical habitat within or adjacent to the proposed project site? No

Section 3.16

9. Would the actions involved in construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project affect TES or its habitat?

Yes Section 3.16 10. What are the immediate and long-term threats to any TES and their habitats according the Biological Assessment (BA) and/or ESMP? Not applicable. No BA or ESMP required.

11. Does the USFWS agree, in writing, with the BA and its determination of jeopardy? Not applicable.

Wildlife and Fisheries

13. Would the alternatives result in a significant impact to any wildlife or fish species identified as management priorities by the installation's Ecosystem Management Plan? No fisheries are present on YPG. No significant impacts to wildlife species would be expected. Section 3.16 and 3.21

14. Would the Proposed Action result in a significant loss of vegetation? Yes. The project will result in the removal and disturbances to desert shrub habitat. Section 3.18

15. Has a forest stand or vegetation community map been created for the area? No

16. Are the proposed sites effectively managed as part of an installation Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) program? Yes Section 3.16, 3.18, and 3.21

17. Will the Proposed Action affect salvageable lumber?

No

18. Are the proposed sites characterized by poor vegetative cover or high erosion? Yes. There are some areas with highly erodible soils and some areas with disturbed vegetative cover. Sections 3.15 and 3.18

19. Would a significant amount of rare plant habitat be impacted by the Proposed Action?

No

20. Would the Proposed Action result in the potential introduction or spread of any highly invasive plant species?

Yes. Disturbance to native vegetation as part of the Proposed Action could enable the spread of two invasive plant species.

Section 3.16, 3.18, and 3.21

Wetlands

21. Are TES associated with any of the wetlands resources in the vicinity of potential installation proposed actions?

No, no wetlands occur at or near any of the proposed locations

22. Would the Proposed Action result in significant impact to wetlands?

No, no wetlands are present on YPG

23. Does a wetland delineation exist for the Proposed Action footprint?

No, no wetlands are present on YPG

24. Are future actions by non-military and other military entities expected and would they cause impacts on wetland resources?

Yes, but they would not impact wetland resources because those resources are not present.

Summary

25. Does the Proposed Action involve a new disturbance, or does it extend beyond the existing disturbance boundaries?

Yes, desert shrub habitat would be lost and disturbed. All impacts would occur within the YPG boundary.

Section 3.15 and 3.18

29. Have previous projects in this area affected the same species or habitats that could be affected by the Proposed Action?

Yes. Existing testing and training activities result in disturbance to desert shrub habitat. Section 3.16, 3.18, and 3.21

27. Would the Proposed Action likely result in further construction projects or increased activity in the area in the future that could affect the same species and habitats potentially being affected by the Proposed Action?

Yes. Testing and training would be expected to increase over time. Section 3.16, 3.18, and 3.21

28. Does the Proposed Action involve development that would cause significant loss of preferred habitat for any management priority species?

No Section 3.16, 3.18, and 3.21

29. Does the Proposed Action increase the level of intensity of military activity in the area?

Yes. The frequency and locations for testing and training activities would be expected to increase.

Section 3.16, 3.18, and 3.21

30. Is habitat for a Species of Concern being affected?

Yes. Habitat for the Sonoran population of desert tortoise is located in Cibola Region, a small portion of Kofa, and the northern portion of the East Arm. Section 3.16

31. Are there special interest management areas in the vicinity that could be affected by the Proposed Action?

No. There are special interest management areas (e.g. Kofa NWF). However, impacts would be expected to be limited to the YPG boundary. Section 3.16, 3.18, and 3.21

32. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?

Yes. Cumulative impacts are discussed in Sections 3.16, 3.18, and 3.21.

E-15: Traffic and Transportation Systems Quick Look Questions (Section 3.17)

1. Are transportation data and the transportation plan for the installation more than 5 to 10 years old and, if so, is the plan subject to current updating/modification efforts?

A transportation plan has not been prepared for the installation. Transportation improvements are included in the Master Plan which will be subject to periodic review and updating.

2. Is there a transportation improvement program for the installation and, if so, will current and anticipated traffic concerns be resolved upon completion of the plan?

There is not a transportation improvement program for the installation. Transportation projects identified in the Master Plan will help address security and road access issues (e.g. road flooding). Anticipated improvements to traffic concerns are described in Section 3.17.2.3.

Section 3.17.2.3

3. Has a recent (last 5 to 10 years) regional transportation study been conducted via a collaborative effort between the installation and nearby towns and cities?

No.

4. Are there any historical or current conflicts between the installation and various governmental agencies, and/or stakeholder groups, relative to on-post or off-post traffic-related concerns?

No.

5. Is there any evidence of current or anticipated encroachment or rapid urban development that might have implications relative to the traffic and transportation system?

No.

6. Will the proposed action(s) over the planning horizon cause increases to on-post and/or off-post traffic levels?

No. No change in current traffic volumes would be expected.

Section 3.17.2.3

7. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?

Yes. Some road improvement projects are forecast for US 95 which would result in improvements to traffic flow and safety.

Section 3.17.2

E-17: Water Resources Management Quick Look Questions

1. Is the installation located completely, or partially, in a designated sole source aquifer area, and/or have local surface waters been designated as having water quality concerns relative to compliance with water quality standards or criteria?

Yes. Section 3.20.1.1

There are no sole source aquifers in Arizona (http://www.epa.gov/region2/water/aquifer/). The Lower Colorado and Lower Gila Rivers are listed on the Arizona 2006/2008 303(d) List of Impaired Waters. Approximately 32 miles of the Lower Colorado River above the Mexican border are listed as impaired due to low dissolved oxygen levels and elevated selenium levels. Approximately 28 miles of the Lower Gila River are listed as impaired due to elevated selenium and boron levels. An additional waterway in the Lower Gila River watershed, Painted Rocks Borrow Pit Lake, is listed as impaired due to low dissolved oxygen levels and elevated levels of DDT metabolites, toxaphene, and chlordane in fish.

2. During its construction and/or operational phase, will the Proposed Action exhibit point and/or nonpoint emissions of water pollutants?

Yes. Section 3.20.2.3.

During the construction phase there is a possibility of direct impact from the Aberdeen Road Flood Improvements. A portion of Castle Dome Wash would be disturbed and impacts could include erosion and sedimentation. A small portion of the wash would be lost or converted to artificial substrate.

Indirect adverse impacts could occur due to construction of proposed facilities and field operations, including erosion and sedimentation due to land disturbance.

2a. Will such emissions exceed standards as designated in federal or State water quality regulations or permits?

No. Section 3.20.2.3

Construction of the Aberdeen Road Flood Improvements would require a CWA Section 404 permit from USACE and a CWA Section 401 Water Quality certification from ADEQ. YPG and its construction contractor would comply with all conditions of the CWA Section 404 permit and Section 401 Water Quality certification.

Standard construction BMPs would be coupled with the implementation of a Construction SWPPP to stabilize disturbed soils and minimize the potential for indirect impacts to water resources.

3 Is the installation located in an area where the available surface and/or groundwater supplies are already stressed due to excessive use and/or drought conditions? *Yes. Section 3.20.1.1*

Historically, the Colorado and Gila Rivers were the source of nearly all groundwater in the Yuma basin through direct infiltration from the river channels and from annual flooding when high flows overtopped the river banks. Impoundment of water in upstream reservoirs on the Colorado

River has resulted in loss of sedimentation and scouring of the river channel, lowering the river profile in the Yuma area and causing the Colorado River to act as a drain to the groundwater system. Due to upstream impoundments and consumptive use, the Gila River now flows intermittently, causing it to act as a drain to the groundwater system.

Groundwater quality varies across the Yuma basin, with elevated concentrations of total dissolved solids (TDS), arsenic, lead, agricultural pesticides, nitrate, and VOCs in some areas. Historically, the chemical composition of groundwater was similar to that of water in the Colorado and Gila Rivers. However, groundwater quality has been altered as a result of agricultural practices.

4. Will the additional water requirements for the Proposed Action be large in relation to the available surface and/or groundwater supplies?

No. Section 3.20.1.1

Groundwater supplied by most wells on the installation is non-potable because of high fluoride, sodium chloride, and arsenic levels. Drinking water is delivered by commercial companies or developed from treated groundwater. Separate water distribution systems in Kofa, Laguna, and Cibola obtain water for potable and non-potable uses from groundwater wells.

5. Are there wide variations in the monthly and/or seasonal patterns of water use at the installation?

No. YPG is used year-round for testing and training.

6. Does the proposed action threaten any sensitive receptors of water? (Examples of such receptors include aquatic ecological resources, threatened or endangered plant or animal species, and excessive human health risk levels.)

No. Section 3.21.2.3

Wildlife on YPG tends to be most abundant near sources of water. Artificial water tanks have been placed to encourage wildlife to relocate away from areas where testing and training activities regularly occur. Proposed activities would not be conducted in proximity to artificial water sources, which would reduce the potential for impacts to wildlife.

Adherence to stormwater construction permits and established BMPs would be sufficient to prevent the likelihood of contamination.

7. Within the last 5 years, has the installation been subject to Notices of Violations (NOVs) or fines relative to Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) or Clean Water Act (CWA) permit requirements? Are there any concerns that federal and State source-oriented permits may not be up to date, and are there any specified conditions not being met?

Yes. Section 3.20.1. In 2007 the drinking water from three systems on YPG was found to be in violation of the new arsenic standard, which resulted in a notice of violation issued by ADEQ and USEPA.

No. To meet current federal standards for public drinking water supply, YPG has constructed two new water treatment facilities.

8. Does the installation drain to an impaired waterbody?

Yes. Section 3.20.1.1

Groundwater and surface water from YPG flows in a general southerly direction to the Colorado River and Gila River, described in question #1 above.

9. Would the Proposed Action result in an adverse impact to surface water?

Yes. Section 3.20.2.3.

During the construction phase there is a possibility of direct impact from the Aberdeen Road Flood Improvements. A portion of Castle Dome Wash would be disturbed and impacts could include erosion and sedimentation. A small portion of the stream would be lost or converted to artificial substrate. However, potential impacts to water quality would be minimal with the implementation and enforcement of SWPPP and standard construction BMP standards.

10. Does the Proposed Action involve development within a floodplain?

No. Section 3.20.2. There are no designated floodplains on YPG.

10a. Are there any practicable alternatives available to constructing within a floodplain?

NA

11. Are there seasonally flooded areas within the footprint?

NA

12. Are streams, lakes, or ponds present within the footprint?

Yes. Section 3.20.2.3. A portion of Castle Dome Wash would be disturbed from the Aberdeen Road Flood Improvements. No other streams, lakes, or ponds are present within the footprint.

13. Does the Proposed Action increase the level of intensity of military activity on military lands?

Yes. The locations for testing and training activities would increase and the activities are predicted to increase in frequency over time..

14. Could the Proposed Action lead to further projects or activity in the area that could negatively affect surface water?

No. None are known or reasonably foreseeable.

15. Does the Proposed Action involve clearing vegetation within 75 feet of open water?

No

16. Have negative impacts to surface water been an issue in the past?

No. However, YPG is aware of the potential for stormwater transport of contaminants (e.g., MCOCs) to washes and downstream receiving waters and has implemented SWPPPs and BMPs to reduce the probability of such occurrences. Section 3.9.2.3.

17. Are there other potential impacts to surface water that individually or collectively could result in significant cumulative effects?

No. Because potential direct effects to water resources would be confined within the boundaries of YPG and because BMPs and design features would minimize the potential for indirect impacts to offsite waters, there is little potential for interaction of the Proposed Action with other projects. No cumulative impacts would be expected on YPG.

18. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?

No. There is little potential for interaction of the Proposed Action with other projects

E-18: Subsistence Resources Quick Look Questions (Section 3.1)

1. Would the Proposed Action adversely impact to the availability of any subsistence resources?

No

Subsistence resources do not occur on YPG. No subsistence activities (hunting, fishing, gathering of wild materials) occur on YPG. This resource area is not evaluated in the document.

2. Is the area considered to be important for subsistence access or resource sustainability?

No

3. Does the Proposed Action reduce the land available or change the timing or availability for subsistence activities?

N/A

4. Have past activities in the area had negative impacts on subsistence resources?

N/A

5. Could the Proposed Action lead to further projects in the area that could negatively impact subsistence resources?

No

6. Is additional cumulative effects analysis needed?

No

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix D Air Emissions Calculations This page intentionally left blank.

General Conformity – Record of Non-Applicability

Project/Action Name: Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission Activities and Operations - Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona

Project/Action Identification Number:

Project/Action Point of Contact:

Begin Date: January 2014

End Date: October 2015

General Conformity under the Clean Air Act, Section 176 has been evaluated for the project described above according to the requirements of 40 CFR 93, Subpart B. The requirements of this rule are not applicable to this action because total direct and indirect PM_{10} emissions are below the conformity threshold values established at 40 CFR 93.153 (b) and this action is not considered regionally significant under 40 CFR 93.153(i).

Supporting documentation and emission estimates are attached.

SIGNED _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	PROPOSED ACTION	
2.0	CALCULATION OF EMISSIONS FROM NEW CON	STRUCTION4
	2.1 Construction-Related Emissions	4
3.0	CONCLUSION	6

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Model Results

GENERAL CONFORMITY REVIEW (GCR)

Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Mission Activities and Operations at Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona

1.0 PROPOSED ACTION

From January 2014 through October 2015, the U.S. Army proposes to construct several new buildings and make facility renovations on Yuma Proving Ground.

The new facilities and facility renovations are needed to support the current and future mission of Yuma Proving ground. The new facilities include the following:

- Seven Operational Buildings,
- Six Warehouses, and
- Four Administrative Buildings

Two pre-existing buildings will be demolished, and no new significant stationary sources will be added to the site during the project. The general conformity review for this project pertains only to construction-related emissions and facility space heating. The PM10 emissions are the pollutant of interest.

2.0 CALCULATION OF EMISSIONS FROM NEW CONSTRUCTION

The emissions associated with the proposed action are construction-related. There will no mobile emissions associated with new government owned vehicles (GOVs) and privately owned vehicles (POVs) due to the proposed actions.

2.1 Construction-Related Emissions

The proposed projects are listed in Table 2-1. The Table includes the gross area of the proposed facility and the area to be graded.

TABLE 2-1 Proposed Actions and Proposed Facility Area and Grading Area Yuma Proving Ground Yuma, Arizona					
ld	Project	Gross Construction Area (ft ²)	Gross Area to be Graded (ft ²)		
L002	Realign Barranca Road	146,797	84,902		
	Construct Runway Extension	119,790	500,000		
L009	Construct YTC Warehouse	7,750	7,750		
L010	Construct Instrument Development Facility	32,500	32,500		
L011	Tracked Vehicle Trail Office	8,100	8,100		
L029	Construct optical maintenance facility	7,500			
	Graded parking area with power pole farm		90,342		
	Perimeter fencing centered at YTC.		2,400		
L031	Construct MFFS Dining Facility (3 Location Options)	48,979	48,979		
L032	Expand Bravo LTA – No Emissions				
L034	Construct MFFS Ready Room (3 Location Options	48,979	48,979		
L037	Construct vehicle test course		792,795		
L040	Construct drop zone near LAAF (DZ) (984-foot [ft] x 1,969-ft)		196,021		
L102	Construct MFFs Terminal	28,000	28,000		
	Construct Rigger Facility	15,500	15,500		
	Construct UAS Airfield, hangars, taxiway, and UAS flight test area	599,250	599,250		
	Construct CASA Transport Aircraft Hangar	153,858	153,848		
L106	Construct 4 Administrative Buildings	44,465	44,465		
	Construct Installation Logistics Complex	76,833			
	Total	1,338,301	2,653,841		
			60.9 Acres		

The U.S. Air Force Air Conformity Application Model (ACAM), version 4.5, was used to estimate construction-related emissions and facility space heating emissions. It is assume that all construction activities start at the same time. For construction related-emissions, ACAM splits facility construction into two phases; Phase 1 is grading and Phase 2 is the actual construction activity. The following data were input into the model:

- Gross Sq ft 1,338,301 sq ft
- Duration of Phase 1 45 days
- Gross Area to be Graded 2,653,841 sq ft (60.9 acres)
- Soil Piles covered or watered twice daily
- Loads Secure Cover
- Exposed Surface/Grading watered twice daily
- Truck Hauling Road paved
- Start Date of Construction January 2014
- End Date of Construction October 2015
- Duration of Phase 2 400 days

The model calculates emissions for the following activities:

- Grading Equipment Emissions (pounds/day, assume 1 grader, 1 rubber tired dozer, 1 tractor/loader/backhoe, and 1 water truck)
- Emissions Due to Construction Worker Trips (based on 0.42 trip per 1,000 sq ft-day)
- Construction Equipment Emissions (based on sq ft to be constructed during Phase 2, assume 1 crane, 1 tractor/loader/backhoe, 1 forklift).
- Grading Operations Emissions (pounds/day, assume 55 lb/acre-day, uncontrolled)
- Facility Heating (based on regional heating energy requirements and emission factors for natural gas)

Based on ACAM, an increase of 32.4 tons of PM_{10} would be expected due to construction related activities (see Attachment 1) in 2014, the highest year during construction. PM_{10} emissions are expected to be 0.18 tons during the second year of construction.

3.0 CONCLUSION

It is assumed that all of the proposed would start at the same time. Total annual emissions generated by the proposed actions are expected to peak with the release of 32.4 tons of PM_{10} due to construction-related emissions in 2014, as well as an ongoing increase of 0.36 ton/year of PM_{10} after the proposed facilities become operational. These increases are well below the conformity threshold values. Therefore, a general conformity review is deemed unnecessary at this time.

Attachment D-1 Model Results

Attachment 1 - ACAM Output

SOURCE CATEGORY	CO	NOx	SO ₂	VOC	PM ₁₀
Emissions (tpy)					
2014					
Area Sources					
Other Phase I Const. – Grading Operations	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	31.7
Other Phase II Const. – Mobile/Stationary Construction Equipment	3.32	0.34	0.0034	0.16	0.017
Other Phase II Const. – Workers Trips	1.43	0.062	0.00	0.064	0.00
Other Phase I Const. – Grading Equipment		0.14	0.0014	0.067	0.0072
Building Demolition Emissions		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.65
Total	6.18	0.54	0.0048	0.29	32.4
2015		-	-		
Area Sources					
Other Phase I Const. – Grading Operations	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Phase II Const. – Mobile/Stationary Construction Equipment	3.32	0.34	0.0034	0.16	0.017
Other Phase II Const. – Workers Trips	1.43	0.062	0.00	0.064	0.00
Other Phase I Const. – Grading Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Building Demolition Emissions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	4.75	0.40	0.0034	0.22	0.017
Point Sources					
Miscellaneous Point Sources	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Commercial/Retail and Office/Employment Heating Emissions	1.79	4.06	0.013	0.12	0.16
Residential Space Heating	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	1.79	4.06	0.013	0.12	0.16
Grand Total	6.54	4.46	0.016	0.34	0.18
2016					
Area Sources					
Other Phase I Const. – Grading Operations	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Phase II Const. – Mobile/Stationary Construction Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Phase II Const. – Workers Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Phase I Const. – Grading Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Building Demolition Emissions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Point Sources					
Miscellaneous Point Sources	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Commercial/Retail and Office/Employment Heating Emissions		8.98	0.029	0.26	0.36
Residential Space Heating	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	3.97	8.98	0.029	0.26	0.36
Grand Total	3.97	8.98	0.029	0.26	0.36

ld	Project	Gross Construction	Gross Area to
		Area (ft ²)	be Graded (ft ²)
L002	Realign Barranca Road	146,797	84,902
	Construct Runway Extension	119,790	500,000
L009	Construct YTC Warehouse	7,750	7,750
L010	Construct Instrument Development Facility	32,500	32,500
L011	Tracked Vehicle Trail Office	8,100	8,100
L029	Construct Optional Maintenance Facility	7,500	
	Graded Parking Area with Power Pole Farm		90,342
	Perimeter Fencing Centered at YTC		2,400
L031	Construction MFFS Dining Facility (3		
	Location Options)	48,979	48,979
L032	Expand Bravo LTA - No Emissions		
L034	Construct MFFS Ready Room (3 Location		
	Options)	48,979	48,979
L037	Construct Vehicle Test Course		792,795
	Construct drop zone near LAAF (DZ) (984-		
L040	foot [ft] x 1,969-ft)		196,021
L102	Construct MFFS Terminal	28,000	28,000
	Construct Rigger Facility	15,500	15,500
	Construct UAS Airfield, hangars, taxiway,		
	and UAS flight test area	599,250	599,250
	Construct CASA Transport Aircraft Hangar	153,858	153,858
L106	Construct 4 Administrative Buildings	44,465	44,465
	Construct Installation Logistics Complex	76,833	
		1,338,301	2,653,841
			60.9 Acres
Construction Worker Trip (POVs) Emissions

Equation

Commercial/Retail (trips/day) = 0.32 (trips/1000 SF/day) x Area of Commercial/Retail Units (1000 SF)

Trips/day =	428.3		
Number of Days =	400		
Pollutant	grams/trip	lbs/day	Tons 1st Yr
CO	15.184	14.34	1.43
NOX	0.661	0.62	0.062
VOC	0.678	0.64	0.064
SO2	0.0005	0.00047	4.72E-05
PM10	0.0047	0.0044	4.44E-04

Mobile and Stationary Construction Equipment Emissions

Equation

Construction Equipment Emissions Phase 1 (lbs/day) = Total Building Square Feet(sq. ft.) / 435600 × [Emission Rate (lbs/day) for a Grader for the specific year + Emission Rate (lbs/day) for a Rubber Tired Dozers for the specific year + Emission Rate (lbs/day) for a Tractor/Loader/Backhoe for the specific year + Emission Rate (lbs/day) for a Water Truck for the specific year]

Construction Equipment Emissions Phase 2 (lbs/day) = Total Building Square Feet(sq. ft.) / 435600 × [Emission Rate (lbs/day) for a Crane for the specific year + Emission Rate (lbs/day) for a Tractor/Loader/Backhoe for the specific year + (Emission Rate (lbs/day) for a Forklift for the specific year x 2)]

Emission Factors

	СО	NOx	VOC	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Horsepower	(g/hp-hr)	(g/hp-hr)	(g/hp-hr)	(g/hp-hr)	(g/hp-hr)	(g/hp-hr)
75 ≤ hp < 175	3.70	0.30	0.14	0.0030	0.015	0.014
175 ≤ hp < 600	2.60	0.30	0.14	0.0030	0.015	0.014

Phase 1

Type of Unit	Rated HP	# of Units	hr/day	Load Factor		Emission Factor (g/hp-hr)					Emissions (lb/day)					
	(hp)				СО	NOx	VOC	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	СО	NOx	VOC	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Grader	174	1	6	0.61	3.70	0.30	0.14	0.0030	0.015		15.96	1.29	0.60	0.0129	0.065	0.000
Dozer Tractor/Loader/	357	1	6	0.59	2.60	0.30	0.14	0.0030	0.015	0.014	22.3	2.57	1.20	0.026	0.128	0.120
Backhoe	108	1	8	0.55	3.70	0.30	0.14	0.0030	0.015	0.014	11.91	0.97	0.45	0.0097	0.048	0.045
Water Truck	189	1	8	0.50	2.60	0.30	0.14	0.0030	0.015	0.014	13.32	1.54	0.72	0.015	0.077	0.072
TOTAL EMISSIONS											63.4	6.36	2.97	0.064	0.32	0.24
										Tons	1.43	0.14	0.067	0.0014	0.0072	0.0053

Phase 2

Type of Unit	Rated HP	# of Units	hr/day	Load Factor		Emission Factor (g/hp-hr)							Emission	s (lb/day)		
	(hp)				СО	NOx	VOC	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO	NOx	VOC	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Crane Tractor/Loader/	399	1	4	0.43	2.60	0.30	0.14	0.0030	0.015	0.014	12.09	1.39	0.65	0.0139	0.070	0.065
Backhoe	108	1	8	0.55	3.70	0.30	0.14	0.0030	0.015	0.014	11.91	0.97	0.45	0.0097	0.048	0.045
Forklift	145	2	6	0.30	2.60	0.30	0.14	0.0030	0.015	0.014	9.19	1.06	0.50	0.0106	0.053	0.050
TOTAL EMISSIONS								33.2	3.42	1.60	0.034	0.171	0.160			
									Tons	for 1st Year	3.32	0.34	0.16	0.0034	0.017	0.016

 Days Phase 1
 45

 Days Phase 2
 400

Grading Operation Emissions

Equation

PM10G (tons/yr) = 55.00 x ACRES x DPYI / 2000
ACRES = Number of gross acres to be graded during Phase 1 (but not more than 50 acres).
DPYI = Number of days per year during Phase 1, which is the grading phase.
55.00 = Emission factor in pounds per acre per day.
2000 = Conversion factor from pounds to tons.

Grading Dust Reductions

PM10GR (tons/yr)(reduced) = PM10G - (PMRED1 + PMRED2 + PMRED3 + PMRED4)

Is all exposed soil watered twice daily? PMRED1 (tons/yr) = PM10G x 0.37

Are all unpaved haul roads watered twice daily? PMRED2 (tons/yr) = PM10G x 0.03

Are soil piles enclosed, covered, or watered twice daily? PMRED3 (tons/yr) = PM10G x 0.16

Are covers securely applied to all haul/dump trucks moving soils/aggregate? PMRED4 (tons/yr) = PM10G x 0.02

PM10G (tons/yr)	75.4
PMRED1 (tons/yr)	27.9
PMRED2 (tons/yr)	2.26
PMRED3 (tons/yr)	12.1
PMRED4 (tons/yr)	1.51
Total	31.7

Building Demolition Emissions

Equation

E (tons/yr) = 0.00042 x J x Q / 2000

 $J = (N \times O \times P)$

J = Building volume handled per day.

N = Width of building in feet.

O = Length of building in feet.

P = Height of building in feet.

Q = Number of operating days required to demolish a building (user inputs calendar days that are converted to operating days).

Project	Length (ft)	Width (ft)	height (ft)	PM10 (tons)
L106	200	250	35	0.37
			Total	0.37

Commercial/Retail Heating Emissions

Equation

Ep = F x (1 – CENHEAT) x FACBTU x Efp x sum of gross area/2000

F = Fraction of the year the building operate. Assume 1

CENHEAT = Fraction of facility heating provided by central heating plant (MMBtu basis). Assume 0

FACBTU = Heating energy requirement, MMBtu/square feet. Refer to Appendix K for energy requirements by region and building activity type. (0.072 million Btu/ft²)

EFp = Emission factor for pollutant, p, for natural gas heating (lb/MMBtu). The factors

are as follows: CO = 0.0824, NOX = 0.1863, VOC = 0.0054, SO2 = 0.0006 and PM10 = 0.0075.

	NOX	VOC	SO2	PM10	со	NOX	VOC	SO2	PM10
sq ft Ib/MMBtu	lb/MMBtu	lb/MMBtu	lb/MMBtu	lb/MMBtu	tons	tons	tons	tons	tons
1,338,301 0.0824	0.1863	0.0054	0.0006	0.0075	3.97	8.98	0.26	0.029	0.36

2015 1.79 4.06 0.118 0.0131 0.16

Appendix E Programmatic Agreement

The Programmatic Agreement will be added to the Final PEIS.

Appendix F Noise Contour Figures from the Installation Operational Noise Management Plan



Figure 4-1 YPG Small Caliber Noise Contour (.50 Caliber including Air-to-Ground)



Figure 4-2 YPG Large Caliber Noise Contour (Data provided)



Figure 4-3 YPG Large Caliber Noise Contour Off Post (Detailed Kofa area)



Figure 4-4 YPG Large Caliber Noise Contour Off Post (Detailed Cibola area)



Figure 4-5 YPG Large Caliber Noise Contour (Double Yearly Operations)



Figure 4-6 YPG Large Caliber Risk of Complaints Area



Figure 4-7 YPG Large Caliber Risk of Complaints Area (Detailed Laguna Test Area)



Figure 4-8 YPG Large Caliber Risk of Complaints Area (Detailed Martinez Lake Area)



Figure 4-9 YPG Large Caliber Risk of Complaints Area (Detailed Northern Cibola Area)



Appendix G Sensitive Species Tracked by State of Arizona with Potential to Occur in Yuma and La Paz Counties

Table G-1

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat and Potential of Occurrence
Arizona Chuckwalla a	Sauromalus ater (Arizona Population)	SC, BLM-S,	Near cliffs, boulders, rocky slopes, rocky desert, lava flows, hillsides, and outcrops with creosote. Occurs nearby along north side of Gila River near Muggins Peak, but nearby populations limited to the Colorado and Gila rivers. Species would not be impacted by the proposed action and is not further discussed.
Arizona Toad ^b	Anaxyrus microscaphus	SC, BLM-S, USFS-S	Rocky streams and canyons in the pine-oak belt and lower deserts with upland desert and evergreen woodland vegetation. Not known to occur and unlikely to occur within the Proposed Action area. Nearest location is the Bill Williams River in LaPaz County. Species is unlikely to be impacted and is not further discussed.
Bald Eagle ^c (Winter Population)	Haliaeetus leucocephalus (wintering pop.)	SC, BLM-S, USFS- S, WSC	Large trees or cliffs near water (reservoirs, rivers, and streams) with abundant prey. Known to occur along Colorado and Gila rivers. Could incidentally occur on YPG, but would not occur within the Proposed Action Area. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.
Banded Gila Monster ^a	Heloderma suspectum cinctum	SC	Primarily Sonoran Desert and extreme western edge of Mohave Desert in undulating rocky foothills, bajadas, and canyons. Known to occur nearby in the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge and south of Gila River. Species is discussed.
Blue Sand Lily ^d	Triteleiopsis palmeri	BLM-S, SR	Sandy areas (dunes) in low desert. Nearest occurrence is in Yuma County south of the Gila River and east of the City of Yuma. Species is unlikely to be impacted and is not further discussed.
Cactus Ferruginous Pygmy-owl [°]	Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum	SC, BLM-S, USFS- S, WSC	Along streams with cottonwoods and willows adjacent to mesquite bisques, generally with saguaros nearby. Sometimes along dry washes with large mesquite, paloverde, ironwood, and saguaro. Nearest known occurrence is in south central Yuma County near the Mexico border. Not known to occur and unlikely to occur within the Proposed Action area. Species is unlikely to be impacted and is not further discussed.
California Black Rail ^c	Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus	SC, BLM-S, WSC	Mainly tidal salt marshes and also brackish and fresh-water marshes. Known to occur nearby along the Colorado River in Yuma County. Could incidentally occur on YPG, but would not occur within the Proposed Action Area. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.

Table G-1

Tallia Treving Creation	4		
Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat and Potential of Occurrence
California Fan Palm e	Washingtonia filifera	SR	Desert oases in Sonoran and Mojave deserts at elevations between 500 and 1,000 feet. Suitable habitat is not present on YPG and species would not occur, Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.
California Leaf- nosed Bat ^f	Macrotus californicus	SC, BLM-S, USFS- S, WSC	Sonoran desert scrub in summer and winter. Roosts in mines, caves, and rock shelters. Species occurs on YPG and is discussed.
Cave Myotis ^f	Myotis velifer	SC	Desert scrub of creosote, brittlebush, palo verde, and cacti. Roosts in caves, tunnels, and mineshafts, and sometimes bridges and buildings. Species occurs on YPG and is discussed.
Clark's Grebe ^c	Aechmophorus clarkii	BLM-S, USFS-S, WSC	YPG is not within the range of this species. Nearest known occurrence is at the border of LaPaz and Mojave counties. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.
Clustered Barrel Cactus ^d	Echinocactus polycephalus var. polycephalus	SR	Rocky flats, washes, bajadas, rock ledges, and rocky, gravely slopes in the driest parts of the Sonoran and Mojave deserts. Known to occur south of the Gila River in Yuma County. Species is unlikely to occur on YPG. Species is unlikely to be impacted and not further discussed.
Desert Barrel Cactus ^d	Ferocactus cylindraceus	SR	Gravelly or rocky hillsides, canyon walls, alluvial fans, and wash margins in the Mohave and Sonoran deserts, on igneous and limestone substrates. YPG is within the range of the species and suitable habitat is present. Species is discussed.
Desert Rosy Boa ^a	Lichanura trivirgata gracia	SC, BLM-S	Rocky areas with desert scrub in desert ranges, especially in canyons with permanent or intermittent streams with cotton-wood or pine- oak riparian communities. Known to occur near the border of YPG in the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. Species is discussed
Dune Spurge ^d	Euphorbia platysperma	SC	Sandy soils in dune habitats. Not known to occur on or near YPG. Nearest known occurrence is along the Mexico border in southwest Yuma County. Species is unlikely to occur on YPG. Species is unlikely to be impacted and not further discussed.
Dune Sunflower ^d	Helianthus niveus ssp. tephrodes	SC	Sand dunes or sandy flats of the Algodone Dunes. Not known to occur on YPG, but does occur nearby in the City of Yuma area. Species is unlikely occur on YPG. Species is unlikely to be impacted and is not further discussed.

Table G-1

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat and Potential of Occurrence
Gander's Cryptantha ^d	Cryptantha ganderi	SC	Sandy soil in desert dunes and Sonoran desert scrub. Nearest known occurrence is in southeast Yuma County on the Mexico border. Unlikely to occur on YPG. Species is unlikely to be impacted and not further discussed.
Great Egret ^c	Ardea alba	BLM-S, WSC	Marshes, swampy woods, tidal estuaries, lagoons, streams, lakes, rivers and ponds; also in fields and meadows. Known to occur along the Colorado River. Could incidentally occur on YPG, but would not occur within the Proposed Action Area. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.
Greater Western Bonneted Bat ^f	Eumops perotis californicus	SC, BLM-S, USFS-S	Lower and upper Sonoran desert scrub near cliffs, preferring rugged rocky canyons with abundant crevices. Not known to occur on YPG. Nearby occurrences include the Colorado River in LaPaz County and near the south Yuma County border. Could incidentally occur on YPG, but would not occur within the Proposed Action Area. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.
Kearney Sumac ^d	Rhus kearneyi	BLM-S, SR	Arid slopes, along canyons and drainages. Nearest known occurrence is in Yuma County south of Gila River and east of the City of Yuma. Unlikely to occur on YPG. Species is unlikely to be impacted and is not further discussed.
Kofa Mt Barberry ^d	Berberis harrisoniana	BLM-S	Bottoms of deep, shady, rocky canyons. Known to occur nearby in the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. Extensive surveys have been conducted on YPG and none has been found. Species is unlikely to be impacted and is briefly discussed.
Least Bittern ^c	lxobrychus exilis	BLM-S, WSC	Freshwater and brackish marshes with aquatic vegetation. Known to occur in the nearby Colorado River of Yuma and LaPaz County. Could incidentally occur on YPG, but would not occur within the Proposed Action Area. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.
Loggerhead Shrike	Lanius Iudovicianus	SC	Open country with scattered trees and shrubs, savanna, desert scrub, and occasionally open woodland. Often observed on poles, wires, or fence posts. Resident species on YPG and commonly winters in the Lower Sonoran Zone. Species is discussed.

Table G-1

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat and Potential of Occurrence
Lowland Leopard Frog ^b	Rana yavapaiensis	SC, BLM-S, USFS- S, WSC	Aquatic systems in desert grasslands to pinyon- juniper. Absent from the Colorado River watershed. Not known to occur and unlikely to occur within the Proposed Action area. Species is unlikely to be impacted and is not further discussed.
Mohave Fringe- toed Lizard ^a	Uma scoparia	BLM-S, WSC	Fine, windblown sands and dunes, flats, riverbanks, and washes of very arid desert with low growing vegetation. Generally within creosote scrub desert habitat. Occurs on YPG, but limited to sand dune complex in northwest Cibola Region. Speices is discussed.
Pale Townsend's Big-eared Bat ^f	Corynorhinus townsendii pallescens	SC, BLM-S, USFS-S	Day roosts include caves and mines from desert scrub up to woodlands and coniferous forests. Night roosts in abandoned buildings often. Hibernate in winter in cold caves, lava tubes, and mines mostly in uplands and mountains. Known to occur on YPG near the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. Species is discussed.
Parish Onion ^d	Allium parishii	BLM-S, SR	Open rocky and sandy slopes in the Mojave Desert and desert mountain ranges. Known to occur near YPG in the Kofa National Wildlife Refuge. Species could occur on YPG and is discussed.
Pocketed Free- tailed Bat ^f	Nyctinomops femorosaccus	USFS-S	Desert scrub and arid lowland habitats in southern Arizona, roosting in crevices high on cliff faces in rugged canyons. Known to occur in the YPG area and could occur on YPG. Species is discussed.
Sand Food ^d	Pholisma sonorae	SC, BLM-S, HS	Drifting sandy soil and other sandy areas in low desert. Nearest known occurrence is in south Yuma County near the Mexico border in the Yuma Desert. Unlikely to occur on YPG. Species unlikely to be impacted and is not further discussed.
Scaly Sandplant ^d	Pholisma arenarium	BLM-S, HS	Not known to occur on or near YPG. Nearest known location is in north LaPaz County north of I-10. This species would not be impacted by and is not further discussed.
Schott Wire Lettuce	Stephanomeria schottii	BLM-S	Semi-stabilized sand dunes with creosote, white bursage, big galleta grass, and other wildflowers. Not known to occur on YPG. Nearest known occurrence is south of Gila River and east of the City of Yuma area. Unlikely to occur on YPG due to lack of habitat. Species is unlikely to be impacted and is not further discussed.

Table G-1

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat and Potential of Occurrence
Senita ^d	Lophocereus schottii	SR	Occurs around washes on sandy and gravelly soils. Suitable habitat is present on YPG Species is not discussed.
Snowy Egret ^c	Egretta thula	BLM-S	Marshes, lakes, ponds, lagoons, mangroves, and shallow coastal habitats. Known to occur along the Colorado River drainage in south Yuma County. Could incidentally occur on YPG, but would not occur within the Proposed Action Area. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.
Spotted Bat ^f	Euderma maculatum	SC, BLM-S, USFS- S, WSC	Varied but most often in dry, rough desert scrub, from low to high desert, and riparian habitats. Known to occur nearby in central Yuma County just below the Gila River. Could occur on YPG. Species is discussed.
Straw-top Cholla ^d	Opuntia echinocarpa	SR	Driest parts of Sonoran and Mohave deserts, often in creosote bush scrub habitats. Suitable habitat is present at YPG. Species is discussed.
Varied Fishhook Cactus ^h	Mammillaria viridiflora	SR	Grows under grasses or brushes in sandy granitic soils of high hills and mountainsides in oak woodland and at edge of forest. Species could occur on YPG, but would be unlikely. Species would not be impacted by proposed action.
Western Burrowing Owl ^c	Athene cunicularia hypugaea	SC, BLM-S, USFS-S	Open, well-drained grasslands, steppes, deserts, prairies, and agricultural lands. Known to occur on YPG, along the lower Colorado River Valley and Gila River Valley,and the area around the City of Yuma. Species is discussed.
Western Red Bat ^f	Lasiurus blossevillii	BLM-S, USFS-S, WSC	Not known to occur on or nearby YPG. Nearest known location along Bill Williams River in LaPaz County. Species would not be impacted by proposed action and is not further discussed.
Western Yellow Bat	Lasiurus xanthinus	BLM-S, USFS-S, WSC	May roost in leafy vegetation, including palm trees. Low-to-mid elevation riparian communities with broad-leaved deciduous trees. Observed once on YPG in the Muggins Mountains. Could incidentally occur on YPG, but would not occur within the Proposed Action Area. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.
White-faced Ibis ^c	Plegadis chihi	SC, USFS-S	Freshwater marshes, swamps, ponds, and rivers. Known to occur nearby along the Colorado River in south LaPaz County. Could incidentally occur on YPG, but would not occur within the Proposed Action Area. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.

Table G-1

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat and Potential of Occurrence
Yuma Desert Fringe-toed Lizard ^a	Uma rufopunctata	SC, BLM-S, WSC	Sparsely vegetated fine, windblown sand dunes, flats, riverbanks and washes of very arid desert. Nearest known occurrence is south of the Gila River in central Yuma County and in the City of Yuma area, mainly associated with Yuma dune system. Unlikely species would occur on YPG. Species is unlikely to be impacted and is not further discussed.
Yuma Hispid Cotton Rat ^f	Sigmodon hispidus eremicus	SC	Dense grassy areas, fields, brushy or weedy areas with cattails along Colorado River, streams, ponds, irrigated fields, and desert scrub. Known to occur nearby YPG along the Colorado River in Yuma County. Unlikely species would occur on YPG due to lack of suitable habitat. Species is unlikely to be impacted and not further discussed.
Yuma Myotis ^f	Myotis yumanensis	SC	Wide variety of upland and lowland habitats, including riparian, desert scrub, moist woodlands, and forests. Prefer cliffs and rocky walls near water. Not known to occur on YPG, but does occur nearby along the Colorado River in Yuma County. Could incidentally occur on YPG, but would not occur within the Proposed Action Area. Species would not be impacted and is not further discussed.

ⁱNotes: SC – Federal Species of Concern, LE (XN) – Federally Endangered (Experimental Nonessential Population), BLM-S – Bureau of Land Management Sensitive, USFS-S U.S. Forest Service Senstive, Sources: Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), 2010c; ^aAGFD, 2011e; ^bAGFD, 2011e; ^cAGFD, 2011d; ^dAGFD, 2011c; ^eTetra Tech, 2009; ^fAGFD, 2011b; ^gAGFD, 2011f; ^hNatureserver, 2011