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1.0 INTRODUCTION

On November 6, 1998, the U.S. Department of the Army (DA) issued the Draft McGregor Range, New Mexico Land Withdrawal Renewal Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (LEIS) (also referred to as the Draft McGregor Range LEIS) for review by the states of New Mexico and Texas, Indian tribes, local governments, other federal agencies, private organizations, and the general public. As with the scoping meetings, hearing notification letters were sent in English and Spanish. The formal comment period lasted 95 days, ending on February 9, 1999.

As part of the comment process, the Army held public hearings in Alamogordo and Las Cruces, New Mexico, and El Paso, Texas, to discuss the Draft McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Renewal LEIS. Nearly 70 people attended the hearing in Alamogordo; 14 in Las Cruces; and five in El Paso. The Army received 397 comments from the hearings and through letters and e-mail.

Volume II of this LEIS, the Public Comment and Response Document, contains three chapters and one appendix. Chapter 1.0 contains this introduction and summarizes the methodology used to resolve the comments. Chapter 2.0 provides a summary of the issues and comments received. Chapter 3.0 contains the full text of the public comments on the Draft McGregor Range LEIS that raise issues, ask questions, or recommend changes to the text of the Draft McGregor Range LEIS, as well as all three public hearing transcripts. This chapter also contains the Army’s responses to the public comments and describes how the comments affected the Draft McGregor Range LEIS. Appendix A contains the full text of the public comments on the Draft McGregor Range LEIS that state a preference for a specific alternative. The comment letters are separated based on which alternative is supported.

Methodology

The Army reviewed all comments on the Draft McGregor Range LEIS. Many of the comments required that the text of the final LEIS be corrected, clarified, or otherwise revised. Each comment was reviewed for content and relevance to the environmental analyses and data contained in the Draft McGregor Range LEIS, and addressed accordingly.

Spoken comments at public hearings were recorded by a court reporter and a verbatim transcript was produced. The written comments and transcripts were reviewed and individual comments and questions were identified. Each comment and question identified is addressed in Chapter 3.0 and Appendix A of this volume. The responses indicate whether or not the text of the Draft McGregor Range LEIS was revised because of the comment.

Many commentors provided comments supporting specific alternatives discussed in the Draft McGregor Range LEIS. The Army acknowledged and will consider these comments, but these comments did not result in changes to the text of the Draft McGregor Range LEIS.

Some comments raised topics that are not pertinent to the Draft McGregor Range LEIS. In those cases, the Army answered the questions or addressed the concerns; but no change to the text was made.
2.0 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

2.1 ISSUES

The Army received comments regarding the Draft McGregor Range LEIS from 15 federal agencies, Native American groups, state agencies, local agencies, and private citizens and organizations. The full text of these comments and the Army’s response are presented in Chapter 3.0.

Public comments on the Draft McGregor Range LEIS raised four topics of broad interest or concern. These topics, categorized as “Issues,” are:

- Legislation should be included in the congressional withdrawal decision for the restriction of military actions on Otero Mesa and the Sacramento Mountains foothills, and the environmental protection of this area;
- The length of the withdrawal period;
- Increased public access to McGregor Range; and
- Guarantee of access for recreation, mineral leasing, and oil and gas exploration.

2.1.1 Legislation

Several comments requested that legislation for specific activities on Otero Mesa and the Sacramento Mountains foothills be included in the withdrawal action. These legislation requests included designating Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area (WSA) as a Wilderness Area; and designating Otero Mesa as a National Conservation Area (NCA); restricting the types of military missions that would be allowable on Otero Mesa and the Sacramento Mountains foothills; recognizing and providing for the long-term use of lands by the cattle growers; and allowing mineral leasing, and gas and oil exploration on areas of McGregor Range.

The request for the designation of Culp Canyon as a Wilderness Area and Otero Mesa as a NCA is addressed in the LEIS under Alternative 6. The Army’s proposed training area use refinements to its Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) discussed in Section 2.1.1, restricts the types of military activities in each training area. Long-term use and practices that have sustained cattle growers and other land uses on McGregor Range have been recognized in the legislation regarding the current withdrawal (Public Law [PL] 99-606, Military Lands Withdrawal Act [MLWA]) in that Section 3, Management of Withdrawn Lands, provides for grazing, protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat, control of predatory and other animals, recreation, and the suppression of brush and range fires. The MLWA also provides that all nonmilitary uses of withdrawn land are subject to such conditions and restrictions as necessary to permit the military use of such lands and protect public safety. The Army proposal for withdrawn land under each alternative incorporates the Bureau of Land Management’s (BLM’s) McGregor Range Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA) that resulted from PL 99-606. In this manner, these uses are explicitly proposed for the forthcoming legislation. In addition, under the McGregor Range RMPA and the 1990 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Army and the BLM, there are provisions for 5-year reviews of the possibility of opening a portion of McGregor Range to locatable mineral exploration and development. Portions of McGregor Range are open to oil and gas and geothermal leasing, and for saleable materials disposal. Therefore, additional legislative authority for minerals leasing is not required.
2.1.2 Length of the Withdrawal Period

Several commentors stated concern regarding the renewal of the withdrawal for 50 years. The comments stated that 50 years is too long a timeframe for the Army to predict its training and testing needs.

The Army employs various planning cycles for different aspects of its mission. For example, the Army uses a 6-year programming cycle for operational activities with facility planning over a 20-year horizon. Doctrinal and equipment life-cycle planning can extend over a period of 40 years or more. The proposed 50-year withdrawal period encompasses each of these periods and enables long-term national security plans to rely on a stable land resource.

Different (shorter or longer) withdrawal periods would not substantially change the environmental impacts of a land allocation decision. Continuing stewardship and compliance activities would be required regardless of duration. Public and/or agency participation in ongoing environmental management activities on McGregor Range is assured through existing laws, regulations, and policies as listed in Table 1.6-1. The Army is committed to continuing public participation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as major new actions that could significantly affect the environment are proposed for the installation. The McGregor Range RMPA, jointly prepared by the BLM and the Army provides for continuing public participation. The annual Resource Management Plan (RMP) update informs the public of the progress made in implementing the RMPA. The Army’s Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) contain provisions for agency coordination and revision as necessary every 5 years. Together, these regulatory requirements, policies, and procedures will ensure opportunities for both public and agency input into the future.

2.1.3 Public Access

Many comments requested that the public have increased access to areas on McGregor Range for such activities as recreation, grazing, mineral leasing, and oil and gas exploration. The current use of some areas as an impact area would be considered incompatible with the public’s expressed desire for access to the area. Additionally, during firing exercises (FIREX) and field training exercises (FTXs), access to some or all areas of the range are restricted to protect public safety. However, as stated in Section 2.1.1, the current withdrawal (PL 99-606), Section 3, Management of Withdrawn Lands, provides for grazing, protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat, control of predatory and other animals, recreation, and the suppression of brush and range fires.

2.1.4 Protection of Otero Mesa and the Sacramento Mountain Foothills

Several commentors stated that because of the uniqueness of Otero Mesa and the Sacramento Mountains foothills, these valuable areas must be protected. Although military activities in these areas may continue under some of the withdrawal alternatives, the Army has and will continue to take precautions to minimize impacts to the areas, and complies with environmental regulations and laws. In addition, nonmilitary activities on Otero Mesa and the Sacramento Mountains foothills are co-managed with the BLM in accordance with the RMPA.

2.2 GENERAL COMMENTS

Many commentors provided statements in support of a specific alternative. There are 179 comments that support Alternative 1, the renewal of the McGregor Range land withdrawal. There are six comments that support Alternative 3, the partial withdrawal of McGregor Range and the return of 180,000 acres to the
public domain. There are four comments in support of Alternative 4, the partial withdrawal of McGregor Range and the return of 244,000 acres to the public domain. There are three comments in support of Alternative 5, the No Action Alternative. Thirteen comments state support for Alternative 6, designation of Culp Canyon as a Wilderness Area, and the Otero Mesa and Sacramento Mountains foothills as an NCA. The full text of the letters that provide only support for a specific alternative are provided in Appendix A.
January 29, 1999

Dr. Andrew Viets
Program Manager
McGregor Renewal
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Viets:

In accordance with our responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing NEPA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 office in Dallas, Texas has completed its review of the Department of the Army (DOA) legislative Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the renewal of the withdrawal of public lands at McGregor Range for military purposes.

This DEIS has been prepared in support of an application by the United States (U.S.) Army to renew the withdrawal of McGregor Range which is critical to our nation's military readiness. The Military Lands Withdrawal Act (MLWA) provides that the Army may seek renewal of the McGregor Range withdrawal. In connection with the application for renewal, the MLWA specifies that the Secretary of the Army will publish a DEIS, consistent with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), if there is a continuing requirement for military use of this range. Since this action is a proposal for legislation, the Army and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) have mutually agreed to use the DEIS process, pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1506.8, to comply with the requirements of Public Law (PL) 97-336. This DEIS is being prepared in cooperation with BLM and local government. Therefore, pursuant to the DEIS process, the Army has decided to prepare a Final EIS, and a Notice of Availability of the Final EIS will be published in the Federal Register. However, there will not be a Record of Decision (ROD) because the decision to renew the withdrawal is made by the U.S. Congress and signed into law by the President.

McGregor Range, located in Otero County, New Mexico, has supported the military mission of the U.S. Army at Fort Bliss from the 1940s to the present. McGregor Range is comprised of public lands, which are lands owned by the Federal Government and administered by the Department of the Interior (DOI) through BLM pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) (PL 94-579) and other public land laws. At McGregor Range, the
1. The Army employs various planning cycles for different aspects of its mission. For example, the Army uses a 6-year programming cycle for operational activities with facility planning over a 20-year horizon. Doctrinal and equipment life cycle planning can extend over a period of 40 years or more. The proposed 50-year withdrawal period encompasses each of these periods and enables long-term national security plans to rely on a stable land resource.

Different (shorter or longer) withdrawal periods would not substantially change the environmental impacts of a land allocation decision. Continuing stewardship and compliance activities would be required regardless of duration. Public and/or agency participation in ongoing environmental management activities on McGregor Range is assured through existing laws, regulations, and policies as listed in Table 1.6-1. The Army is committed to continuing public participation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as major new actions that could significantly affect the environment are proposed for the installation. The McGregor Range Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA), jointly prepared by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Army provides for continuing public participation. The annual Resource Management Plan (RMP) update informs the public of the progress made in implementing the RMPA. The Army's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) and Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) contain provisions for agency coordination and revision as necessary every 5 years. Together, these regulatory requirements, policies, and procedures will ensure opportunities for both public and agency input into the future.

2. A shorter withdrawal period would not substantially change the environmental impacts of the proposal. Continuing stewardship and compliance activities would be required regardless of the duration of the withdrawal.
the EIS. Our classification will be published in the Federal Register according to our responsibility under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, to inform the public of our views on proposed Federal actions.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the DEIS. We request that you send our office two (2) copies of the Final EIS at the same time that it is sent to the Office of Federal Activities, EPA, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

Sincerely yours,

Robert D. Lawrence, Chief
Office of Planning and Coordination
Compliance Assurance and Enforcement Division
3. The Army will consider your suggestion relative to opportunities for use of the installations' capabilities to support new missions and relative to its current and future funding constraints.

4. Under Alternatives 1 and 2, the Army has the responsibility to close the area when public safety is potentially endangered. Should the area be designated a National Conservation Area (NCA), the current use as a buffer zone and field training exercise (FTX) area would be incompatible with the public's expressed desire for access to the area.

5. The Army has continuing training requirements that can be met through the use of its fee-owned lands. Management of the Army fee-owned lands is proposed to continue under the existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the BLM, therefore, no significant environmental impacts are expected relative to fee-owned lands under any scenario including a congressional decision to transfer the lands. The Army proposes to provide water to support the activities under the existing MOU with the BLM under each alternative.
Federal Government
United States Department of the Interior

6. Alternative 1 of the Draft McGregor Range Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (LEIS) is based upon the mission capabilities of McGregor Range. The installation is in the process of refining its facility planning in the training complex including McGregor Range. Military uses are illustrated on Figure 2.1-1 relative to specific training areas and described in Table 2.1-1. The uses include Surface Impact, surface danger zone (SDZ)/Safety Footprint, On-road Vehicle Maneuver, Controlled Access FTX, Dismounted Training, Aircraft Operations, Conservation, and Public Access. Off-road use of tracked vehicles is limited to Training Area (TA) 8 in the southern portion of the Tularosa Basin.

7. Congress could direct through legislation that the Tularosa Basin be utilized as the primary military use area on McGregor Range and place limits on military use of the Otero Mesa. Additionally, Congress may select other periods of withdrawal or transfer jurisdiction of specified areas from the Secretary of Interior to the Secretary of the Army. These land management options would not affect the environmental impacts of the land allocation decision before Congress.

8. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Proposed Expansion of German Air Force (GAF) Operations at Holloman Air Force Base (AFB), New Mexico, states that training activities on the tactical target complex will require that portions of the areas south of New Mexico Highway 506 be closed to the public for approximately 60 hours per week. The MOU between the BLM and the U.S. Air Force (USAF) provides that routine public access to the USAF tactical target complex will be from 1:00 p.m. Friday through Sunday at 9:00 p.m. Use by the USAF would generally be Monday through Friday morning. The scheduling for the target complex, as well as for Army training, will be controlled by the Fort Bliss Range Scheduling Office in a manner that generally allows the
Federal Government
United States Department of the Interior

8. Continued

USAF use of the target complex and Army use of the training areas. Concurrent use is planned to meet most of the demand of both missions.

9. Under Department of Defense (DoD) policy for the use of major range and test facilities such as White Sands Missile Range (WSMR), evaluation of routine use for training such as conducted at McGregor Range is not permitted. Joint use is hindered by the different missions and associated scheduling philosophies. There are different installation support requirements and different operating tempos.

10. The agency comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

11. The Army employs various planning cycles for different aspects of its mission. For example, the Army uses a 6-year programming cycle for operational activities with facility planning over a 20-year horizon. Doctrinal and equipment life-cycle planning can extend over a period of 40 years or more. The proposed 50-year withdrawal period encompasses each of these periods and enables long-term national security plans to rely on a stable land resource.

12. The LEIS presents the possible conflicts between the proposed action and alternatives and the objectives of federal, regional, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls for the area concerned (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 1502.16 [C]). The potential conflicts that arise from adopting other than Alternative 1 are discussed in Section 2.2.3. That congressional designation of the current method of grazing administration as specified in the RMPA would serve to solidify the legal aspects of the issue was recognized in this discussion. The agency comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

Pages ES-12 and 1-3: Wording has been included concerning the spatial requirements of a concept or plan referred to as “Army force XXI and Army after next.” There is no explanation
13. The LEIS presents the possible conflicts between the proposed action and alternatives and the objectives of federal, regional, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls for the area concerned (40 CFR Part 1502.16 [C]). The potential conflicts that arise from adopting other than Alternative 1 are discussed in Section 2.2.3. That congressional designation of the current method of grazing administration as specified in the RMPA would serve to solidify the legal aspects of the issue was recognized in this discussion. The agency comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

14. The following text has been added to Section 1.2 and the terms defined in the glossary. “The Army has a long history of developing innovative approaches to future warfighting challenges. The future Army Force XXI and its follow-on, Army-After-Next, is being designed with organizations and capabilities that will allow it to be rapidly tailored, strategically deployable, and effectively employable in joint and multinational operations. Army Force XXI provides rapid and effective response to the changing situations and local conditions. Mission planning and rehearsal will be conducted simultaneously with the build-up of decisive forces, as automated systems and simulations, capable of operating from ships and aircraft, provide the capability to plan, coordinate, and war game possible courses of action while forces are en route. Vastly improved capabilities of long-range missiles with smart submunitions, precision weapons delivered throughout the battlespace, and attack helicopters capable of operations deep within enemy forces, integrated with an air campaign, are critical to ensuring that national objectives are met. Army Force XXI operations must be fully integrated as the land force commander draws from a suite of complementary capabilities of the other services, our
14. Continued

allies, and other government and nongovernment organizations. The training and test activities conducted on McGregor Range are critical to achieving the expectations set for Army Force XXI and its follow-on in the preparedness planning the Army-After-Next."

15. The text will be modified as follows: "...helicopter training complex, establishment of a launch facility for a tactical ballistic missile (TBM) target for Patriot training, and..."

16. An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared by Fort Bliss for any additional FTX sites on McGregor Range, should Alternative 2 or 3 of the Fort Bliss Mission and Master Plan Programmatic EIS (PEIS) be adopted.

17. The text has been revised as recommended.

18. The potential Army Tactical Missile Systems (ATACMS) impact area in TA 25 is depicted as a small circle with the horizontal hatching designating an impact area and its envisioned size. The specific location of a potential launch facility in TA 10 for Patriot targets is undetermined at this time.

19. The text has been revised to include appropriate available information from the Construction of Drag Roads Near the U.S. Highway 54 Border Control Checkpoint, Otero County, New Mexico Environmental Assessment Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) dated 8/18/93.

20. The sentences within the paragraph have been reorganized.

21. The text has been revised as recommended.

22. The land use for the USAF tactical target complex is summarized in Section 4.1.1.2, subsections Military Use and Nonmilitary Use. Additional information on land use effects relative to the tactical target complex is presented in Chapter 4, Section 4.3, Land Use of the Proposed Expansion of GAF Operations at Holloman AFB, New Mexico EIS prepared by the USAF in April 1998.
23. The Region of Influence (ROI) (Figure 3.2-1) considered for the McGregor Range LEIS is the airspace that is affected by training activities on McGregor Range and Dona Ana Range–North Training Areas and aviation activities at the Biggs Army Air Field (AAF).

24. Reference to Border Patrol drag roads has been included in the text.

25. The parenthetical information has been deleted.

26. Historic landscapes are defined as a type of cultural resource in Section 3.9.1 and the potential for historic military and rural landscapes on McGregor Range is discussed in Section 3.9.4.3. Currently, both a rural and military historic landscape are being reviewed, there are no designated historic landscapes on McGregor Range.

27. The text has been revised as recommended.

28. Section 3.12 describes noise in the existing environment of McGregor Range. Information regarding the overall noise level anticipated from the use of the Otero Mesa tactical target complex is found in Section 4.12.1 of the LEIS and in the USAF’s Proposed Expansion of GAF Operations at Holloman AFB, New Mexico, Final EIS dated April 1998.

29. The agency comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

30. The text has been revised as recommended.

31. The last sentence in the paragraph states, “Use of the GAF target complex is expected to reduce access of 60,000 acres on Otero Mesa for up to 60 hours per week.” No text change is required.

32. The text has been revised as recommended.
33. The LEIS presents the possible conflicts between the proposed action and alternatives and the objectives of federal, regional, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls for the area concerned (40 CFR Part 1502.16 [C]). The potential conflicts that arise from adopting other than Alternative 1 are discussed in Section 2.2.3. That congressional designation of the current method of grazing administration as specified in the RMPA would serve to solidify the legal aspects of the issue was recognized in this discussion. The agency comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

34. The text has been revised as recommended.

35. The LEIS presents the possible conflicts between the proposed action and alternatives and the objectives of federal, regional, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls for the area concerned (40 CFR Part 1502.16 [C]). The potential conflicts that arise from adopting other than Alternative 1 are discussed in Section 2.2.3. That congressional designation of the current method of grazing administration as specified in the RMPA would serve to solidify the legal aspects of the issue was recognized in this discussion. The agency comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

36. The text has been revised as recommended.

37. The LEIS presents the possible conflicts between the proposed action and alternatives and the objectives of federal, regional, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls for the area concerned (40 CFR Part 1502.16 [C]). The potential conflicts that arise from adopting other than Alternative 1 are discussed in Section 2.2.3. That congressional designation of the current method of grazing administration as specified in the RMPA would serve to solidify the legal aspects of the issue was recognized in this discussion. The agency comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

38. The text has been revised as recommended.

39. The LEIS presents the possible conflicts between the proposed action and alternatives and the objectives of federal, regional, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls for the area concerned (40 CFR Part 1502.16 [C]). The potential conflicts that arise from adopting other than Alternative 1 are discussed in Section 2.2.3. That congressional designation of the current method of grazing administration as specified in the RMPA would serve to solidify the legal aspects of the issue was recognized in this discussion. The agency comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

40. The text has been revised as recommended.

41. The LEIS presents the possible conflicts between the proposed action and alternatives and the objectives of federal, regional, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls for the area concerned (40 CFR Part 1502.16 [C]). The potential conflicts that arise from adopting other than Alternative 1 are discussed in Section 2.2.3. That congressional designation of the current method of grazing administration as specified in the RMPA would serve to solidify the legal aspects of the issue was recognized in this discussion. The agency comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Continued on Next Page
37. Continued

The soil loss from wind on undisturbed land in the Pintura-Doña Ana complex, the predominant soil type for the off-road area (TA 8), under undisturbed conditions is 21.73 tons/acre/year or over 4 times the acceptable soil loss. Under moderate use assumptions, wind erosion could increase this to 54.7 tons/acre/year or 2.5 times the natural loss on undisturbed lands. Section 4.5.9 was modified to read “The impact of military activity has exposed soils in TA 8 to increased gully erosion and irretrievable loss of soil by wind. These impacts would likely continue regardless of which withdrawal configuration alternative is selected. By following installation management practices and avoiding highly erodible soils, these impacts can be minimized.”

38. Soils in the coppice dunes area of the Tularosa Basin portion of McGregor Range are discussed in Section 3.5.2 while impacts are discussed in Section 4.5.2.

39. More detailed air quality evaluations supporting this conclusion may be found in the Final PEIS for the Joint Training Exercise Roving Sands at Fort Bliss, Texas and New Mexico and White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, published in February 1994, and the Supplemental EA for Joint Training Exercise Roving Sands 97, published in February 1997.

40. The potential for air quality effects resulting from activities of a Heavy Division Training Center would be evaluated in additional NEPA documentation on the proposal to establish a center. Most of the activities associated with the capability of the Fort Bliss Training Complex to support potential activities such as a Heavy Division Training Center would occur outside of McGregor Range since the capabilities on this withdrawn land occur primarily in TA 8, Meyer Range, and the McGregor Range Camp. The discussion was presented in a programmatic sense using the best available data to illustrate potential use of Fort Bliss capabilities that could effect the use of McGregor Range.

Continued on Next Page
41. The Army agrees with the agency comment and is committed to continuing evaluation under NEPA as major new actions that could significantly affect the environment are proposed for the withdrawn area.

42. The sentence has been deleted as recommended.

43. Results of existing studies indicate that grazing may have resulted in a reduced capacity for the Otero Mesa grasslands to support breeding Aplomado falcon potential habitat (see Section 3.8.3.4). In addition, grazing may have been a factor that lead to the extirpation of this species from the United States (see Section D.4.4 in Appendix D). Therefore, the table was not changed, although a footnote was added indicating that the assessment of the impacts of grazing on potential Aplomado falcon habitat on Fort Bliss are preliminary.

44. The text has been revised to read “…would be solely by the BLM.”

45. The Army will consider the agency suggestion in the future development of the monitoring system as funding resources permit.

46. The Army will consider the agency suggestion in the future development of the monitoring system as funding resources permit.

47. The Army agrees with the agency comment. The following qualifications may be found in Section 4.8.7.1. “The results from this analysis must be interpreted with some qualifications. The model was generated from plot data in grassland and desert shrub communities where vegetation cover ranged from 15 percent to 53 percent of the total covered area. Extrapolation of the model to other vegetation
47. Continued

The methodology presented for change detection is to classify the TM images into land cover types for the given date and then to use these results to do the change detection. This method could result in errors in the classification process of each date (usually less than 90 percent classification accuracy for desert vegetation), showing up as changes on the ground. Using the actual calibrated images to do change detection and then using these results as a guide for detailed field investigations could be a better monitoring method.

References:


We appreciate the opportunity to review this LEIS. We trust the above comments will be of assistance as you prepare subsequent documentation.

Sincerely,

Glenn B. Selwa
Regional Environmental Officer

48. The monitoring program that uses National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) LANDSAT Thematic Imagery is under development and will be used to monitor the entire landscape of Fort Bliss at high spatial resolution to capture variability in land cover on training areas. Validation will occur through the on the ground use of Land Condition Trend Analysis (LCTA) and other field investigations/observations. This capability will allow positioning of monitoring plots to provide an accurate sample of impacts on the training landscape. Additional post sampling analysis using plot data, monitoring data, and Geographic Information System (GIS) themes will allow analysts to map the extent and impact of training activities on a landscape scale. The analysis presented in the LEIS reflects the early stages of the process being implemented at Fort Bliss to evaluate cumulative impacts of military training, grazing, and natural events on training lands.
Dr. Andrew Vliet
Program Manager, McGregor Renewal
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center
and Fort Bliss
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:


Sincerely,

[Signature]

Acting Deputy State Director
Division of Resource Planning, Use and Protection

2 Enclosures
1- Letter (4 pp)
2- cc List
49. Based on recommendations received from the public through the NEPA scoping process, the McGregor Range LEIS analyzes five boundary alternatives and a sixth alternative to establish a NCA for Otero Mesa and the Sacramento Mountain foothills. As required by NEPA, the environmental impacts of each alternative were presented in comparative form with substantial treatment of each alternative.

Dear Dr. Vliet:

The New Mexico Resource Advisory Council (RAC) is a 15 member New Mexico citizens advisory council appointed to provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), New Mexico State Office. In previous correspondence to you dated January 9, 1998, we provided scoping comments for review and consideration during preparation of the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (LEIS) for the renewal of the McGregor Range military withdrawal.

We recommended the Army consider six alternatives in the LEIS. Five boundary alternatives and a sixth alternative to establish a National Conservation Area (NCA) for the Otero Mesa and foothills. During this process, we have been disappointed in the actions and methods of the military in this process and selection of the proposed action. By making a case only for the proposed action, the military has devalued the other alternatives, public support for those alternatives and the entire process.

Regardless of which alternative is chosen, we wish to emphasize the importance of continued public access to public land. People have a right to use public land, and this right must not be hampered.

The RAC’s guiding tenets for McGregor Range were first articulated in a letter dated August 5, 1997, in response to the Air Force’s proposal to establish a bombing range on Otero Mesa:

1. The public has historically used Otero Mesa and the Mountain Foothills for multiple-use. Otero Mesa holds some of New Mexico’s finest examples of native grasslands and finest antelope herds.

2. The area west of Otero Mesa, known as the “Tulancio Basin” is an appropriate location for the continued military use including a bombing range. This area is currently used as an impact area for military munitions for Fort Bliss.

Enclosure 1-1
50. The Army’s proposed action, described in Section 2.1, allows for the continuation of the substantive public use of the range, subject to risks to public safety and national security requirements.

51. The Army’s proposed action would continue management under the White Sands Resource Area RMP as amended for McGregor Range for the 50 years to provide a stable land base for military training and planning. However, Congress could reinforce this proposed action through legislation that the existing MOU govern the future management of McGregor Range. Congress could further specify other periods of withdrawal and allowable activities on different portions of McGregor Range. For example, Congress could specify a 35-year period of withdrawal and that the Tularosa Basin be utilized as the primary military use area on McGregor Range, and place limits on military use of the Otero Mesa.

52. The Army has an on-going evaluation of the ordnance and explosive hazards on McGregor Range and will continue with studies and pursue clean-up actions to the extent resources are available.

As described in Section 3.13.3, an archive search report documented areas of potential ordnance and explosive hazards. Additional physical surveys are being conducted to evaluate the extent of the potential ordnance and explosive hazards. Potential hazards to public safety associated with the granting of public access in portions of McGregor Range such as the Tularosa Basin may preclude return of this area to the public domain necessitating transfer of that land to the Secretary of the Army for future clean-up.
53. The Army employs various planning cycles for different aspects of its mission. For example, the Army uses a 6-year programming cycle for operational activities with facility planning over a 20-year horizon. Doctrinal and equipment life-cycle planning can extend over a period of 40 years or more. The proposed 50-year withdrawal period encompasses each of these periods and enables long-term national security plans to rely on a stable land resource.

Different (shorter or longer) withdrawal periods would not substantially change the environmental impacts of a land allocation decision. Continuing stewardship and compliance activities would be required regardless of duration. Public and/or agency participation in ongoing environmental management activities on McGregor Range is assured through existing laws, regulations, and policies as listed in Table 1.6-1. The Army is committed to continuing public participation under NEPA as major new actions that could significantly affect the environment are proposed for the installation. The McGregor Range RMPA, jointly prepared by the BLM and the Army provides for continuing public participation. The annual RMP update informs the public of the progress made in implementing the RMPA. The Army’s INRMP and ICRMP contain provisions for agency coordination and revision as necessary every 5 years. Together, these regulatory requirements, policies, and procedures will ensure opportunities for both public and agency input into the future.
* Group 1.
  Holder of Federal grazing permit/lease,
  transportation/rights of way, developed outdoor recreation,
  off-highway vehicle user, commercial recreation activity,
  commercial timber industry, energy/mineral development;

** Group 2.
  national/regional environmental organization, resource
  conservation group, dispersed recreational activity,
  archeological or historical interest, national/regional wild
  horse/burro groups; and

*** Group 3.
  holder of state/county/local elected office, State agency
  employee in field of natural resource/land/water, Indian
  tribes, academicians of natural resource/science,
  public-at-large.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerry W. Sundel</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>716 Rosa St.</td>
<td>Farmington, NM 87401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Begaye</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>Box 609</td>
<td>Shiprock, NM 87420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. David Vickers</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>41 Sandi Loop</td>
<td>Los Lunas, NM 87031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry KiKi Saavedra</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>2838 2nd SW</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel P. Silva</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>1323 Canyon Trail SW</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Nestor Chavez</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>1116 Alamillo Dr., NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl M. Williams</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>Box 27165</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Godbey</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>1002 Cedar Crest</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danice R. Pernux</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>4300 E. La Resolana</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph P. Mozurcic</td>
<td>NM House of Representatives</td>
<td>13224 Candelaria NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal Government
United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management
Federal Government
United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Joseph M. Thompson
NM House of Representatives
Box 22082
Albuquerque, NM 87111

Dona G. Irwin
NM House of Representatives
420 S. Slave
Deming, NM 88030

J. Paul Taylor
NM House of Representatives
Box 133
Mesilla, NM 88046

Mary Helen Garcia
NM House of Representatives
5271 S. Highway 28
Las Cruces, NM 88005

Benjamin B. Rioso
NM House of Representatives
233 E. San Pedro St.
Las Cruces, NM 88001

E.G. Smokey Blanton
NM House of Representatives
8005 N. Dona Ana Rd.
Dona Ana, NM 88005

J. "Andy" Kiarner
NM House of Representatives
3245 E. University Ave.
Las Cruces, NM 88011

F. Dianne Hamilton
NM House of Representatives
4132 N. Gold St.
Silver City, NM 88061

Manuel Herrera
NM House of Representatives
105 N. Cactus
Bayard, NM 88023

Nick L. Salazar
NM House of Representatives
Box 1076
San Juan Pueblo, NM 87566

Debbie A. Rodella
NM House of Representatives
Box 1074
San Juan Pueblo, NM 87566

Roberto J. Gonzales
NM House of Representatives
Box 6193
Taos, NM 87571

Jeannette Wallace
NM House of Representatives
1913 Spruce
Los Alamos, NM 87544

July Vandernar Russell
NM House of Representatives
4104 La Colomta Ct.
Rio Rancho, NM 87124

Patsy Trujillo Knauer
NM House of Representatives
Box 15532
Santa Fe, NM 87506

Ben Lagan
NM House of Representatives
Rt. 1 Box 102
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Max Coli
NM House of Representatives
Rt. 9, Box 72-F
Santa Fe, NM 87505

Luciano "Lucy" Varela
NM House of Representatives
1709 Callejon Zenaica
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Don Tripp
NM House of Representatives
Box 1369
Socorro, NM 87801

Rhonda King
NM House of Representatives
Box 103
Stanley, NM 87056

Gloria C. Vaughn
NM House of Representatives
503 16th St.
Alamogordo, NM 88310

Delores C. Wright
NM House of Representatives
150 West Lisa
Chaparral, NM 88021

Terry T. Marquardt
NM House of Representatives
903 New York Ave.
Alamogordo, NM 88310

Joe M. Stell
NM House of Representatives
22 Colwell Ranch Rd.
Carlsbad, NM 88220

John A. Heaton
NM House of Representatives
102 S. Canyon
Carlsbad, NM 88220

W. C. "Dub" Williams
NM House of Representatives
HC66, Box 10
Glencoe, NM 88324

Daniel R. Foley
NM House of Representatives
806 Deboni Drive
Roswell, NM 88201

Darla A. Dana
NM House of Representatives
6574 Cherokee Rd.
Dexter, NM 88230

David M. Parsons
NM House of Representatives
607 Golondrina
Roswell, NM 88201

Lisa L. Lutz
NM House of Representatives
1620 Bokalia Ave. SE
Rio Rancho, NM 87124
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter D. Bradley</td>
<td>New Mexico State Senate</td>
<td>Box 961, Roswell, NM 88202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manny M. Aragon</td>
<td>New Mexico State Senator</td>
<td>Box 119, Albuquerque, NM 87114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph J. Cerrado</td>
<td>New Mexico State Senator</td>
<td>Box 119, Quesa, NM 87556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna J. Duran</td>
<td>Pauline B. Eisenstadt</td>
<td>Box 658, Corrales, NM 87040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph A. Fidel</td>
<td>Harry Jane M. Garcia</td>
<td>Box 22, Los Alamos, NM 88032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil A. Grigio</td>
<td>Gloria Huu</td>
<td>Box 10, San Jose, NM 87565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy T. Jennings</td>
<td>Don Ridd</td>
<td>Box 119, Gallup, NM 87301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll H. Lampell</td>
<td>Linda M. Lopez</td>
<td>Box 9, Jemez Springs, NM 87122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando R. Macias</td>
<td>Rocio M. Mares III</td>
<td>Box 119, Santa Fe, NM 87501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy J. McGilven</td>
<td>Cisco McRory</td>
<td>Box 119, Albuquerque, NM 87050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Public Comment and Response Document*
MEMORANDUM FOR DASA (ETS)  

FROM: SAF/MEQ  
SUBJECT: Air Force Comments on McGregor Range LEIS  

We have reviewed the draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statements (LEIS) on removal of the withdrawal of McGregor Range. This range is vital to USAF and Guard Air Force (GAF) training and combat readiness. 

Based on our review of the document, it appears that Alternatives three through six have significant adverse impacts to the USAF and GAF, as Otura Mesa (located within McGregor Range) would return to the public. However, the LEIS does not adequately reflect these potential impacts. 

The Record of Decision (ROD) for the GAF LEIS identifies Otura Mesa as the site for construction of a new target complex for air-to-ground training. Otura Mesa will support the tactical training for a total of 42 GAF Tomahawk aircraft, a politically and economically important initiative. Returning Otura Mesa to the public will seriously impact our training, combat readiness, and German-US relations. Our detailed comments are attached. 

If you have any questions or need our comments, my point of contact is Maj Jim Mills, DSN 223-7548; e-mail: James.W.Mills@pentagon.mil. 

[Signature] 
THOMAS W. MCCAUL, M.R. 
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health) 

Attachments: 
Detailed Comments 

54. Table ES-3 illustrates that under Alternatives 3 through 6, the capability for training that requires air-to-ground surface impact areas is totally eliminated; therefore, the mission could not be accomplished. This loss would totally eliminate the benefits to the USAF and GAF expressed in the purpose and need section of the USAF's Proposed Expansion of GAF at Holloman AFB, New Mexico, Final EIS, dated April 1998. As stated in the LEIS Section 1.5.3, Other Environmental Analyses and Decisions Relevant to the Action, the USAF EIS was incorporated by reference into this LEIS. Details of the operational and environmental impacts of the LEIS Alternatives 3 through 6 may be found in the USAF document.
55. These units are included in the total Army Stationing and Installations Plan (ASIP) data presented in Table 1.2-2. The LEIS pertains to the McGregor Range portion of Fort Bliss. The discussion of unit stationing at Fort Bliss Section 1.2.2.1 was limited to those units that typically perform much of their mission on McGregor Range. All units, both U.S. and allied, stationed at Fort Bliss, or elsewhere, that use McGregor Range on an infrequent basis were considered in the total training use of McGregor Range.

56. The text has been changed to read, "...the USAF is expanding GAF operations at Holloman AFB (HAFB), New Mexico."

57. The first bullet has been revised as "Construction of an air-to-ground tactical target complex."

58. The text was revised to read: "Military activities at HAFB, other than the USAF construction of a new air-to-ground tactical target complex, such as the deactivation of units such as the 435th Fighter Squadron that reduced flight operations over McGregor Range, have the potential to contribute to the cumulative effects on McGregor Range."

59. The text has been revised as requested.

60. The first sentence has been deleted as requested.

61. The U.S. Department of the Air Force has been added to the list of agencies notified or contacted.

62. The sentence has been revised to read, "...the full renewal of the withdrawn land would allow the U.S. Army to continue its current air defense mission, allow continued military training for other U.S. services and allied forces, and would provide flexibility."

Capt Cabral/TLEVP/064-0565/S Jan 99
63. The text has been revised to read, “Alternatives 1 and 2 would not affect airspace use or management in the ROI. Alternatives 3, 4, and 6 would not affect airspace use or management in the ROI. However, the return of Otero Mesa and other areas of the existing McGregor Range to the public domain would preclude development of the USAF tactical target complex on Otero Mesa, potentially reducing the level of activity within Restricted Area 5103.”

64. Table ES-3 illustrates that under Alternatives 3 through 6, the capability for training that requires air-to-ground surface impact areas is totally eliminated, therefore the mission could not be accomplished. This loss would totally eliminate the benefits to the USAF and GAF expressed in the purpose and need section of the USAF’s Proposed Expansion of GAF Operations at Holloman AFB, New Mexico, Final EIS, dated April 1998. As stated in the LEIS Section 1.5.3, Other Environmental Analyses and Decisions Relevant to the Action, the USAF EIS was incorporated by reference into this LEIS. The operational and environmental impacts of the LEIS Alternatives 3 through 6 may be found in the resource area discussions in Chapter 4 of the LEIS.

65. While the Army’s principal requirement for McGregor Range is to support Air Defense Artillery (ADA) missile training, other activities such as the USAF tactical target complex are discussed throughout the document. Table ES-3 in the Executive Summary illustrates the capability for training that requires air-to-ground surface impact areas such as the Otero Mesa site. This refers to the USAF target complex. As stated in the LEIS Section 1.5.3, Other Environmental Analyses and Decisions Relevant to the Action, the USAF EIS was incorporated by reference into this LEIS. In general, the tactical target complex is discussed under each resource evaluation of Alternative 1 in this LEIS. However, details of the operational and environmental impacts of the tactical target complex may be found in the USAF document.

Continued on Next Page
66. This section describes differences in military use for Alternative 2 from those described for Alternative 1. The tactical target complex is discussed briefly in Section 4.1.1.2. Under Section 4.1.2.2, the tactical target complex is considered one of the potential expanded missions.

67. As stated in the LEIS Section 1.5.3, Other Environmental Analyses and Decisions Relevant to the Action, the USAF EIS was incorporated by reference into this LEIS. In general, the tactical target complex is discussed under each resource evaluation of Alternative 1 in this LEIS. However, details of the operational and environmental impacts of the tactical target complex may be found in the USAF document.

68. Curtailment of the Army’s Patriot training mission as well as the USAF and GAF training missions (land users of McGregor Range) would occur under Alternatives 3 through 6. These are addressed under each alternative as direct impacts. Section 4.1.7 addresses cumulative impacts that add to these direct impacts from activities other than the Army missions on McGregor Range. In this context, no additional impacts are expected to occur.

69. Section 4.2.2, Alternative 2, discusses airspace use and management under conditions that still allow USAF construction of the tactical target complex. Section 4.2.3, Alternative 3, addresses the reduced level of activity from returning the Otero Mesa to the public domain. Section 4.2.4, Alternative 4, includes a statement that incorporates the effects of Alternative 3. Section 4.2.5, Alternative 5, recognizes that while air activity would remain, air-to-ground activity would cease. Section 4.2.6 recognizes that the establishment of an NCA could also contain undetermined changes that affect airspace use and management.

70. The text has been revised as recommended.

71. Mr. William Wuest was not listed as a person contacted in Section 6.4. Persons Consulted records were reviewed and additional USAF persons contacted were added as appropriate.
72. The existing text has been replaced with the following text. “An initiative by WSMR with safety implications involves the proposal to launch an ATACMS from Fort Wingate, New Mexico, to impact on McGregor Range. WSMR currently conducts such launches that terminate in impact areas on WSMR. The safety implications of these activities were assessed in the Theater Missile Defense Extended Test Range EIS completed in November 1994. When the launch occurs, coordination is effected with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), landowners potentially impacted are notified, and some residents are evacuated.”
26 January 1999

Vicki Hamilton
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center & Fort Bliss,
Directorate of the Environment,
Attn: NTDC-DOE-C (LES)
Building 516 B, Pleasanton Road,
Fort Bliss, Texas 79936-5802


Dr. Andrew Vliet, DMPAul
Program Manager, McGregor Renewal
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center & Fort Bliss
Attn: P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

RE: (B). McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal, Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (DRAFT)

ENCLOSURES: (a). Bureau of Indian Affairs Acknowledgement cases

(b). Cultural/Historical Assessment of the Piro/Manso/Tiwa Tribe
   by Nick Hauser, Cultural Anthropologist

Dear Ms. Hamilton and Dr. Vliet:
Native Americans
Piro-Manso-Tiwa Indian Tribe

The Piro/Manso/Tiwa Indian Tribe, Pueblo of San Juan de Guadalupe, P.O. Box 16241, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88004, hereby submits written comments to reference (A) and (B) Draft Environmental Impact Statements. Where applicable, the Tribe expresses a common comment by referencing the appropriate section and/or paragraph of the applicable EIS document(s). Please note that the Tribal comments are limited only to the "DRAFT" EIS documents that have been submitted to the Tribe for review. All other documentation referenced in the EIS documents were not provided with the "DRAFT" Reports.

Piro/Manso/Tiwa Indian Tribe comments:

A. Fort Bliss EIS, 1.9 Cultural Resources, and McGregor EIS, 1.9 Cultural Resources

For the record, the Piro/Manso/Tiwa Indian Tribe, submits the following commentary to correct and update EIS deficiencies and omissions of the Cultural history and affiliation of this Tribe in New Mexico, Texas and the El Paso del Norte geographical land areas.

1. The Piro/Manso/Tiwa Indian Tribe, Pueblo of San Juan de Guadalupe officially filed a petition for Federal Recognition with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in January 1, 1992. The petition of the Tribe is under review consideration by the Bureau, and the Tribe is listed as number 8 on a Ready Status (see enclosure (a)).

The people of the Piro/Manso/Tiwa Indian Tribe, Pueblo of San Juan de Guadalupe, Las Cruces, New Mexico are lineal descendants of the Piro Pueblos of Abo, Awa, Abiquiu, Quarai, San Ildefonso, Socorro and Tohqui of the Salinas Pueblos of central New Mexico, San Ildefonso del Sur and Socorro del Sur of the El Paso del Norte areas. Also, the Tribe is comprised of descendants from the Tiwa Pueblos of Taos and Yaltes del Sur, Texas. In addition, the Tribe is comprised of descendants of the Manso (Athapaskan) Indians, who were the original inhabitants of the Mimbres Valley of southern New Mexico and who occupied the geographical areas from the Mimbres Valley to the Guadalupe mountains of Texas and into northern Mexico as encountered by the Spanish Explorer Coronado in 1540. The Organ Mountains are identified as the MANSO MOUNTAINS in earlier Spanish geographical maps and documents. The Manso people and descendants have used the Franklin and Organ Mountain ranges for sacred worship. Further, the Tribe claims official cultural affiliation to the Mimbres-Mogollon cultures and the Jornada-Mogollon cultures of which archaeological sites and burial grounds are evident in the Fort Bliss/McGregor/White Sands/NM/DoD military areas and National Park Service grounds. Pursuant to Public Law 101-560, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the Tribe has filed claims of Cultural Affiliation on the human remains and associated funerary objects with: (1) Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument, (2) Carlshbad-Governor National Park, (3) Guadalupe Mountains National Park, (4) White Sands National Monument, (5) Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument, (6) Chemehuevi National Monument, (7) San Diego Museum of Man, (8) Cibola National Forest and the same is applicable to Fort Bliss and McGregor.
The Tribe requests that the two GIS documents be amended to reflect the cultural affiliation of the Tribe to Fort Bliss and the McGregor Range. Further, the Tribe would appreciate copies of the inventories of human remains and associated funerary objects and Archaeological studies. As a supplement to our comments, the Tribe submits enclosure (b), a Cultural/Historical Assessment of the Piro-Manso/Tiwa Indian Tribe by Nick House, Cultural Anthropologist.

73. Section 3.9.3.4 was revised to include the following. “None of the inventories conducted to date have identified Piro-Manso-Tiwa human remains or associated funerary objects.”

74. Federal agency consultation with Native American tribes occurs under the auspices of the Executive Memorandum (29 April 1994) entitled, “Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments”. Under this guidance, it is not necessary to have an existing Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), MOU, or other agreement document in place between the federal agency and the Native American tribe. However, MOUs are in development with the federally recognized tribes in the area.

75. Federal acts requiring consultation with Native American tribes are implemented through the NEPA process and U.S. Army Regulations (Department of the Army [DA] Pamphlet 200-4), which reference the federal acts and require compliance with those acts.

Native American tribes may also participate in consultation through the avenues of public scoping and public comment.

76. The Army has no discharging facilities on McGregor Range. The Army facilities at Fort Bliss do not pump and/or discharge water into aquifers and river basins affected by the adjudicated standards.
Native Americans
Piro-Manso-Tiwa Indian Tribe

--- Biloxi, Choctaw Confederation of Muscogees, Inc. (#56a) (Withdrawn from the United Houma Nation, Inc. 9/30/95; responding to same Proposed Finding; comment period closed 11/13/1996)

--- Point Au Chien Indian Tribe (#56b) (Withdrawn from the United Houma Nation, Inc. 7/22/1996; responding to same Proposed finding; comment period closed 11/6/97)

Final Determination Pending - 5

17616 United Houma Nation, Inc., LA (#56) (Active 5/20/91; proposed negative finding published 12/22/94; comment period closed 11/13/96; resub 3rd-party comments received 2/24/97)

165 Yuchi Tribal Organization, OK (#121) (complete 4/22/93; proposed negative finding published 10/24/95; comment period closed 4/22/96; comment period extended to 11/29/96; petitioners reply to comments 5/97)

140 Mashpee-Naush Colonies Band of Pocumtuck Indians of MA (formerly, Gun Lake Village Band...) (#99a) (Active 12/24/96; proposed positive finding published 7/16/97; comment period closed 11/22/98; 60 day period for petitioners to respond to third party comments period closed 3/13/98)

1517 Cowlitz Tribe of Indians, WA (#16) (Active 7/11/95; proposed positive finding published 2/12/97; comment period closed 5/11/97; comment period extended to 11/17/97; 60 day period for petitioners to respond to third-party comments period closed 1/16/98)

356 Dowaanish Indian Tribe, WA (#25) (Active 5/19/92; proposed negative finding published 6/28/96; comment period extended to 7/25/97; comment period extended to 12/22/97; comment period extended to 1/21/98; reply period closed 3/23/98)

Petitioner Commenting on Proposed Finding - 2

836 Shoahnow Indian Tribe of Indians, WA (#121) (Active 1/7/81; proposed negative finding published 4/11/83; edited staff notes provided 3/25/91; comment period reopened 12/19/91, extended indefinitely at petitioners' request pending resolution of Sanish litigation; comment period reopened; comment period closed 4/12/98; comment period extended to 9/11/98)

1,585 Chinook Tribes of the State of Washington, WA (#57) (Active 3/28/84; proposed negative finding published 8/22/97; comment period closed 12/22/97; comment period extended to 8/15/98; comment period extended to 7/30/98)

PETITIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
(as of June 17, 1998, continued)

READY STATUS

Ready, Waiting for Active Consideration - 12

Petitioners have corrected deficiencies and/or stated their petition should be considered "ready" for active
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In Post-Final Decision Appeal Process - 3

Before the Interior Board of Indian Appeals (IBIA) - 3

82 Golden Hill Paugussett Tribe, CT (#211) (negative final determination published 9/26/96; eff 12/26/96; petitioner requested reconsideration from IBIA 12/25/96; decision affirmed by IBIA subject to supplemental proceedings 6/10/98)

313 Snoqualmie Indian Tribe, WA (#50) (negative final determination published 8/28/97; eff 11/28/97; Tulalip Tribes requested reconsideration from IBIA 11/26/97)

c-000 MOWA Band of Choctaw, AL (#55) (negative final determination published 12/24/97; eff 3/24/98; petitioner requested reconsideration from IBIA 3/23/98)

PETITIONS RESOLVED
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Enclosure (b)

To: Mr. Andrew J. Roybal
Co-Director, Piro-Manso-Tiwa Indian Tribe (Las Cruces, New Mexico)

Subject: Cultural/Environmental Assessment of the PMT Indian Tribe

From: Nick Houston, Research Consultant, Cultural Anthropologist/Historian

Date: January 24, 1996

Dear Mr. Roybal:

It is a pleasure to serve as a consultant to the PMT and coordinate my research activities with the Tribal Council and with Dr. Howard Campbell (U.S.I.E.). I hereby provide a statement which is an assessment concerning the cultural and historical relationship of the PMT as a distinct Native American Tribe and the ancestral relationships to other Indian communities of Southern New Mexico and the El Paso District (particularly Ysleta, Senec and El Paso del Norte).

I have reviewed much of the documentary materials which you and other tribal members have developed as well as done by contract consultants. I am impressed with the depth of research and the analysis and interpretation. I have attempted to augment information from my research as necessary only in those areas where I have additional knowledge and can contribute to your research endeavors. For example, I have introduced you and Mr. Campbell to Namacole, the late Maso descendant of San Lorenzo (Cd. Juárez, Mexico). I have also included additional references to the Maso of the El Paso and the Pueblos of Senec and El Paso del Norte (Cd. Juárez). I am also aware of the historical interactions and relationships between Ysleta Pueblo and the Indians of the Las Cruces area (i.e., PMT).

Please find enclosed (1) "Chronology of Significant Events - Puro, Maso, Tiwa"; (2) "Maso Research Bibliography" (compiled upon the Maso society of the PMT); (3) 1784 Ysleta Census; (4) 1784 Ysleta Census; (5) 1787 Ysleta Census; (6) 1787 Ysleta Census; (7) 1787 Senec Census; (8) 1787 Senec Census; and (9) 1844 Ysleta and Senec Tribal Leaders List. I have other census materials which are not included but I believe your files may contain that information. I read the well researched report by Reymond and Taylor and realized that some of the documents that pertain to PMT Indians were not traced to Bents or Ysleta. Many of these Indian names are obvious Maso Indian names and are mentioned in the archived reports and pertain to the pueblos of Chamizal, San José, Barrancas, Alamos Grande, San Lorenzo and Pueblos.

I have an extensive background in cultural anthropology and history, particularly related to the Puro, Maso and Ysleta Indians of the El Paso area. I have devoted more than 6 years of concentrated study of these groups and have been involved in this research, from time-to-time, since 1966. I have a B.A. in History, M.A. in Anthropology and a MPH in Health Education. I have worked with Native American communities in the United States and Latin America for over 20 years.

I wrote a chapter in the Handbook of North American Indians (Volume 9) published by the Smithsonian Institution which concerned the Ysleta Indians of Ysleta del Sur Pueblo (El Paso, Texas) but also mentioned the Puro and Maso relationships as well as the Indian community of Turquita (Las Cruces, New Mexico). I have offered my testimony as an expert witness before the Senate Indian Affairs Committee as well as before the State Legislative Committee (Austin, Texas). I have worked on several claims cases (Ysleta del Sur and Tonto Apache). I have more than 25 years of experience working with Indian communities in the American Southwest (primarily Arizona, Texas, Nevada, Utah, New Mexico and California).

I have been engaged in research in the Ciudad Juárez area and worked with the descendants of the Maso and Puro Indians in that vicinity - La Cienega San Joaquin (Masos) and Senec del Sur (Puro). I have an extensive experience in working with Spanish and English documents (military records, reports, and church records) and an cultural anthropologist have conducted research throughout the El Paso, Cd. Juárez and Las Cruces area.

Copyright © 1996 by Turtle River Nation Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or copied in any form.
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I believe that I am well qualified as a cultural anthropologist and historian, who has been involved in extensive research in this region, to comment on the Mancos Tiwa Tribe (PMT). They are the only tribal entity that formally recognizes (as their name implies) their tribal identity to the primary indigenous peoples of this region - the Mancos, the Piro and the Tiwa. They represent not only the survivors or descendants of those groups but a living legacy that today still is vital and alive and practices the age old traditions of the three groups. This is unlike, the descendants in Cd. Juarez who acknowledge their Piro and Mancos heritage but have lost their cultural identity and tribal government and no longer can be considered as Native Americans.

I believe that the PMT ancestry to the Las Cruces area predates the period of contact with non-Native Americans. The Las Cruces region was Mancos aboriginal territory which extended from Presidio, Texas north to the Gila River in New Mexico. The PMT are a Native American tribal group who have continued from those major tribes groups in order to survive. This was not a merging of tribes but was a gradual process of intermarriage between local tribes. Even the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur reflect this intermarriage pattern although they have retained their Tigua identity. This continuity of identity and tribal character has survived despite repeated attacks to destroy this identity that is documented through over a period four hundred years. These attacks have taken on many forms that include the following: mass sterilization programs, confiscation of tribal lands, enforcement by law which denied the right to practice native religion, war and military actions against the native people, slavery, forced labor and incarceration, forced removal from homelands, denial of traditional resources, and subjugation to alien disease (epidemics). The PMT have also been active, although less pronounced.

The cultural identity of the PMT is obvious to any competent social scientist or historian. Commencing with my first visit to the Las Cruces area in 1966, I became aware that there were two distinct groups who considered themselves "Indian" and that a split was occurring between these two peoples. The first group were often called the "Tigua" and possessed an ancestry that included not only the Mancos (Cd. Ysleta del Sur Pueblo) but the Piro of Someo del Sur and Mancos of Cd. Juarez. In Cd. Juarez I found families (as well as documents and photographs) of Mancos and Piro who were related to the PMT of Las Cruces. I also witnessed the interaction between the PMT families and those of the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur Pueblo. This interaction involved common cultural and family associations and involvement in tribal and religious observances at either location. Tigua oral history mentioned relocation of family members to Las Cruces and the acquisition of an ancient mineral paint pigment from the Las Cruces people.

I have examined the PMT genealogical records which clearly demonstrate the tribal ancestry to the Mancos, Tigua and Piro groups of the El Paso district. In fact, I have submitted newly discovered information concerning PMT history (several the Tigua archives that contain names of tribal members from the Piro Province of Someo and the Mancos Province of Baretal and San José). I have also introduced PMT members to Mancos descendants in Cd. Juarez.

The PMT are a Native American tribal entity who have genealogical and cultural roots to the three base cultures. The PMT are an active tribe that represents a long historical tradition of self-governance that has been recognized by the US Government (BIA Indian School, Indian Scouts for the US Army), State of New Mexico (New Mexico militia), and the governments of Mexico (tribal lands and rights) and Spain (tribal lands and rights). This legacy is expressed in the tribal government, community and family life and in ceremonial and religious observances. The tenacious cultural strength of the PMT is the major factor in their survival as a viable Native American tribe.
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The Organ Mountains in Spanish times were referred to as Sierra de los Mazos. Spanish records mention that Mazo inhabited the Las Cruces region, especially the Organ Mountains. On several occasions, Spanish government officials entered that region to pay taxes for peace with the Mazos or conducted war expeditions to annihilate the Mazos. The Piro and Tiwa ancestry of the PMT is also derived from the Saline Pueblos east of Socorro, New Mexico. This is a shared ancestry with the people of Ysleta del Sur. The Federal Government (Fish Services) has recognized this ancestry as evidence in the re-instatement of human remains that were stored at the Arizona State University (Tempe). The Saline Pueblos were abandoned during the 1670’s as result of continued drought and depredations by hostile Indian groups.

The Mazos were the original Indian group in the El Paso area. The Piro and Tiwas arrived with the 1680 Pueblo Revolt as refugees (some arrived by force and other voluntarily). There were already in (1659) some Piro families in the Masno settlement at the Pass of the North who provided assistance to the first Franciscan missionary, Fray Garcia de San Francisco Yztanga. There were some Piro Indians from New Mexico (Tiwas, Piro, Tano, Tesuque) living at El Paso del Norte, prior to the Pueblo Revolt. At that early time (1659-1680), this was intermarriage between the Mazos and other Pueblo Indian peoples.

The PMT represent are Pueblo Indian. It is well documented that the Tiwas and Piro were Pueblo Indian. Also, the evidence is overwhelming that the Mazos were Pueblo Indian as well. Mexican and American records refer to the Mazos as Pueblo Indians. This was also established by Adolph Bandelier who visited the Las Cruces and El Paso del Norte region (CA. 1905) and noted the cultural compositions of the Masno with the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. These associations included clans and tribal governments.

The first recorded land transaction in the El Paso area involved the purchase of a tract of land near the Mazos mission of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe from the Mazos Indians by the Spanish government (Governor Antonio de Ocampo) in order to establish the headquarters of the government of the province of New Mexico. The original mission built by the Mazos Indians still stands today (the only El Paso Mission intact) and is the cultural composition of the Masno with the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. These associations included clans and tribal governments.

Despite the sanctions committed by the Spanish Government on the Mazos, Tiwas and Piro peoples, that government was more tolerant and protected Indian rights (especially land) than did the Mexican and American governments. In fact, the three groups maintained their sovereignty and land during the two hundred year period of Spanish rule.

The sacredness of the mountains is common among Pueblo Indians (and other Native Americans). This long tradition among the PMT is evidenced in the historical record pertaining to the Las Cruces area (Organ Mountains) and among the Tiwas, Piro and Masco pueblo of the El Paso district. I have included old newspaper references to the Mazos and their ceremonials that related to Cerro de la Bota (Saline Mountains). The Mazos Indians of El Paso del Norte made frequent pilgrimages to the mountains and the historical record demonstrates that these activities involved other clans in addition to the Guadalupe (San Juan) Indians. In fact, Mexican authorities attempted to terminate these mountain vigils by force.

The presence of the Mazos Mission in El Paso del Norte was Old Lady of Guadalupe. This recognition continued with the establishment of Tigua who has the same patron. PMT members traditionally have shrines to Guadalupe in their homes and the main feast was held in mid December on Guadalupe Day (Dec. 12).

I certainly concur with the analysis of Dr. Howard Campbell concerning modern PMT cultural life and community interaction which is very viable and is representative of a long tradition that has existed in the Las Cruces area for some one hundred years and can be traced to its Piro, Mioso and Tiwa ancestors. I have attended two tribal meetings and have observed the self-governance process and the spirituality and sense of community that characterize each gathering. The latter involves prayer, cleaning and reverence for mother earth. Evidence of tribal government and community interaction is well documented from the 1930's to the present (old history, newspaper articles, tribal minutes and documents and photograph albums).

Copyright © 1998 by Turtle River Nation Inc.
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The Piro Manso Tigua Tribe are the true descendants of the Piro (mainly Senecí del Sur in Cal. Juárez, Mexico), Manso (El Paso del Norte or modern day Col. Juárez, Mexico, and the Las Cruces region of New Mexico) and the Tigua (Ysleta del Sur, Texas). The PMT also acknowledge to be descendants of the Tigua and Tem Cara Indians of the Gran Quivira or Salinas Pueblos to the southeast. In this sense, so are the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur Pueblo of which the PMT are also related. The Tigua and Manso ancestry is primarily from Quail Pueblo and the Piro (or Tem Cara) is from Abo Pueblo.

The PMT have legitimate claim to the territory in southern New Mexico, especially within the Las Cruces area and Organ Mountains, which is documented in the historical and anthropological literature. This claim is through the Manso Indians who traditionally occupied the riverside region and adjacent plains and mountains from southern New Mexico to Presidio, Texas. The Organ Mountains were historically (in the Spanish period) known as The Sierra de los Mansos. Their claim to the Las Cruces area is logical and it is possible that the Manso bands may have continually hunted and gathered in this region, and from time to time lived in this region during the period from 1659 (founding of El Paso del Norte and the Manso Mission of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe). It is likely, that during periods of threat from hostile Indians (Apaches and Comanches), the Manso retreated to the El Paso del Norte area.

The ancient tradition of lighting fires on the mountains in mid December is from the Manso Indians of El Paso del Norte. This tradition is well established in the historical literature. It may originate from the lighting of fires on the site of the feast of Guadalupe and it is documented in the historical literature concerning Tortugas Pueblo in Las Cruces. This practice appears to originate from the mid-winter solstice as celebrated by the PMT.

The PMT are the only Native American group that formally recognize their Piro, Manso and Tigua heritage. In this sense, they are survivors of the Manso and Piro who are now extinct as a tribal entity. Their historic association with the Virgin of Guadalupe is from the Manso Indians of El Paso del Norte.

It is this researcher's opinion, based on the historical record and from oral history, that the Manso practiced some agriculture but relied heavily on a hunting and gathering economy and exploited the Rio Grande area from Presidio to southern New Mexico and may have extended as far north as the Gila River. At the time of contact with the White Man, culturally, they were probably Pueblo Indians but no longer lived in sedentary pueblos as did their relatives to the North (Piro and Tigua Indians).

I wish to thank the PMT Indian Tribe for their cooperation and interest in supporting my research and collaboration with Dr. Campbell.

Sincerely,

Nicholas P. Houser

Copyright © 1998 by Turtle River Nation Inc.
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Written Comment Sheet
McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Renewal
Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your input

PLEASE PRINT

DATE: January 1999

Tribal letter comments enclosed.

NAME: Louis Reybal, Governor, Piro/Manso/Tiwa Indian Tribe, Pueblo of San Juan de Guadalupe
ADDRESS: P.O. Box 56243
CITY: Las Cruces,
STATE: New Mexico ZIP CODE: 88004
PHONE NUMBER: (505) 647-5372
Area Code

Please check if you would like to receive a copy of the Final LEES (Phone Number Required for Federal Express Delivery)

Please Hand This Form In or Mail BEFORE FEBRUARY 5, 1999

Dr. Andy Vilet, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
ATTN: ATZC CSA (LEES Comments)
P.O. Box 66020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79908
Email: mcgregor@embl10.bliss.army.mil
To date, Fort Bliss has not identified any discharges into arroyo-riparian drainages, nor to unclassified tributaries, which might drain into playa lakes. Storm water Best Management Practices (BMPs) have been and continue to be implemented at all Fort Bliss facilities, including the ten Fort Bliss industrial facilities, which occur in New Mexico. These BMPs will preclude storm water impacts, and are described in the Fort Bliss Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Fort Bliss continues to monitor storm water discharges from its industrial areas, and is pursuing the development and execution of various storm water-related projects. These actions demonstrate that Fort Bliss has resolved to comply with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Storm Water regulations.
78. The text in Section 3.6.3 has been modified to point out the Army’s on-going program to evaluate each activity for compliance with New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP).

79. The text has been revised to include a discussion of the New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED), Hazardous and Radioactive Material Bureau (HRMB) regulated sites and to note that any alternative use of these properties will require coordination with the HRMB.
Mr. Andy Vliet, Commander
U. S. Army Air Defense Center
ATTN: ATZ-C-CSA
Ft. Bliss, Texas 79916

Re: Copy of letter supporting McGregor Range Land Withdrawal

Dear Mr. Vliet:

Enclosed is a copy of one of the letters we sent out in support of the McGregor Range Land Withdrawal.

If you have any questions or need further information, please call me at (505) 437-7427.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Zieler
Otero County Commissioner

RLZ/kmd

enclosure (1)
January 7, 1999

Chamber of Commerce  
Mr. Ed Brabson, President  
1301 N. White Sands Blvd.  
Alamogordo, NM 88310

Dear Mr. Brabson:

The Board of County Commissioners in Otero County are making an official statement of  
continued withdrawal of McGregor Range with the Army’s proposed action, which renewes for a  
period of 50 years beginning in 2001. McGregor Range’s boundaries as they are today.

We fully support the withdraw for continued military use. Further, we have requested  
cooperating agency status to assist in the withdrawal process of such use.

The installations are critical components of our economy and valuable to national defense. They  
are also a vital asset to Alamogordo.

Otero County fully supports the Joint Air Force Base, Fort Bliss, and White Sands Missile  
Range.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

RONNY SARDIN, Chairman

RICHARD L. ZIEGLER, Vice Chairman

TIMOTHY MCGINN, Member
80. Section 3.7.1 summarizes the surface water rights as described in the McGregor Range Water Requirements and Resources Assessment dated October 1998. Additional material from this document to include Table 6-1, Surface Water Rights Associated with McGregor Range, and the discussion of groundwater rights was included in the text of Sections 3.7.1 and 3.7.2 of the final LEIS. This new table describes 17 surface water rights held by the federal government, communities, and private individuals and organizations.

81. Long-term use and practices that have sustained cattle growers and other land uses on McGregor Range have been recognized in the legislation regarding the current withdrawal (PL 99-606) in that Section 3, Management of Withdrawn Lands, provides for grazing, protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat, control of predatory and other animals, recreation, and the suppression of brush and range fires. The Act also provides that all nonmilitary uses of withdrawn land is subject to such conditions and restrictions as necessary to permit the military use of such lands. The Army proposal for withdrawn land under each alternative incorporates the BLM’s McGregor Range RMPA that resulted from PL 99-606. In this manner, these uses are explicitly proposed for the forthcoming legislation.

82. Federal government planning is specific to each department and as a result, is often unknown to other departments. In this LEIS, the Army has included as many actions of federal, state, and local governments, as well as local organizations as could be identified. Those actions with sufficient available information were included in the cumulative effects discussion in Chapter 4 of the LEIS.
83. The Army appreciates Otero County’s comment and considered it during preparation of the final LEIS. It has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review. However, evaluation of the entire southwest as a whole is beyond the scope of the NEPA requirement relative to the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal.

84. The Army appreciates Otero County’s involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. The Army will continue to include Otero County in its development of actions subject to public or agency coordination or review under NEPA or the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA).
January 25, 1999

ATTN: ATZC-CSA
Mr. Andrew J. Vlat, DPhil
McGregor Range
Military Land Withdrawal
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Mr. Vlat:

Thank you for this opportunity to respond to the draft LEIS regarding the McGregor Range.

I opt for alternative number 6 of the draft document which suggests that Culp Canyon be designated as a wilderness area by the U.S. Congress and the irreplaceable Otero Mesa plus the foothills of the Sacramento be designated as a National Conservation area.

The many reasons for the above suggestions have been offered by the BLM, by the Sportsman from several counties and by the Ranchers who seem to have an agreement with the Sierra Club.

I comprehend why the U.S. must rent our bases to foreign governments - save US$ , but for the fox telling the hen, “Sit quietly while I have you for lunch,” is a little much!

As I understand, the German Air Force refuses to fly on Sundays, also Holloman is close to Bliss where other German nationals are stationed - thus facilitating a shuttle for those who wish to fly to Germany.

Previously, I stated that I would like to see the utilization rate data for existing Bombing, Fighter, planes bases, ranges, not only of the Air Force, but also of the Army, Navy and Marine Corps.

The U.S. Military must recognize that the Population of the US and the world is increasing while the land mass is not (if it is, it is by incremental amounts).

Therefore, better utilization of existing military areas must be made - Lands such as the Otero Mesa and surrounding areas must be returned to full public utilization.

Peg Briney
National Director-at-Large
Isaac Walton League of America

85. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

86. Existing and proposed airspace utilization relative to the Proposed Expansion of GAF Operations at Holloman AFB, New Mexico, is presented in Chapter 2 of the EIS evaluating that action. It was prepared by the USAF in April 1998. The Army utilization rates for the McGregor Range airspace are described in Section 3.2 of the LEIS.
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William F. Briney, M.D., F.A.C.S. COL USAF (RET)
1420 Hollywood Road • Roswell, New Mexico 88201
982-4069 02/27/91
2/26/91

D. Andy Vulet
Program Manager
M. McGregor Range Military Land
Withdrawal Renewal
U.S. Army, Air Defense, Artillery Center and
Ft. Bliss
Attn: ATZC-CSA
PO Box 6060
Ft. Bliss, Texas 79906
Dear Sir:

By this writing I wish to comment on your renewal on the status of the McGregor range land withdrawal renewal. The McGregor range Environmental Impact Statement offers six alternatives.

Alternative one - The Army's proposed action provides no opportunity to abate the problem of degradation of the unique environmentally valuable area and is therefore unacceptable.

Alternative five - The no action alternative is equally unacceptable as it would leave essential military ground operations in the area.

Alternative two is unacceptable as it would renew the withdrawal of Otero Mesa, the area which has great environmental value.

Alternative three and four have value in offering opportunities to protect these environmentally valuable areas but
87. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the Final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

88. Your comment was considered during preparation of the Final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

89. The Army’s proposed action continues the current public access and BLM co-management of McGregor Range.

90. The Army employs various planning cycles for different aspects of its mission. For example, the Army uses a 6-year programming cycle for operational activities with facility planning over a 20-year horizon. Doctrinal and equipment life-cycle planning can extend over a period of 40 years or more. The proposed 50-year withdrawal period encompasses each of these periods and enables long-term national security plans to rely on a stable land resource.

Different (shorter or longer) withdrawal periods would not substantially change the environmental impacts of a land allocation decision. Continuing stewardship and compliance activities would be required regardless of duration. Public and/or agency participation in ongoing environmental management activities on McGregor Range is assured through existing laws, regulations, and policies as listed in Table 1.6-1. The Army is committed to continuing public participation under NEPA as major new actions that could significantly affect the environment are proposed for the installation. The McGregor Range RMPA, jointly prepared by the BLM and the Army provides for continuing public participation. The annual RMP update informs the public of the progress made in implementing the RMPA. The Army’s INRMP and ICRMP contain provisions for agency coordination and revision as necessary every 5 years.

Continued on Next Page
90. Continued
Together, these regulatory requirements, policies, and procedures will ensure opportunities for both public and agency input into the future.
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91. We agree that more subsurface evaluation of McGregor Range is needed to better evaluate the potential for oil and gas production. As stated in the Energy and Minerals subsection (page 3.1-6) in Section 3.1.2.2 in the Land Use chapter, about 100,000 acres of the range currently are open for oil and gas leasing, subject to Army approval. No revisions to the text are necessary.

92. This issue was added to Section 1.5.2.2, Issues Identified in Scoping. The RMPA and the Proposed RMPA, Final Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, that are referenced in the Section 1.5.3, specifically address issues relative to leasable and locatable minerals. The decision to open only 100,000 acres due to suitability for leasable minerals was discussed in those documents.

93. A reference has been added to the end of the first paragraph in Section 2.1.2, as follows: “Exploration and development of mineral resources are managed by the BLM in accordance with the White Sands RMP as amended.”
94. The information on oil and gas exploration in the Tularosa Basin in Section 3.5, *Earth Resources*, is a general summary and is not intended to go into specific detail. The information was summarized from the *Minerals and Energy Resource Assessment of the McGregor Range*, August 1998, prepared for the withdrawal application. Additional information from this study is provided in Appendix C of the LEIS. However, Section 3.5.1 discusses energy resources such as oil and gas and Figure 3.5-1 shows the locations and depths of oil test wells in the McGregor Range area. The information in Section 3.5.1 was obtained from the most recent appraisals available. Obviously, when and if significant discoveries are made in the basin, the appraisals will require revision. The recent discovery on Otero Mesa, east of McGregor Range is discussed in the section and was mentioned previously in Section 3.1.2.2. We have no information on the "seismic spec shoot," but the paragraph on page 3.5-9 notes the expression of "informal" interest in future exploration by oil companies. No revisions to the text are necessary.

95. Data necessary to evaluate the socioeconomic effects of oil and gas development on McGregor Range was not available during the development of this LEIS. Information required for such an analysis includes the number of employees that would be committed to the effort, where they would reside, what their wage scale would be, when the exploration and development would take place, the amount of the oil and gas to be placed on the market, the expected market price, and the costs associated with the exploration and drilling. The geotechnical probability of the occurrence of developable deposits was discussed in Section 3.5 as summarized from the minerals and energy study (U.S. Army, 1998g) prepared for the withdrawal application.

Continued on Next Page
96. As discussed in Section 3.1.2.2, McGregor Range is closed to locatable minerals. Under the McGregor Range RMPA and the 1990 MOU between the Army and the BLM, there are provisions for 5-year reviews of the possibility of opening a portion of McGregor Range to locatable mineral exploration and development. Portions of McGregor Range are open to oil and gas and geothermal leasing and for saleable materials disposal. Additional legislative authority for minerals leasing is not required.

97. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
98. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. However, specific information regarding the proposal for widening U.S. Highway 54 along McGregor Range was not available during the preparation of this report.

---
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Written Comment Sheet
McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Renewal
Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your input

PLEASE PRINT

DATE: November 9, 1998

I would appreciate knowing how McGregor Range land, and particularly my own, will be affected by New Mexico Highway Department widening of U.S. 54 in an extension of the freeway from the Texas border.

If that is addressed in the report, I don’t find it.

Thank you for your courtesy in sending the reports and newsletter.

NAME:

ADDRESS: Marjorie F. Graham

3703 Federal Ave

El Paso, TX 79904

CITY:

STATE, ZIP CODE:

PHONE NUMBER (915) 564-7675

Please check if you would like to receive a copy of the Final LEIS (Phone Number Required for Federal Express Delivery)

Please Hand This Form In or Mail BEFORE FEBRUARY 5, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
ATTN: ATAC-LEIS (LEIS Comments)
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906
Email: mcgregor@enh10.bliss.army.mil
The Army's proposal would continue the record of sound environmental stewardship established over the past 40 years.
100. The Army's principal requirement for McGregor Range is to support ADA training, and other activities such as the USAF tactical target complex are discussed throughout the document. Table ES-3 in the Executive Summary illustrates the capability for training that requires air-to-ground surface impact areas as the Otero Mesa site. This refers to the USAF target complex. As stated in the LEIS Section 1.5.3, Other Environmental Analyses and Decisions Relevant to the Action, the USAF EIS was incorporated by reference into this LEIS. In general, the tactical target complex is discussed under each resource evaluation of Alternative 1 in this LEIS. Details of the operational and environmental impacts of the tactical target complex may be found in the USAF document. The tactical target complex is shown on Figure 2.1-1.

101. The alternatives of this LEIS include renewing the withdrawal in its current configuration or withdrawing a different amount of land. Although the No Action Alternative would allow retirees and others more access to the range, it is unlikely that any of the alternatives presented to Congress will generate activities that significantly affect retirement living in the region.

102. Under DoD policy for the use of major range and test facilities such as WSMR, evaluation of routine use for training such as conducted at McGregor Range is not permitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Location in Document (Include page and line numbers or broader information)</th>
<th>Comment and Suggested Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLT 2 Increased soil erosion from grazing permits to utilize the land for grazing their cattle. Please clarify that better grazing would not increase erosion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My vote goes for producing the amount of public land controlled by the military so other alternatives would be the best for the American people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The largest journey begins with a single step. If one by one, even the military and coal miners move towards a better future, we can move a way to live a life to build a step towards letting the American people find the true path to a better life in the military and for government who needs to be trusted! What a refreshing change that would be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
103. For safety purposes, it is necessary to keep the SDZs within the Range boundaries. Therefore, a simple shift to the west is not feasible.

104. Aircraft noise and other potential impacts from development of the tactical target complex was presented in the Final EIS, Proposed Expansion of GAF Operations at HA FB, New Mexico, April 1998.

105. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

106. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
107. The Army employs various planning cycles for different aspects of its mission. For example, the Army uses a 6-year programming cycle for operational activities with facility planning over a 20-year horizon. Doctrinal and equipment life-cycle planning can extend over a period of 40 years or more. The proposed 50-year withdrawal period encompasses each of these periods and enables long-term national security plans to rely on a stable land resource. Different (shorter or longer) withdrawal periods would not substantially change the environmental impacts of a land allocation decision. Continuing stewardship and compliance activities would be required regardless of duration. Public and/or agency participation in ongoing environmental management activities on McGregor Range is assured through existing laws, regulations, and policies as listed in Table 1.6-1. The Army is committed to continuing public participation under NEPA as major new actions that could significantly affect the environment are proposed for the installation. The McGregor Range RMPA, jointly prepared by the BLM and the Army provides for continuing public participation. The annual RMP update informs the public of the progress made in implementing the RMPA. The Army’s INRMP and ICRMP contain provisions for agency coordination and revision as necessary every 5 years. Together, these regulatory requirements, policies, and procedures will ensure opportunities for both public and agency input into the future.

108. The MOU that is incorporated in the RMPA is presented in Appendix A of the LEIS. This document is a part of the case file information that will support the legislation.

109. The FLPMA [43 CFR 1702(j)] states the purpose of a withdrawal is to limit activities in order to maintain other public values or to reserve the area for a particular public purpose or program. Minimizing public safety risks from military training and testing activities requires reserving McGregor Range from settlement, sale, location, or entry. It
Defense and the Department of Agriculture concerning use of National Forest System lands for military activity (pp. A-35 to A-38) would appear to supersede the 1971 MOU. The 1988 Master Agreement requires that the Department of Defense seek special use authorizations for military training activities on National Forest System lands (Sec. V). Further, it stipulates that those training activities are actions that require a NEPA analysis (Sec. III.B). Has the Army complied with these requirements in its training activities on Lincoln National Forest lands? We request discussion of these points; it would help clear up any misunderstandings we may have.

4. (pp. 2-4, 2-5; Figure 2.1-1, Table 2.1-1) This figure and table appear to indicate that Training Area 10 is closed to public access. Our membership has historically been granted access to this area, which has some of the most appealing scenery on McGregor Range. Will it now be off limits to the public? We would strongly oppose such a closure. Please clarify the access status of these lands.

5. (p. 2-10, lines 41-42; p. 3-1-12, lines 41-50; p. 4-1-5, lines 16-17) The analysis of recreational use of McGregor Range is flawed and misleading. For several reasons, the draft EIS underestimates the level of recreational interest in the Range:

- Up until last summer, public access to entire training areas was denied any time even a single Fort Bliss individual or contractor employee was conducting activities in any part of a training area. This policy included weekends, the time when the public would most likely seek access.

- This restrictive policy was changed last summer to allow greater public access, but the data used for the EIS analysis were collected under the old policy. Those data thus do not reflect current or future conditions.

- Members of the public who were denied access under the old policy were not always recorded as seeking access. Our members, on being denied access, have specifically asked the Fort Bliss staff to enter their name if Fort Bliss is supposed to log the request. The response has always been, no, they don’t do that.

- The process for obtaining access permits is difficult and cumbersome. It discourages the public from seeking permits. The Range Enforcement Office is an hour’s drive from many parts of El Paso. It is closed on weekends, forcing many individuals to use vacation time if they want to get a permit.

109. Continued

is incumbent upon the federal government to control public access to hazardous areas through withdrawal or transfer.

Military activities in the Lincoln National Forest were described in the Army’s EIS for the Land Use Withdrawal McGregor Range Fort Bliss, Texas, August 1977. Present military activities are described in the Draft Fort Bliss Mission and Master Plan PEIS, July 1998.

110. Figure 2.1-1 has a diagonal line hatch pattern to denote areas of public access. TA 10 is included in the portion of McGregor Range that the Army proposes for continuing public access.

111. As recognized in the comment, the policy restrictions on public access have been modified during the development of this LEIS. The Army has considered the comments received throughout the public involvement process. The data required to estimate future public use that would allow quantitative evaluation in the final LEIS are not available. All persons are required to coordinate access and use with the Range Commander (through the Range Scheduling Office) to ensure safety and to avoid interference with military missions. This procedure applies to government employees, contractors, and the public at large. Current access procedures allow concurrent use of some areas for a military mission or Army and BLM maintenance and resource survey activities, with public recreational use. Members of the public can obtain annual recreation access permits from either the Army or BLM. The Army is currently considering procedures that would be automated to the degree possible to facilitate public access while maintaining public safety.
112. The two activities mentioned (grazing and training) are compatible actions and have co-existed on Otero Mesa since 1966. This area is considered by many to be in excellent environmental condition after almost 34 years of co-use. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

113. The Army is currently considering procedures that would be automated to the degree possible to facilitate public access while maintaining public safety. The request for accompanied guests is being considered by the Range Commander.

114. Section 1.2.2.3 discusses other mission activities on McGregor Range in addition to the annual Roving Sands Joint Training Exercise (JTX). The principal mission that requires the Otero Mesa for on-going military training is the air defense training mission, in particular, the Patriot training. Figure 2.1-2 illustrates a full range of Patriot training scenarios that can be accomplished with the present land withdrawal. Figures 2.2-2 through 2.4-2 illustrate how the loss of Otero Mesa, even though it is a small area relative to the area used for Roving Sands, would significantly affect training for this critical mission.

The FLPMA [43 CFR 1702(j)] states the purpose of a withdrawal is to limit activities in order to maintain other public values or to reserve the area for a particular public purpose or program. Minimizing public safety risks from military training and testing activities requires reserving McGregor Range from settlement, sale, location, or entry. It is incumbent upon the federal government to control public access to hazardous areas through withdrawal or transfer. 
private citizens/organizations

9. (p. 3.8-12, lines 36-38) The public's ability to evaluate the adequacy of the impact analysis is compromised by the absence of information from the biological assessment. The final EIS needs to provide full details of Section 7 consultations.

10. (p. 4.8-39, lines 1-4) We strongly disagree with the statement that no mitigation measures are required. Mitigation is absolutely necessary, especially in light of the proposed increase in use of the black grama grasslands.

Further, we understand Fort Bliss is a Training and Doctrine Command post, but all training is done by Forces Command units. Apparently for this reason, Training and Doctrine Command will not fund any monitoring or mitigation of training impacts created by Forces units. This incredible catch-22 is a major impediment to sound resource management on McGregor Range.

We also understand environmental funds can be, and are at times, diverted for non-environmental projects. For these reasons, we request that the following mitigation measures be discussed in the EIS and submitted to Congress with the EIS:

a. The withdrawal legislation should commit to a yearly appropriation of environmental funds for impact monitoring and mitigation to make up for the lack of Training and Doctrine Command funds available for this purpose.

b. Congress should stipulate clearly that these funds could be used only for the above-stated purpose.

c. The withdrawal legislation should guarantee that the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan, the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan and the Integrated Training Area Management program for Fort Bliss will be funded until expiration of the withdrawal.

d. The withdrawal should be limited to a 20-year period.

e. A public oversight or participation process should be established so the public can be brought into the environmental compliance process, become aware of compliance issues, and assist, if appropriate, in their resolution.

115. Fort Bliss has been consulting with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) since 1997. The Threatened and Endangered Species section of Affected Environment (Section 3.8) explains the habitat for listed species that occur, and describes their status. Section 4.8 provides potential impacts on sensitive species of renewing the withdrawal under each of the configuration alternatives.

116. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

117. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

118. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
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Dr. Andrew Vliet
February 8, 1999
Page 5

f. The black grama grasslands should be protected through a commitment to allow either grazing or training, but not both, in any given grama grassland area. The grasslands below the mesa that are designated nationally significant should be set aside from ground disturbance, since these are among the last ungrazed grama grasslands.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Laurence Gibson
Chairman
119. The limitations of the methodology used to derive the quantitative results was expressly noted in the LEIS, Section 4.8.7.1. "The images used in the analysis represent a snapshot view of conditions for 2 days 10 years apart, and do not represent trends in vegetation cover. The number of observations over time correlates to the reliability of the trend analysis." This caveat being said, the resources being devoted to development of this monitoring program is an indication of the Army's concern for the long-term stability of this landscape not only from a natural resource management perspective but also from the requirement to have quality training lands available to support the mission.

120. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
121. The Army believes the LEIS has disclosed the potential benefits and adverse impacts of each of the alternative amounts of land that Congress could withdraw for military use. Impacts specific to current or future individual missions and locations have been or will be analyzed in project-specific NEPA documentation. Ways to improve the communication of effects on the environmental resources was considered for the final LEIS.

122. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
123. The Army employs various planning cycles for different aspects of its mission. For example, the Army uses a 6-year programming cycle for operational activities with facility planning over a 20-year horizon. Doctrinal and equipment life-cycle planning can extend over a period of 40 years or more. The proposed 50-year withdrawal period encompasses each of these periods and enables long-term national security plans to rely on a stable land resource.

Different (shorter or longer) withdrawal periods would not substantially change the environmental impacts of a land allocation decision. Continuing stewardship and compliance activities would be required regardless of duration. Public and/or agency participation in ongoing environmental management activities on McGregor Range is assured through existing laws, regulations, and policies as listed in Table 1.6-1. The Army is committed to continuing public participation under NEPA as major new actions that could significantly affect the environment are proposed for the installation. The McGregor Range RMPA, jointly prepared by the BLM and the Army provides for continuing public participation. The annual RMP update informs the public of the progress made in implementing the RMPA. The Army's INRMP and ICRMP contain provisions for agency coordination and revision as necessary every 5 years. Together, these regulatory requirements, policies, and procedures will ensure opportunities for both public and agency input into the future.

124. McGregor Range includes 18,004 acres of U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands, which are used by the Army in accordance with a MOU between the USFS and the DA, Fort Bliss. The 18,004 acres of USFS lands are not part of the withdrawal renewal. The USFS lands will continue to be used by the Army under the existing MOU. The following sentence has been added to the text. "The 18,004 acres of USFS are not included in this withdrawal renewal."
125. The proposed action and alternatives are briefly described in the Executive Summary beginning on page ES-2. More detailed descriptions of the proposed action and alternatives are presented in Chapter 2, which presents discussions regarding the responsibilities and missions that pertain to each alternative.

126. The WSMR activities that are conducted on McGregor Range are described in Section 1.2.2.3. The U.S. Army Missile Command (MICOM) elements stationed at Fort Bliss use McGregor Range on a regular basis.
127. The referenced documents are the Training Area Development Concept (TADC) and the Fort Bliss Mission and Master Plan PEIS. The following libraries received copies of these documents: El Paso Public Library; Irving Schwartz Public Library; Westside Branch Library; Branigan Memorial Library; Dell City Library; Alamogordo Library; New Mexico State University, Bramson Library; New Mexico State University, Roswell Library; University of Texas at El Paso Library; Cloudcroft Library.

128. The Executive Summary briefly describes the proposed action and alternatives, but does not discuss the resulting impacts. Table 2.7-1 in Chapter 2 summarizes the Comparison of Alternatives by Resource and Potential Impacts. Detailed discussions of the impacts resulting from the actions are presented in Chapter 4. Cost analyses to implement the proposed action and alternatives are not typically part of the NEPA process.

129. As discussed in Section 2.5, Alternative 5 - No Action, the Army fee-owned in-holdings within the lands returned to the public domain would be exchanged for public lands in TAs 8 and 32, to maintain essential infrastructure around McGregor Range Camp, the McGregor Ammunition Supply Point (ASP), and the Meyer Range Complex. Under the other five alternatives, the lands surrounding this infrastructure would remain withdrawn for military purposes, therefore, land exchanges would not be required.

130. Viable alternative locations for these facilities are not known at this time. However, it is known that should Alternative 5 be implemented, these ranges would no longer be useable for military purposes. Cost analyses of implementing the alternatives are not typically part of the NEPA process.

131. A detailed discussion of the Culp Canyon WSA and NCA designation are provided in Section 2.6. As stated in Section 2.6, these designsations would be concurrent with or follow congressional action on the Army’s application for renewal of the land withdrawal.
Continued

132. Military and nonmilitary activities, including restoration and remediation of contaminated areas, would continue under Alternative 1. A discussion of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) is presented in Section 3.14.3.1.

133. The FLPMA [43 CFR 1702(j)] states the purpose of a withdrawal is to limit activities in order to maintain other public values or to reserve the area for a particular public purpose or program. Minimizing public safety risks from military training and testing activities requires reserving McGregor Range from settlement, sale, location, or entry. It is incumbent upon the federal government to control public access to hazardous areas through withdrawal or transfer.

134. As discussed in Section 2.5, Alternative 5 - No Action, restricted airspace above the land area could continue to be used for some aircraft training by Army aviation and USAF units within the region. Section 4.2.5 discusses changes to Restricted Area airspace that could occur should all air-to-ground and ground-to-air activities be discontinued. Any of these airspace actions would follow congressional action on the McGregor Range LEIS and would be evaluated under a separate NEPA process.

135. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
136. The LEIS compares the existing conditions on McGregor Range to the conditions that would exist if the alternatives were implemented. Implementation of the alternatives would not change the conditions of the existing geological resources. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

137. The FLPMA [43 CFR 1702(j)] states the purpose of a withdrawal is to limit activities in order to maintain other public values or to reserve the area for a particular public purpose or program. Minimizing public safety risks from military training and testing activities requires reserving McGregor Range from settlement, sale, location, or entry. It is incumbent upon the federal government to control public access to hazardous areas through withdrawal or transfer.

138. The Army water rights on the Sacramento River and Carrisa Springs pertain to the diversions for the McGregor Range pipeline systems, primarily for livestock, although the stated use is for preservation of wildlife. This system, originally constructed by ranchers, has been in place since the turn of the century, and, in all probability, will continue to be tied to McGregor Range, which is what the LEIS says here. However, any decisions or determinations regarding those rights will be up to the New Mexico State Engineer, not the military; nor is it the intent of the LEIS to suggest to the BLM how to conduct their business. We are not aware of any "additional stockpiled military water rights... not within McGregor Range," nor was any reference to such found in the State Engineer's files. No revisions to the text are necessary.

139. A more detailed discussion of the extent and types of cultural resources on McGregor Range is presented in Section 3.9 and Appendix E. In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and common practices to protect these resources, a map summarizing their location has not been provided.

Continued on Next Page
140. The Army cantonment facilities have been concentrated at Fort Bliss proper and the three range camps: McGregor, Doña Ana, and Orogrande which is in the north of the Doña Ana Range–North Training Areas. While principally for supporting troops when they undergo field training, these camps have a small cadre of personnel stationed at them. All three of these range camps are in New Mexico. Section 3.5 discusses the probable level of energy resources on McGregor Range. The employment of the mining sector (including oils and gas) is presented in Table 3.10-4 while the earnings of this sector are shown in Table 3.10-7. The secondary employment attributable to this sector of the three-county economy is also presented in Table 3.10-6.

141. It is not known that the impacts would be significant. Therefore, no revisions to the text are necessary.

142. As stated in Section 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4, the Secretary of the Army would prepare a written determination concerning the contamination of the returned lands with explosive, toxic, or other hazardous substances. The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, would decide what decontamination, if necessary, is economically feasible given different potential future use and relative risk. Alternatively, the Secretary of the Interior could decide not to accept certain areas due to future liability, thereby necessitating transfer to the Army. Cost analyses of cleanup are not typically part of the NEPA process.

143. The noise impacts resulting from the approved USAF tactical target complex and the possible helicopter training range are discussed in Section 4.12.1. The land use compatibility guidelines are set for human activities. The guidelines were issued by the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON), which is composed of representatives from the DoD, U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), EPA, and the Veterans Administration. A brief discussion of land use compatibility is presented in Appendix F, Section F.1.3.
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144. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

145. The Army has an on-going evaluation of the ordnance and explosive hazards on McGregor Range, and will continue with studies and pursue clean-up actions to the extent resources are available. Potential hazards to public safety associated with the granting of public access in portions of McGregor Range, such as in the Tularosa Basin, may preclude return of this area to the public domain, necessitating transfer of that land to the Secretary of the Army for future clean-up. The text will be modified to reflect this circumstance.

146. The Army complies with all federal, state, and local hazardous materials laws and regulations. In some instances, Army procedures are more conservative than the federal, state, or local regulations.

147. The types and uses of hazardous chemicals used on McGregor Range are discussed in Section 3.14.1. McGregor Range is not used for the testing or training of chemical munitions.

148. The principal military mission on McGregor Range is training. Air defense training conducted at McGregor Range is essential to the nation’s security. Portions of McGregor Range, such as the Class C Bombing Range, are currently used for other service training. The use of the USAF tactical target complex on Otero Mesa is discussed in Section 2.1.1 and shown on Figure 2.1-1.

149. Explanations were added to Section 1.2 and the glossary.

150. The FLPMA [43 CFR 1702(j)] states the purpose of a withdrawal is to limit activities in order to maintain other public values or to reserve the area for a particular public purpose or program. Minimizing public safety risks from military training and testing activities requires reserving

Continued on Next Page
150. Continued

McGregor Range from settlement, sale, location, or entry. It is incumbent upon the federal government to control public access to hazardous areas through withdrawal or transfer.

Military activities in the Lincoln National Forest were described in the Army's EIS for the Land Use Withdrawal, McGregor Range Fort Bliss, Texas, August 1977. Present military activities are described in the draft Fort Bliss Mission and Master Plan PEIS, July 1998.

151. The Army employs various planning cycles for different aspects of its mission. For example, the Army uses a 6-year programming cycle for operational activities with facility planning over a 20-year horizon. Doctrinal and equipment life cycle planning can extend over a period of 40 years or more. The proposed 50-year withdrawal period encompasses each of these periods and enables long-term national security plans to rely on a stable land resource.

Reasonable capabilities of McGregor Range to support requirements for future training were described in Alternative 1. The capabilities to support the possible future activities other than those with completed or on-going NEPA documentation shown on Table 2.1-4 may or may not become actual missions performed on McGregor Range and are not projected as such. They are discussed in consideration of the Army's long-range planning objectives and full disclosure of these potential uses of withdrawn land.

152. Under Alternative 1, the withdrawal of McGregor Range would be renewed under the same conditions as provided in PL 99-606. The boundaries of the range would remain the same, as would current and projected activities. Figure 2.1-2 represents existing target flight areas and SDZs as well as the SDZ required to use a tactical ballistic missile as a target for Patriot training, should the Army propose do so in the future. Figure 2.1-1 illustrates the military land use potential

Continued on Next Page
152. Continued

for each training area on McGregor Range. This potential is consistent throughout each alternative as the action and alternatives evaluated relate to the withdrawal configuration.

153. The potential use is based upon the capabilities of McGregor Range. The uses considered are conceptual and may or may not occur, dependent upon the needs of the Army in the future.
154. Geothermal resources in southern McGregor Range are being explored, and installation of a geothermal binary generation and desalination plant is under consideration as an alternative energy source for the installation under the Army's geothermal energy program. It is also being considered as a potential source of water for the McGregor Range Camp following desalination.

155. The following text has been added to Section 2.1.2, "Should oil and gas exploration occur on McGregor Range lands that are available for oil and gas leasing, the activities would be managed by the BLM in accordance with the White Sands RMP (BLM, 1986a)."

156. This table presents the results of the impact analyses that were conducted for each resource and alternative. No change to the text is required. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final EIS.

157. Oil and gas operations on designated areas of McGregor Range are managed by the BLM in accordance with the White Sands RMP.

158. The analyses of the socioeconomic impacts of the alternatives indicate that Alternatives 1 through 4 would not have an economic impact on the area because military employment and purchases would not change significantly. Under Alternative 5, there would be a minor impact due to reduced military employment and purchases.
158. The NEPA process for the LEIS analyzes the environmental impacts to the existing environment resulting from implementation of the current withdrawal configuration and alternatives to the amount of land withdrawn. The environment has already been altered from its original or pre-McGregor Range state. The description of the existing environment represents the cumulative effects from all actions, natural and man-made up until 1996.

160. The Army water rights on the Sacramento River and Carrisa Springs pertain to the diversions for preservation of fish and wildlife and additionally is used to support livestock grazing. The McGregor Range pipeline system, originally constructed by ranchers, has been in place since the turn of the century, and is used to support natural resource management responsibilities of the Army and the natural resource and nonmilitary activity management responsibilities of the BLM as specified in the 1990 MOU between the two agencies.

161. The referenced section describes existing rights-of-way (ROWs). Access and ROWs are further described along with the existing procedures affecting energy and mineral development may be found in Section 3.1.2.2. Should oil and gas operations occur in the future, they would be managed by the BLM subject to the Army's concerns for the compatibility of military missions and public safety.

162. The environmental evaluation and clearance process includes the conduct of archeological surveys. Roving Sands FTX sites are rotated to minimize the disturbance to areas and to prevent the disturbance of the area to a point that it is unable to recover naturally.

163. The buffer zone to the USAF tactical target complex is required to ensure safety during the use of inert/subscale munitions whereas only inert munitions are used on the McGregor Class C Bombing Range.

The potential increase in the number of FTX sites on Otero Mesa and along U.S. Highway 54 is discussed in Section 3.1.7-20 – 3.1-1148. The U.S. Army and Bureau of Land Management are in the Livestock Business as detailed here. This should be left solely to the local ranchers or the area should be completely withdrawn. Do not allow state grazing contractor put their animals in quarantine to reduce the risk of non-native plant species introduction or weed wash the hauling trailers.

165. 3.1-13/38 – 3.1-14/10 Special Management Areas
ACEC's and WISA's should be very temporary designations limited by a set time frame. The ARM/BLM should be required to get these areas approved as Wilderness Areas, National Grasslands or other such legislatively approved designations.

166. 3.1-19/35 – 3.1-20/3 General statements about the viability of livestock operations (not needed), all lead to the observation...
163. Continued

2.1.1 and Table 2.1-4. Figure 2.1-4 illustrates the areas on McGregor Range that meet the physical and operational requirements for controlled access FTX sites.

164. Although ROWs are not required for infrastructure constructed by the Army on McGregor Range, the Army must comply with NEPA and other environmental regulations that require environmental assessments and studies.

165. Grazing on McGregor Range is managed by the BLM. BLM procedures that affect grazing on McGregor Range may be found in the McGregor Range RMPA (BLM, 1990).

166. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS.

167. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS.

168. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS.
168. That small (mom & pop) ranching operations are not economic. It appears the U.S. Government wants each family unit today to work 2 jobs in the city/metroplex to get by, leaving the range land for big business or the environmentalists.

169. The text in the Land Use section was modified to add a cross reference as follows: "Additional information regarding mineral and energy resources is provided in Section 3.5, Earth Resources, and Appendix C."

170. The referenced section is describing the feature categories of aesthetic and visual resources. A description of the existing aesthetics and visual resources is presented in Section 3.1.5.1 and 3.1.5.2. All the buildings are not painted a specific color, but rather are maintained to fit the cultural landscape and remain as unobtrusive as is practical.

171. McGregor Range pipelines date from the early 1900s, prior to requirements for ROWs and archeological surveys. However, about 30 percent of the range has been surveyed for cultural resources as discussed in Section 3.9.

172. The sewage treatment lagoons on McGregor Range are not netted to protect birds. In fact, the lagoon at McGregor Range Camp has become a miniature wildlife refuge, abounding in birds. Range facilities are in compliance.

173. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final EIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

174. However, as stated in Section 3.1.2.2, ROWs are not required for infrastructure constructed by the Army within McGregor Range, such as telephone or utility distribution lines. Yes, ROWs are granted for commercial telephone or utility lines originating off-range that enter onto the range.

175. Four wells in Texas, 6 to 10 miles from the McGregor Range boundary, were not included on the figure. Since completion of the Draft LEIS, the geothermal test wells have been located by the Global Positioning System (GPS). The wells will be added to Fig. 3.5-1.
176. The production values in the table are shown in actual dollars, a common practice, rather than in current dollars. Reserve figures were not available.

177. Collection and analysis of data as recommended are beyond the scope of the LEIS and the *Mineral and Energy Resource Assessment* (U.S. Army, 1998g), prepared by Mariah and Associates and the New Mexico Bureau of Mines and Mineral Resources, for the application to renew the McGregor Range land withdrawal.

178. The comment is technically correct, but the use of "Tularosa Basin" is not incorrect. The Tularosa Basin (or Tularosa Valley) is a formally recognized geographic feature having surface expression, in addition to being a geologic structural feature. The Orogrande basin is not recognized as a geographic feature, although it is a geologic structural feature. In order not to confuse a mostly nontechnical audience, "Tularosa Basin" will be retained as a geographic location, but the sentence will be reworded to read, "Paleozoic source and reservoir rocks underlie the Tularosa Basin...."

179. "Numerous...wells" will be replaced with "several." The information on oil and gas exploration in the Tularosa Basin in the LEIS is a general summary and does not go into specific detail. The information was obtained from the most recent appraisals available.

180. The comment is unclear. The referenced statement neither says nor infers that the Otero Mesa-Diablo Plateau is entirely underlain by the flanks and core of the Pedernal uplift. As for the abundance of source rocks, there does appear to be disagreement in opinion between LEIS sources (Black, 1975; King and Harder, 1985) and the reviewer.

181. The comment is valid for the referenced part of the paragraph; however the second half of the paragraph does acknowledge the possible presence of smaller reservoirs and the optimism generated by recent exploration.
182. A discussion of raptors in the Hueco Mountains has been added to the text.

183. Most of the 21 historic resources are identified and discussed in Appendix E, Cultural Resources, of the LEIS. The water pipelines and dirt tanks on McGregor Range probably are not considered historical architectural resources because the original pipelines have been rebuilt and expanded several times. Some of the older tanks may still exist in their original form, although most have been rebuilt or are destroyed.
This first Draft Otero County Comprehensive Plan (March 1998) is currently being reviewed by the State of New Mexico. Following approval by the State, the Plan will be finalized by the county planning commission and the citizen working group. Then the County Commission will vote on adopting the Plan. Once adopted, the Plan would reflect the county’s official policy and recommended use of lands within its boundary (excluding municipalities). The Plan would provide a basis for evaluating the effects of proposed activities on the public lands relative to the county’s goals for land use and development. Public lands would continue to be managed by their appropriate state and federal land managers in accordance with all applicable land management and environmental laws.

The potential environmental impacts resulting from the USAF tactical target complex on Otero Mesa are summarized in Section 4.5.1.2. More detailed evaluation is presented in the Final EIS, Proposed Expansion of German Air Force Operations at HAFB, New Mexico.

Thank you for your comment.

The NEPA requires a 45-day minimum comment period for a Draft EIS.

Several of the documents referenced in the LEIS such as the Mineral and Energy Resource Assessment of the McGregor Range (U.S. Army, 1998g), the McGregor Range Water Requirements and Resources Assessment (U.S. Army, 1998f), the McGregor Range Land Use Study (U.S. Army, 1998e), the McGregor Range Economic Report (U.S. Army, 1998m), the Fort Bliss TADC (U.S. Army, 1998d), the Fort Bliss INRMP (U.S. Army, 1998b), the Fort Bliss ICRMP (U.S. Army, 1998c), and the Fort Bliss Mission and Master Plan PEIS (U.S. Army, 1998a), were provided to the following libraries: El Paso Public Library; Irving Schwartz Public Library; Westside Branch Library; Branigan Memorial Library; Dell City Library; Alamogordo Library; New Mexico
Continued

State University, Branson Library; New Mexico State University, Roswell Library; University of Texas at El Paso Library, Cloudcroft Library. In addition, other documents referenced in the EIS have been provided to various area libraries by the agencies that prepared them such as the USAF.
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MR. RUFFENACH: Let me begin by welcoming everyone this evening. This is a public hearing on the McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement. My name’s Ron Ruffenach and I will be facilitating this evening’s meeting.

This hearing is being held in accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, and the regulations that are published by the Council on Environmental Quality. The purpose of this hearing is to receive your comments about the adequacy of the environmental analysis and the environmental impacts associated with the proposals that were studied in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement, or DLEIS.

Before proceeding with the overview briefings this evening, I would like to explain my role. I do work for the U.S. Army. I have had no involvement in the development of this document, however, my role this evening is simply to facilitate this meeting and to have a fair, ordinary and impartial hearing, and more importantly, to provide everyone who would like to speak an opportunity to do so.

This hearing will be conducted in two parts. The first part will begin with a brief presentation by the Army and the Bureau of Land Management. Dr. Andy Vilet and Mr. Tim Sanders will discuss the findings of the DLEIS and the importance of your participation at this hearing, whether by
providing oral or written comments tonight, or by simply
listening to our presentations and providing your comments
later.

The second part of the hearing takes up the remainder
of the evening. This will be your time to come up to the
microphone and present your comments on the draft document. In
order to accommodate everyone who would like to speak, we will
limit individual comments to five minutes. Elected officials
and their representatives will have ten minutes. The time
limits are necessary so that everyone who wants to speak will
have an opportunity to do so. If you didn’t sign up to speak
when you first arrived this evening at the registration table,
you can do so during the short break that we will take
following the presentations. The speaker cards can be found at
the registration table.

However, if you do not wish to speak, we encourage
you to submit your comments in writing and we will give more
information on that later, as to when the comment period ends
and where you can mail those comments. Comment forms, there’s a
table here to my right where you can get those comment sheets
and it has an address on there where you can mail those back to
us. We’ll be talking more about that later on in the evening.

We will take, again, a short break between the
presentations and the actual comment period, so that if you
have any questions that you want to get clarified from any of
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the speakers, you can do so at that time. I would like to now introduce our presenters. Dr. Andy Vliet, the program manager for the McGregor Range Renewal and Mr. Tim Sanders is the interagency coordinator for the BLM Las Cruces field office.

Also with us we have a court reporter this evening because the proceedings for this evening's meetings are documented and do in fact become part of the final record. With that, I will turn the meeting over to Dr. Andy Vliet with the presentation on the Draft LEIS. If I could please have the lights down.

DR. VLIET: Thanks, Ron. As he said, my name is Andy Vliet, I'm the program manager for the McGregor Range Renewal. I'm the guy behind the mailings that you may have been getting. And I've been fortunate to meet with a lot of you in circumstance less formal, maybe over coffee or something like that here in town.

Tonight I'm going to briefly discuss the results of the Environmental Impact Analysis that we've undertaken over the past year. But before I get into that, I'd like to take a minute and go over a little bit of background on the McGregor Range Land Withdrawal process, of which this Draft LEIS is a part.

The Military Land Withdrawal Act of 1986 authorized the use of McGregor Range for military purposes through the year 2001, and requires, among other things, preparation of an
Environmental Impact Statement to address the effects of
continuing the withdrawal, in this case for 50 years until
2051, if there is a continuing need for the range.

The Army believes that there is a continuing need for
the military training and testing activities that take place on
this range, and has filed an application for extension of the
withdrawal. The application includes several studies and
reports in addition to the LEIS. These studies and reports are
submitted to the Department of the Interior and comprise the
case file for renewal of the land withdrawal.

That information, including proposed legislation
prepared by the Army and BLM, has been transmitted to Congress
for legislative action prior to November 2001. Congress makes
a decision, through its legislation, on the future of McGregor
Range. The Draft LEIS serves as a tool to evaluate
environmental effects of renewing the existing military land
withdrawal and the alternatives.

So with that as background, I'd like to provide you
with a summary of the findings of our Environmental Impact
Analysis for the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range. We
examined six alternatives, including our proposed action to
renew the withdrawal that currently exists and the no action
alternative, to let the withdrawal expire and the land return
to the public domain, that are currently subject to the
Military Lands Withdrawal Act.
We also did an analysis of environment impacts of
four other alternatives to the proposed action, including one
that was proposed during scoping. Each alternative describes
different portions of McGregor that Congress could renew and
what lands could return to the public domain.

The Army has been conducting studies to identify
potential contamination on McGregor Range. Prior to the return
of currently withdrawn land under any alternative, the
Secretary of the Army would need to prepare a report on lands
that may be contaminated with explosive, toxic or other
hazardous substances, and then decide, in conjunction with the
Secretary of the Interior, what level of cleanup is feasible
given different future uses and relative risks.

Following this decision, the Army would continue with
studies and pursue cleanup actions at McGregor Range to the
extent resources are available. The LEIS alternatives are
compared to the existing or baseline environment in 14 broad
categories of environmental resources, including land use,
water resources, biological resources, noise, cultural
resources and socioeconomics. Here’s a summary highlighting
the main findings of our environmental analysis for each of the
six alternatives.

Under Alternative 1, the proposed action, Congress
would renew the McGregor Range land withdrawal under the same
conditions as provided for in Public Law 99-606. McGregor
Range currently encompasses approximately 697,472 acres of land, 608,000 of which are withdrawn under Public Law. The Army owns 71,000 acres in fee and uses 16,000 acres of U.S. Forest Service land as a safety buffer for ground training. This additional acreage is not included in the withdrawal but would continue to be used through an agreement with the Forest Service. There would be no change for the McGregor Range boundary under the proposed action.

If Alternative 1 is chosen, impacts to environmental resources will not change significantly from current conditions, but there could be a slight increase in water demand on public supplies in El Paso if use of McGregor Range Camp increases during the renewal period. Land management would continue as present, including continuation of nonmilitary land uses and the beneficial effects of the regional economy.

Operationally, military activities would continue and could expand in the future as additional training needs arise. Any potential new military uses of McGregor Range would require additional project-specific environmental analysis.

Under Alternative 2, McGregor Range, the renewal of McGregor Range would only include the Tularosa Basin and Otero Mesa portions of McGregor Range. This is about 698,000 acres of public land. Under this alternative, the land returned to the public domain would total about 40,000 acres, it includes...
the Sacramento Mountain Foothills portion of McGregor Range,
and public land in the Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area. The
Army would retain the fee-owned lands within the area returned
to public domain for specialized training.
Selection of this alternative would result in an
increase in public access to the Sacramento Mountain Foothills
area for nonmilitary users. There would be no significant
impacts to resources, such as biological resources or to public
safety. Impacts to military operations would include a 33%
reduction in Patriot Missile training scenarios, a reduction in
military ground activities in the Sacramento Mountain
Foothills. Training on Army owned land would continue.
Under Alternative 3, the withdrawal would include
approximately 429,000 acres of public land. This is in the
Tularosa Basin of McGregor Range. The area returned to the
public domain, about 180,000 acres, would include public land
on Otero Mesa and in the Sacramento Mountain Foothills portion
of McGregor Range. Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area and the
McGregor Black Grama Grassland Area of Critical Environmental
concern would be returned.
The withdrawn area of McGregor Range would encompass
areas within the Tularosa Basin and the escarpment of Otero
Mesa. Army owned property within the lands returned to the
public domain would be retained by the Army for specialized
training.
If Alternative 3 is selected, military activity on Otero Mesa would be reduced. The tactical target complex for Holloman Air Force Base would no longer be used, resulting in less aircraft noise for residents north and east of Otero Mesa. The airspace over McGregor Range would continue to be used for military aircraft training, however. Public access to the returned areas would increase and there would be fewer road closures of New Mexico Highway 506. There would be no significant impact to other resources.

Operationally, the military would have an 89% reduction in its Patriot Missile training scenario. There would be a reduction in field training exercise sites, on-road vehicle maneuver areas, and a reduction in ground training activities in the Sacramento Mountain Foothills and on Otero Mesa. Training on Army owned land would continue.

Alternative 4 would renew the withdrawal of about 365,000 acres for continued military use. This includes the Tularosa Basin portion of McGregor Range south of New Mexico Highway 506. This alternative would not renew the withdrawal of any portion of McGregor Range north of New Mexico Highway 506 or on the Otero Mesa.

The lands returned to the public domain, about 244,000 acres, are comprised of all the existing leased cattle grazing units in currently withdrawn land, the Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area, and McGregor Black Grama Grassland Area.
of Critical Environmental Concern. The portion of grazing unit 2 south of New Mexico Highway 506 would be exchanged for the 3 area between New Mexico Highway 506 and grazing unit three. 4 Army owned property within the lands returned to the public 5 domain would be retained for specialized training.

Environmental impacts would be the same as under 6 Alternative 3, but there would be no closures of New Mexico 7 Highway 506 for military reasons. There would be a reduction 8 in aircraft noise because the land north of Highway 506 that 9 currently has a bombing range would be returned to the public 10 domain and the military use would cease. The tactical target 11 complex for Holloman Air Force Base on Otero Mesa would also 12 cease to be used. However, military aircraft training in the 13 airspace over McGregor Range would continue.

From a military operational standpoint, impacts on 14 Patriot Missile training would be the same as under Alternative 15. There would be no military ground operations on public 16 lands on Otero Mesa and north of New Mexico Highway 506, but 17 training could continue on Army owned land within those areas. 18 Under Alternative 3, the no action alternative, there 19 would be no renewal of any portion of withdrawn lands on 20 McGregor Range. All currently withdrawn lands would return to 21 the public domain. Army owned parcels surrounded by public 22 land would be exchanged for public lands in the southern part 23 of McGregor Range to retain training capabilities and essential
infrastructure around McGregor Range Camp, McGregor Ammunition
Supply Point, and the Meyer Range Complex. The installation
facilities on McGregor Range that would have to be relocated
elsewhere include the Orogrande Range, the SHORAD Range, and
the McGregor Range Firing Complex.

There would be no further military use of the land
returned to the public domain. Restricted airspace above the
land area would continue to be used for aircraft training by
military units in the region. In addition to the environmental
impacts that would occur if Alternative 4 were selected, there
could be increased soil erosion in the Tularosa Basin portion
of the range from cleanup activities and grazing under the No
Action Alternative.

However, erosion from military activities would be
less and there would be a reduction in noise associated with
military activities. Unless public access to portions of
Tularosa Basin is restricted prior to cleanup, there could be
increased safety risks. A minor economic impact would result
from the decrease in military employment and purchases.
Operationally, the military would continue aircraft training in
the airspace above McGregor, but there would be no military
ground operations except at the south end of the range.

Alternative 6 was developed using public comments
submitted during scoping. It was suggested that Congress
designate the Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area as a Wilderness
area. In addition, it was suggested that Congress designate
the Otero Mesa and Sacramento Mountain Foothills, including
in-holdings owned by the Army, as a National Conservation
Area. The affected Army owned in-holdings would be exchanged
for other public lands within McGregor Range.

This alternative would require future Congressional
action, separate from the Army’s proposed renewal of the
military land withdrawal, and could alter management practices
associated with the area included in the National Conservation
Area. Existing grazing would continue to be available for
multiple uses, to the extent that these areas have productive
value. The land would be managed in accordance with public
land laws and Congressional specifications for the National
Conservation Area.

The area, as envisioned, could be designated along
with Alternatives 3, 4 or 5. Environmental impacts would be
the same as those that would occur if Alternative 3, 4 or 5
were selected, plus some changes to land use designations would
be required. Military operational impacts would be the same as
those under Alternative 3, 4 or 5, except that no military
training would occur within the National Conservation Area.

To sum up, the Draft LEIS did not identify any
significant environmental impacts with any of the alternatives
compared to current conditions. Operationally, the renewal is
needed to meet our nation’s training requirements now and into
the future. As I mentioned earlier, the Congressional decision for the Army's proposal will be, in effect, the record of decision for the LEIS.

Comments we receive tonight will be used to prepare the final LEIS, which is scheduled for completion by August of this year. While the Military Lands Withdrawal Act only required a draft document, we have chosen to complete a final LEIS which considers public comment on the draft. The final LEIS will be distributed to local libraries, individuals, agencies, local government and organizations. All of your comments on the Draft LEIS will be considered for the final LEIS.

Again, thank you for your time and coming out tonight and I'll be followed by Mr. Tim Sanders from the BLM.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Andy. My name is Tim Sanders, I'm the assistant field manager for the Las Cruces office of the BLM. I would like to talk to you tonight about the Bureau of Land Management's involvement in the McGregor Range EIS. McGregor Range is a part of the public lands and is administered jointly by the Las Cruces Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior and the U.S. Army, Fort Bliss.

The BLM manages McGregor Range much like the adjacent public land, providing for such uses as public access, hunting and livestock grazing. The BLM is a cooperating agency in the
McGregor withdrawal project. In this capacity, the BLM has
reviewed the draft documents and provided input for development
of the withdrawal draft EIS.

McGregor Range offers an assortment of spectacular
natural resources. McGregor Range contains three distinct
regions. Going from the lower elevation to the higher, we have
the Tularosa Basin portion of McGregor Range, we also have the
Otero Mesa portion and the Mountain Foothills. The area of
McGregor Range known as Otero Mesa and the Mountain Foothills
contain some of New Mexico’s most spectacular cultural,
recreational, livestock, wildlife and biological resources.

Otero Mesa and the Foothills contains a nationally
recognized wilderness study area, the Culp Canyon Wilderness
Study area, a black grama grassland area of critical
environmental concern and extensive deer and antelope herds.
The area also provides an important grazing resource and is one
of the few military withdrawals where the public is allowed
access. As a co-manager of McGregor Range, the BLM has focused
its management on the protection and the enhancement of these
valuable public resources.

The Bureau of Land Management worked with Fort Bliss
to develop the EIS alternatives that were presented to you
tonight. Alternative 3, which would return Otero Mesa and the
Foothills to public land status is the alternative that is most
compatible with resource values and public use interests of the
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BLM.

Under Alternative 3, Otero Mesa and the Mountain Foothills would be returned to public land status and would be available for unrestricted public uses. Congress will ultimately select the boundary for McGregor Range Withdrawal. Congress may very well select an alternative other than Alternative 3. If this occurs, five major items should be included in whichever alternative Congress ultimately selects. I would like to go over those five major items with you tonight.

The first of the five is that because of the uniqueness of Otero Mesa and the Foothills, the alternative selected must protect this valuable area.

Second, if an alternative withdrawing Otero Mesa and the Foothills is selected, the alternative must restrict the types of military missions which would be allowable on the Otero Mesa and the Foothills.

Third, the existing 1990 Memorandum of Understanding that exists between the BLM and the Army should be incorporated into whatever alternative is selected. This would ensure public access and continued natural resource management by the Bureau of Land Management. Incorporation of the 1990 ONU would clearly delineate management responsibility on the range, and would address allowable land and mineral uses, wildlife and cultural resource protection measures and livestock grazing.
practices.

Fourth, the selected alternative must ensure continued public access to the range.

And lastly, the withdrawal term should be commensurate with the foreseeable uses of the Range. The Fort Bliss Mission and Master Plan EIS indicates the military planning horizon is usually 20-years. If there is a withdrawal renewal, we believe it should be commensurate with the military’s own 20-year planning horizon.

I would like to conclude tonight by saying the public, BLM and the Army have had a long relationship on McGregor Range. This is a critical moment in determining the fate of over one-half million acres of land in southern New Mexico. It is crucial that the BLM and Army work at the local level with the public’s input and support to craft an alternative which will protect the public use and the natural resources of McGregor Range. Thank you very much.

MR. RUFINNACH: Thank you, Tim. And thank you all for your attention. We realize that this is a very complicated process and we welcome questions to clarify information and to provide additional information during a short term break that we’re going to take before we start the public comment period.

Once again, when we do return from that short break, we will begin with elected officials, followed by those who
registered in the order that they so indicated on those cards
when you came in. I will remind you, however though, that the
informal discussions that take place during the break and
following the meeting will not be documented by the court
reporter. So therefore, if you have something that you really
want included in the official record and you want considered in
comments on the draft document, you can provide those again
during the comment period at the mike or we strongly encourage
those to be provided to us in writing. And again, you can do
so by getting the address and the information from the comment
table here to my right.

Oral comments are no less important than the written
ones, so if you’re not comfortable speaking in front of others,
you can submit those, like I said, to us in writing. If you
have brought written comments, you can turn those in this
evening to me and I will make sure that they get incorporated
in the document. If you want to mail in a comment, the mailing
address is on the fact sheets that are at the different
stations. Again, the comment period ends February 9th, 1999.
Again, all those comments and all the proceedings from this
evening’s meeting and two follow-on meetings tomorrow night in
Las Cruces and Thursday night in El Paso will become part of
the final document.

And right now I’d like to limit our break, initially
we were scheduled for a 15-minute break, I’d like to limit that
to 10 minutes, if that's all right with everybody. I have 7:00
o'clock straight up, on the clock in the back of the room and
we'll reconvene at ten after, thank you.

(Recess was taken.)

MR. RUPPENACH: I'd like to begin the comment
period again for this evening. So far we have had nine people
who have expressed an interest to speak. Once we go through
those nine cards, I will do a call out in case there's anybody
in the audience who would like to make a comment. The comments
will be taken at this microphone here in the center aisle. And
when you come to that microphone, we ask that you speak very
clearly, stating your name and your address, so that that can
be documented by the court reporter.

During your comments we will give you a sign, the
lady sitting here in the front seat will show you a sign
indicating you have 30 seconds left. At that time, we'd ask
that you begin to draw your comments to a conclusion. And at
the end of five minutes, she will hold up another sign, asking
that you please stop.

Again, please restrict your comments to the document
that we're talking about, the Draft LEIS. Our first speaker
this evening is the Honorable Don Carroll, who is the Mayor of
the City of Alamogordo.

MAYOR: CARROLL: Thank you. First I'd like to
welcome you to Alamogordo and thank you for holding this public
189. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

hearing here this evening. McGregor Range is vitally important
to our community and we appreciate the opportunity to have our
community give their input for the continued withdrawal.

I would like to speak on behalf of the continued
withdrawal under Alternative 1. The City Commission recently
passed a resolution supporting Alternative 1 for the withdrawal
and I'll give you a copy of that. We feel that Alternative 1,
which keeps it as it is today, is a workable plan, it gives
maximum flexibility to the military to continue the testing and
training that they do and will allow future testing and
training missions.

The current situation is a partnership with the
public and with BLM and that has worked well in the past and we
are confident that it will continue to work that way in the
future. So I would again say that the City Commission of the
City of Alamogordo is in support of Alternative 1.

MR. RUFFENACH: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Our next
speaker is Bill Hornback.

MR. HORNBACK: I would like to hold for a minute
or two.

MR. RUFFENACH: I'm sorry, sir.

MR. HORNBACK: I'd like to hold off for a minute
or two.

MR. RUFFENACH: Our next speaker is George
Bussing. Mr. Bussing? Our next speaker is Mr. Bill Burt.
190. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

191. The potential impacts resulting from GAF operations on McGregor Range are summarized in Chapter 4 of the LEIS and presented in more detail in the Final EIS, Proposed Expansion of GAF Operations at HAFB, New Mexico. Under Alternative 1, the BLM will continue to co-manage McGregor Range, and will continue to have access to maintain the water pipelines, tanks and other improvements.
What’s going to be hurting if the German Air Force moves out there, you’re not mentioning that. In all of this, you’re not mentioning that.

There’s going to be a bumper zone around there where BLM taps into the water. I was hoping more people would talk before I said anything, but I know what’s going to happen I’ve seen deer starving. When they took McGregor Range, then before BLM took over and the ranchers, you know, they kicked the ranchers out, the water all went dry. Deer was standing out there starving, nobody cared.

When BLM took over, BLM is doing a very good job. They’re keeping water in. If you extend it where they can’t work on pipeline for five days a week during the daytime, if water goes down, your deer is going to starve, your cattle are going to starve and there won’t be anything.

In this other alternative to make it a wilderness area, without somebody maintaining the pipeline there is no water on McGregor, except for mud tanks. You give five years without cattle watering in the mud tank, a mud tank goes dry, it won’t hold. There will be no deer. There will be no antelope in the center of it, they will have to go elsewhere to get water.

BLM is doing a good job, they’re keeping everything going good, but if you make it to where they can’t get in there at any time except on the weekends, that’s not enough time. A
192. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

cow in the summertime or a deer can die within a week. And the Army does not care. The Army does not care that a well is down and stock is out of water. They have a man on 506 and they won't let me go through anytime.

That's just about all I have to say, except BLM is doing a good job and I don't think you should let the German Air Force use it. I was in the Air Force, I have nothing against the American military. I do have something against training foreign troops on our soil. And I think you've probably got some more people that's going to say something about that. But you guys are not mentioning what's going on.

Now, I think you're going to get what you want, this is not going to make any difference. We're just here because you have to do this. And you're going to do what you want to do, but a few of us are going to protest. Thank you.

MR. RUFFENACH: Thank you, Mr. Quick. Our next speaker is Colleen Van Winkle.

MS. VAN WINKLE: Hi, I'm Colleen Van Winkle and I'm with the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce and the Otero County Economic Development Council at 1301 North White Sands Boulevard here in Alamogordo. And on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce and the Board of Directors of Otero County Economic Development, we are for Alternative No. 1, the continued use of McGregor Range for both the public and the military. Thank you.
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
194. The ROD for the Final EIS, *Proposed Expansion of GAF Operations at HAFB, New Mexico*, describes rationale for the decision to place the tactical target complex on the Otero Mesa portion of McGregor Range. The MOA between the USAF and the BLM describes the agencies’ commitment to public access, grazing management, cultural resources, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), the Culp Canyon WSA, and fire management. These documents are provided in Appendix A of the LEIS.

195. Chapter 2, *Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives*, describes the activities that would or would not be included in each alternative.
196. The potential socioeconomic impacts resulting from the alternatives are presented in Section 4.10. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

197. Under Alternative 5, No Action, the withdrawal of 608,385 acres of currently withdrawn land on McGregor Range would not be renewed. There would be no further military use of the land returned to the public domain. With a decreased training capability, it is likely that a smaller number of military units and personnel will spend time at Fort Bliss. It is highly probable that decreased support will be required. Such support would include the procurement of fewer goods and services, mostly from the local economy. Additional information regarding the socioeconomic impacts of implementing Alternative 5 are presented in Section 4.10.5.
198. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

1. tired of being force fed by bureaucrats.
2. Alternative 4 is the only option that should be
3. supported. I choose this option in hopes of reducing foreign
4. military presence in New Mexico. We do not need money that
5. bad. Thank you.
6. MR. RUFFENACH: Thank you, sir. Our final
7. speaker who registered early to speak is A.R. Torres.
8. MR. TORMES: Good evening, my name is Al Torres
9. or A.R. Torres. And I'm here mainly to advise whoever wants to
10. contact me, to contact me, I know about the ranges. I was the
11. territorial maintenance on McGregor Range, Fort Bliss, agent
12. supervisor. I was on those ranges for over 30 years, I know
13. how they were used. I know exactly how they were used, every
14. inch of them. I know where it's dangerous, I know where it
15. isn't.
16. We had over 1600 miles of roads and fences
17. maintained. And right now you people may get something back,
18. Otero County may get something back, but they are not going to
19. get as much as they think. Alternative 4, if they get it,
20. they're lucky and I agree with it. We move north of 506,
21. define 506. There are two of them, define them, remove them,
22. give them to the public domain, not to wilderness.
23. If you give them to wilderness you're only making the
24. boundaries, the bordering properties rich. Timberon, Bug
25. Scuffle, Circle Cross, they become richer. Turn it back to the
public. The Army can maintain better security in the McGregor
Range by separating with 506 and the boundary that cuts across
to the Hammond Ranch. I know where they are, I know every inch
of it and I would like to see that done. Thank you. Anybody
who wants to contact me, they can do it. Thank you.

MR. RUFFENACH: Thank you, Mr. Torres. Again,
that was our final speaker who registered to speak, I will now
ask if there’s anyone in the audience who would like to make a
comment, they may do so. Please raise your hand, so I can call
you in some orderly fashion. Sir? Please again, it’s
important, since we do not have a card for you, to state your
name and your address.

MR. GOSLIN: My name is Clarence R. Goslin, Box
1083 Alamogordo. I am very much in again, they have never
mentioned the Air Force needing the bombing range out there.
if our troops need the ground out there to train on, it is
fine. For the Germans, I say no. And this 50 party went
around helping them. If they’ve got any grandkids, they better
go to thinking, instead of thinking about the dollar and go to
thinking about their grandkids because they’re going to be
fighting them again.

I don’t think that they ought to be allowed
whatevem. I think that they ought to allow the people go out
there and hunt or do whatever they like, graze their livestock
out there, county gets all the tax. That’s all.
199. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Oil and gas reserve estimates on McGregor Range are discussed in Section 3.5.

MR. RUFFENACH: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?

Not seeing any other hands or anyone interested in speaking -- excuse me, sir. Please, I'm sorry.

MR. YAHNLEY: My name is Gordon Yahnley and I'm a geologist with Harvey Yates Company. I live in Roswell, New Mexico. I'm involved in the oil and gas industry. I was partially or directly responsible for a gas discovery that's been made a couple of miles west of Alamo Mountain, which is, oh, 10 or 15 miles east of McGregor Range along the south border of the state line.

I guess I'm here as a proponent for multiple use for McGregor Range that includes oil and gas exploration. I think that the oil and gas reserve estimates that were part of the LEIS were grossly understated. And that, you know, I really wouldn't be here unless I thought that there was more oil and gas potential out there and more reserves to be found.

I think oil and gas activities are not incompatible with the McGregor Range activities, and that any alternative that is picked by the Congress or whoever should include oil and gas exploration activities as part of that legislation.

And that's basically my statement.

MR. RUFFENACH: Thank you very much, sir.

Appreciate it. Anyone else? Yes, ma'am.

MS. MILLICAN: My husband just said you're going to talk? You don't know what you're talking about. I'm Janie
200. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Millican, I live in High Rolls.

MR. RUFFENACK: Closer to the microphone.

MS. MILLCAN: Closer to the mike, okay. I live up in High Rolls and one of my concerns is that I would like to see either 3 or 4, where the Otero Mesa is not used as a bombing range or have the planes fly over. And it’s purely selfish, we moved up to the mountains in order to have quiet and when the planes come over the top of us in Hayes Canyon, we’ve had some blasts where they break the sound barrier that knocked dishes out of the counters and so on.

And I think that we need to take more into consideration, that there’s ranchers out there who are raising their children and the noise factor, because I agree with people I hear, that we have not mentioned Otero as a bombing range and yet it seems like that’s what we’re working towards. To give this, if we go with No. 1, then that gives the military the right to go ahead and use that as the Otero bombing range.

And if they do, it will impact upon the lives of the people. And I personally feel the government has way too much public land under their control.

So my opinion is that we do need to take some of that back for our use. There’s a whole of a lot of territory out there that it seems to me like they could find someplace for the German Army to drop their bombs and do their training without getting into this beautiful Otero Mesa and the other
area up there. Thank you.

MR. RUPPENACH: Thank you, ma'am. I'll do a last
call and then if I put my head down, I'll see another arm go
up. With that, that concludes our comment period for this
evening. Again, the address on the screen is most important
for those of you who wish to continue to provide us input on
the Draft LEIS. Also I would encourage you this evening to
take advantage of a number of the people who are here, who are
involved in the writing of that document.

Again, your discussions, if you want them to be part
of the permanent record, those informal discussions will not be
part of that public record. But I will ask the court reporter
to stay on for a few minutes following our meeting and if you'd
like to go up and present a comment to her directly, you may do
so. However, we really do encourage you to put your comments
in writing. You can use the forms provided on the table. And
again, the comment period closes February 9th.

On behalf of the Army and BLM, thank you for spending
time with us this evening and thank you for providing your
comments.

(Hearing adjourned at approximately 7:30 PM.)
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MR. RUFFENACH: Let me begin by welcoming you here this evening. This is a public hearing on the McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement.

My name is Ron Ruffenach, and I will be facilitating this evening’s meeting. This meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the National, NEPA, and the regulations that are published by the Council on Environmental Quality.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive your comments about the adequacy of the environmental analysis, the environmental impact associated with the proposals that were studied in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement, or DLEIS.

Before proceeding with the opening briefings, I would like to explain my role. I do work for the U.S. Army; however, I have had no involvement in the development of this document. My role here this evening is simply to make sure we have a fair, orderly and impartial hearing, and that everyone who wishes to speak has opportunity to do so.

This hearing will be conducted in two parts. The first part will begin with a brief presentation...
by the Army and the Bureau of Land Management. Dr. Andy Vliet and Mr. Tim Sanders will discuss the findings of the DEIS and the importance of your participation in this hearing, whether by providing oral or written comments tonight or simply by listening this evening and providing your comments later.

The second part of the hearing will take up the remainder of the evening. This will be your time to come up to the microphone and present your comments on the draft document. In order to accommodate everyone who wishes to speak, we will limit individual comments to five minutes. Elected officials and their representatives will have 10 minutes. The time limits are necessary so that everyone wanting to speak will have the opportunity to do so. And also, we are conducting this meeting in the exact same format and fashion that we conducted the last one last evening in Alamogordo and the one tomorrow night in El Paso.

When you signed in this evening, you were asked whether or not you’d like to speak, and we will provide everyone, even though you may not have indicated on the card, an opportunity to do so at the end of the meeting. You can also provide your...
comments to us in writing. And there is a comment

table in the left-hand corner of the room in the
back, my left, where you can take that comment sheet
and provide your comments. You can leave those here
this evening or, again, you can mail them in to the
address on that sheet. And we'll have the address
posted on screen later this evening, and we'll talk
a little bit more about the time the comment period
ends.

I'd like to now introduce our presenters. Dr.
Andy Vliet is the program manager for the McGregor
Range, New Mexico. And Mr. Tim Sanders is
interagency coordinator in the BLM Las Cruces Field
office. Also sitting up here this evening is Col.
Jeff Gault, who is the chief of staff for Fort
Bliss.

You'll also notice in the front of the room
there is a court reporter. The comments made this
evening and the complete documentation of this
meeting are going to be handled by the court
reporter, and they will in fact become part of the
permanent record. So with that, let me turn it over
to Dr. Andy Vliet.

DR. VLIET: Hi, my name is Dr. Andy

Vliet, and I'm the program manager for the McGregor
Range Renewal. I've had a chance previously to
visit with you, and it's kind of good to see you all
again.

Tonight, I'm going to briefly discuss the
results of the environmental impact analysis that we
have undertaken over the past year. But before I
get into that, I'd like to take a minute to go over
a little bit of background on the McGregor Range
land withdrawal process of which this draft LEIS is
a part.

The Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986
authorized the use of McGregor Range for military
purposes through the year 2001 and requires, among
other things, preparation of an environmental impact
statement to address the effects of continuing the
withdrawal, in this case for 50 years, until 2051,
if there is a continuing need for McGregor Range.

The Army believes that there is a continuing
need for the military training and testing
activities that take place on the range and has
filed an application for extension of the
withdrawal. The application includes several
studies and reports in addition to the LEIS. These
studies and reports are submitted to the Department
of Interior and comprise a case file for renewal of
the land withdrawal. That information, including
proposed legislation prepared by the Army and the
BLM, is transmitted to Congress for legislative
action prior to November 2001.
Congress makes this decision through legislation
on the future of McGregor Range. The draft LEIS
serves as a tool to evaluate the environmental
effects of renewing the existing military land
withdrawal and reasonable alternatives. So with
that as background, I'd like to provide you with a
summary of the findings of our environmental impact
analysis for the continued withdrawal of McGregor
Range.
We examined six alternatives, including our
proposed action to renew the withdrawal as it
currently exists, and the no-action alternative to
let the withdrawal expire and return to the public
domain lands that are currently subject to the
Military Lands Withdrawal Act.
We also did an analysis of environmental impacts
of four other alternatives to the proposed action,
including one that was proposed during scoping.
Each alternative describes different portions of
McGregor that Congress could renew and what lands
would be returned to the public domain. The Army
has been conducting studies to identify potential contamination on McGregor Range.

Prior to the return of the currently withdrawn land under any alternative, the Secretary of the Army would prepare a report on lands contaminated with explosive, toxic or other hazardous substances and then decide, along with the Secretary of Interior, what clean-up is feasible given different future uses and relative risks.

Following this decision, the Army would continue its studies and pursue cleanup actions on McGregor Range to the degree that resources are available. The LEIS alternatives are compared to the existing or baseline environment in 14 broad categories of environmental resources, including: Land use, water resources, biological resources, noise, cultural resources, and socioeconomics.

Here is a summary highlighting the minimum findings of our environmental analysis for each of the six alternatives:

Under alternative one, the proposed action—which would renew the McGregor Range land withdrawal under the same conditions as provided in public law 99-606. McGregor Range currently encompasses approximately 698,000 acres of which
600,000 acres are withdrawn under public law. The
Army owns 71,000 acres. And in addition, the Army
uses 18,000 acres of U.S. Forest land as a safety
buffer for ground training. This additional acreage
is not included in the withdrawal, but would
continue to be used through an agreement with the
Forest Service.

There would be no change to McGregor Range
boundaries under the proposed action.

If alternative one is chosen, impacts to
environmental resources will not change
significantly from current conditions, but there
could be a slight increase in water demands and
public supplies in El Paso if the use of McGregor
Range cap increases during the renewal period.

Land management would continue as present,
including continuation of nonmilitary land uses and
the beneficial effects on the regional economy.

Operationally, the military's activities would
continue and could expand in the future as
additional training needs arise. Any potential new
military uses at McGregor Range would require
additional project specific environmental analysis.

Under alternative two--which would renew the
withdrawal of the Tularosa Basin and Otero Mesa
portions of McGregor Range for continued military use. This is approximately 670,000 acres of public land.

Under this alternative, the land returned to the public domain would total about 40,000 acres, and includes the Sacramento Mountain Foothill portions of McGregor Range and public lands in the Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area.

The Army would retain fee-owned lands within the area returned to public domain for specialized training. Selection of this alternative would result in an increase in public access to the Sacramento Mountains Foothills area for non-military uses. There would be no significant impact to resources, such as biological resources or to public safety.

Impact to military operations would include a 33 percent reduction in Patriot Missile training scenarios and reduction in military ground activities in the Sacramento Mountain Foothills. Training on Army-owned land would continue.

Alternative three would renew the withdrawal of approximately 429,000 acres of public lands for continued military use. This is in the Tularosa Basin portion of McGregor Range. The area returned
to the public domain, about 180,000 acres, would
include public lands on the Otero Mesa and in the
Sacramento Mountains Foothills, portions of the
McGregor Range Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area,
and the McGregor Black Grama Grassland area of
critical environmental concern.
The withdrawn area of McGregor Range would
encompass areas within the Tularosa Basin and the
escarpment of the Otero Mesa. Army-owned property
within the lands returned to the public domain would
be retained for specialized military training.
If alternative three is selected, military
activity on Otero Mesa would be reduced and the
tactical target complex supporting Holloman Air
Force Base would no longer be used, resulting in
less aircraft noise for residents north and east of
Otero Mesa. The airspace over McGregor Range would
continue to be used for military aircraft training.
Public access of the returned areas would
increase, and there would be fewer closures of New
Mexico Highway 506. There would be no significant
impacts to other resources.
Operationally, the military would have an
89-percent reduction in its Patriot Missile training
scenarios. There would be a reduction in field
training exercise sites, on-road-vehicle maneuver
areas and reduction in ground training activities in
the Sacramento Mountains Foothills and on Otero
Mesa.

Again, training on Army-owned lands would
continue.

Under alternative four, which would renew the
withdrawal of 365,000 acres of land for continued
military use. This includes the Tularosa Basin
portion of McGregor Range south of New Mexico
Highway 506.

This alternative would not renew the withdrawal
of any portion of McGregor Range north of New Mexico
Highway 506 or on the Otero Mesa. The lands
returned to the public domain, about 244,000 acres,
are comprised of all the existing leased cattle
grazing units in currently withdrawn lands, the Culp
Canyon Wilderness Study Area, and the McGregor Black
Grama Grasslands area, a critical area of concern.

A portion of grazing unit two south of New
Mexico Highway 506 would be exchanged for an area
between New Mexico Highway 506 and grazing unit
three. Army-owned property within the lands
returned to the public domain would be retained for
specialized training.
Environmental impacts would be the same as under alternative three, but there would be no closures of New Mexico Highway 506 for military reasons. There would be a reduction in aircraft noise, because the lands north of Highway 506 that currently are used as a target complex would be returned to the public domain, and military uses would cease.

The tactical target complex for Holloman Air Force Base on Otero Mesa would also cease to be used; however, military aircraft training in the airspace over McGregor Range would continue. From a military operational standpoint, the impact on Patriot Missile training would be the same as under alternative three. There would be no military ground operations on public lands on Otero Mesa and north of New Mexico Highway 506, but training would continue on Army-owned lands within those areas.

Alternative five is the no-action alternative and would not renew any portion of withdrawn lands on McGregor Range. All currently withdrawn lands would return to the public domain.

Army-owned parcels surrounded by public lands would be exchanged for public lands in the southern part of McGregor Range through retained training capability and essential infrastructure around
McGregor base camp, the McGregor Ammunition Supply Point, and the Meyer Range Complex. The installation facilities on McGregor Range that would have to be relocated elsewhere include the Orogrande Range, the SHORAD Range, and the McGregor Range Firing Complex.

There would be no further military use of the land returned to the public domain. Restricted airspace above the land areas would continue to be used for aircraft training by military units within the region.

In addition to the environmental impacts that would occur if alternative four were selected, there could be increased soil erosion in the Tularosa Basin portion of the range from cleanup activities and grazing under the no-action alternative.

However, erosion from military activities would be less, and there would be a reduction in noise associated with military activities.

Unless public access to portions of Tularosa Basin is restricted prior to clean-up, there could be increased safety risks.

Minor economic impacts would result from the decreased military employment and purchases.

Operationally, the military would continue...
aircraft training in the airspace above McGregor Range, but there would be no military ground operations, except at the south end of the range.

Alternative six was developed using public comments submitted during scoping. It was suggested that Congress designate the Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area as a wilderness area. In addition, it was suggested that Congress designate the Otero Mesa and Sacramento Mountains Foothills, including in-holdings owned by the Army, as a national conservation area. The affected Army-owned in-holdings would be exchanged for other public lands elsewhere within McGregor Range.

This alternative would require further Congressional action separate from the Army's proposed renewal of the military land withdrawal and could alter management practices associated with the area included in the national conservation area.

The existing grazing area would continue to be available for multiple uses to the extent that these areas have productive value. The lands would be managed in accordance with public land laws and Congressional specifications for a national conservation area.

The area, as envisioned, could be designated
along with alternatives three, four and five. The environmental impact would be the same as those found in alternatives three, four and five, plus some changes to land use designations may be required.

Military operational impacts would be the same as those under alternatives three, four and five, except no military training would occur within the national conservation area.

To sum up, the draft LEIS did not identify any significant environmental impacts for any of the alternatives compared to current conditions.

Operationally, the renewal is needed to meet our nation’s training requirements now and into the future. As I mentioned earlier, a Congressional decision on the Army’s proposal will be, in effect, the record of decision.

Comments we receive tonight will be used to prepare the final LEIS which is scheduled for completion by August of 1999. While the Military Lands Withdrawal Act only required a draft document, the Army has chosen to complete a final LEIS which considers public comments on the draft LEIS.

The final LEIS will be distributed to local libraries, individuals, agencies, local governments.
and organizations. All of your comments on the
draft LEIS will be considered for the final one.
Again, thank you for your time in coming out	onight. I'll be followed by Tim Sanders from the
BLM.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Andy.
I appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak
with you tonight. My name is Tim Sanders. I'm the
assistant Field Office Manager for the Las Cruces
Field Office of BLM.
I would like to speak to you tonight about the
BLM's involvement in the McGregor Range EIS.
McGregor Range is a part of the public lands
administered by the Bureau of Land Management and
the U.S. Army, Fort Bliss.
The BLM manages McGregor Range much like
adjacent public lands, providing for such uses as
public access, hunting and livestock grazing.
The BLM is a cooperating agency in the McGregor
withdrawal project. In this capacity, the BLM has
reviewed the draft EIS and provided input for the
development of the withdrawal EIS.
McGregor Range offers an assortment of
spectacular natural resources. McGregor Range
contains three distinct regions. Going from the
lower elevations to the higher, we have the Tularosa Basin portion of the McGregor Range. We have the area known as the Otero Mesa. And in the higher elevation, the Mountain Foothills.

    The area of McGregor Range known as Otero Mesa and the Mountain Foothills contain some of New Mexico's most spectacular cultural, recreational, livestock, wildlife and biological resources. Otero Mesa and the foothills contain a nationally recognized wilderness study area, a Black Grana Grassland Area of Critical Environmental Concern, and extensive deer and antelope herds.

    The area also provides an important grazing resource, and is one of the few military withdrawals where public access continues to be allowed.

    As co-manager of McGregor Range, the BLM has focused its management on the protection and enhancement of McGregor Range's valuable public resources. The BLM worked with Ft. Bliss to develop the BIS alternatives.

    Alternative three is the most compatible with the resource values and public use interests of the BLM. Under alternative three, Otero Mesa and the Mountain Foothills would be returned to public land status and would be available for unrestricted
public use.

Congress will ultimately select the boundaries for the McGregor Range withdrawal. Congress may very well select an alternative other than alternative three. If this occurs, there are five major items that should be addressed in whichever alternative is ultimately selected.

I would like to go over these five items with you.

Number one, because of the uniqueness of Otero Mesa and the Foothills, the alternative selected must protect this valuable area.

Second, if an alternative withdrawing Otero Mesa and the Foothills is selected, the alternative must restrict the types of military uses which would be allowed on Otero Mesa and in the Mountain Foothills.

Third, the existing 1990 memorandum of understanding between the BLM and the Army should be incorporated into the alternative. This would ensure continued public access and continued natural resource management by the BLM. Incorporation of the MOU would clearly delineate management responsibility and would address allowable land and mineral uses, wildlife and cultural resource
Fourth, the selected alternative must ensure continued public access.

Lastly, the withdrawal term should be commensurate with the foreseeable uses at McGregor Range. Fort Bliss’ own mission and master plan indicates the military planning horizon is usually 20 years. If there is a withdrawal renewal, it should be commensurate with the military’s own 20-year planning horizon.

In conclusion, I’d like to say that the public, the BLM, and the Army have had a long relationship on McGregor Range. This is a critical moment in determining the fate of over one-half million acres of land in southern New Mexico. It is crucial that the BLM and Army work at the local level with the public’s input and support to craft an alternative which will protect public use and also protect the natural resources which occur on McGregor Range.

Thank you very much.

MR. RUPPENACHER: Thank you, Tim. And thank you all for your attention. We realize this is a very complicated process, so we are going to take about a 10-minute break at this point in time.
so that those of you who have expressed an interest
to speak can have some discussions or get some
points clarified with the presenters this evening.

Before we do that, I'd like to just once again
go over a few of the items related to the comment
period. Again, our focus is to listen to your
comments on the draft document; so, therefore, we
would like your comments this evening to pretty much
focus on the document itself.

If you want to make oral comments, again you can
do so, and we will be calling folks up to the
microphone in the order in which they registered.
Once again, if you are shy of standing up to the
microphone, you can provide your comments in
writing, and we will be taking these comments
through February 9th. And I think there is a slide
at the end of the presentations this evening that
has the address on it. But I also think the
handouts that are around the room also reinforce
that.

Again the speakers this evening will be asked to
limit their comments to five minutes. And again we
ask that if you are going to plan on commenting, and
you haven't done so, will you please fill out a
card. Currently, we have five people who have
expressed an interest to speak.
Oral comments are no more or less important than the written ones. And again, all of these comments will be incorporated into the final document.
At this point in time, I'd like to go ahead and take about a 10-minute break, and I'll call everyone back in about one minute before we're ready to begin, and then we'll have the comment period.
Thank you.
(A recess was taken.)
MR. RUFFENBACH: As I said before the break, we have five speakers who have indicated an interest in speaking this evening. And again, we will ask that you limit your comments to five minutes.
My associate here in the front will give you a 30-second warning sign. We'd ask you to try to draw your comments to conclusion, begin drawing your comments to conclusion at that time. Again, we are conducting these meetings in a format, a similar format at each of the three locations. So in the interest of being consistent, we've allowed five minutes at the other locations, and we will do that again tomorrow evening in El Paso.
As we said earlier, also, the meeting is in fact
201. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
alternative allows Congress to designate the Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills, which includes Culp Canyon Wilderness Study area as a National Conservation Area with its Culp Canyon WSA as BLM wilderness.

NCA designation would take Otero Mesa and the Mountain Foothills off the market. I say "off the market," because the military solicits customers and tenants for its ranges. Foreign governments and multinational forces can choose from those sites which are said to be available. Cost is the major factor.

Presently, the German Air Force wants to use Otero Mesa grasslands to construct a bombing range tactical target complex. Japan wants to continue to use the Otero Mesa grasslands as the buffer zone for live Patriot missile training. The U.S. Army wants to use the grasslands for Patriot missile training.

While the public presently uses the area for its historic uses--grazing, hunting and recreation--and desires to continue to do so. There are alternative sites for military activities, but they cost more to use.

Otero Mesa and the Mountain Foothills, with its Culp Canyon Wilderness area, qualifies as a national
Conservation area because it is unique: It is a National Historic Landscape with national historic and archeological sites. It has vast grasslands and mountain ecosystems. It has unique populations of plants and animals, including eagles, fox, prairie dog towns, aplomado falcons, and unique cacti and tall yucca.

It has unique topography. Otero Mesa is 1200 feet above the Tularosa Basin floor. The Mountain Foothills rise above the mesa and provide spectacular views of two states—Texas and New Mexico.

It has grazing units with no resident ranchers, and thus can be managed for the best interest of the natural resources. It is presently managed for historic uses—grazing, hunting and recreation.

It can be and should be managed as a showcase for the historic custom and culture of southern New Mexico, an historic landscape where ranchers fought the military, where their homes, corrals, wells and cisterns, and gravestones still exist.

The unique tall yucca habitat, which is the nesting habitat for the endangered aplomado falcon, is presently used as a buffer zone for live Patriot Missile training. Every time a missile lands, it

202. Comment considered.
causes a hot range fire. Hot fires are caused by burning propellants; cold fires are naturally caused by lightening fires. But on the ground, it is easy to see the difference. These fires need to be stopped. The buffer zone should be eliminated. There are alternative sites for the training.

Hunting seasons are regulated by the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, which also regulates hunting on the DOD-personnel-only hunting area. Pronghorn herds are uniquely large and docile, and hunts are limited to the use of antique muzzle-loaded guns and bows and arrows.

The Culp Canyon Wilderness Study area was not initially recommended for wilderness status solely because of the temporary withdrawal under BLM/U.S. Army Fort Bliss joint management. This temporary withdrawal of Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills areas of McGregor Range should not be renewed, and Congress should act to permanently resolve public versus military conflicts.

For these reasons, the LRIS includes alternative number six, the designation by Congress of the Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills NCA, and designation of Culp Canyon WSA as wilderness.

I strongly support alternative number 6. I do
203. The Army employs various planning cycles for different aspects of its mission. For example, the Army uses a 6-year programming cycle for operational activities with facility planning over a 20-year horizon. Doctrinal and equipment life-cycle planning can extend over a period of 40 years or more. The proposed 50-year withdrawal period encompasses each of these periods and enables long-term national security plans to rely on a stable land resource.

Different (shorter or longer) withdrawal periods would not substantially change the environmental impacts of a land allocation decision. Continuing stewardship and compliance activities would be required regardless of duration. Public and/or agency participation in ongoing environmental management activities on McGregor Range is assured through existing laws, regulations, and policies as listed in Table 1.6-1. The Army is committed to continuing public participation under NEPA as major new actions that could significantly affect the environment are proposed for the installation. The McGregor Range RMPA, jointly prepared by the BLM and the Army provides for continuing public participation. The annual RMP update informs the public of the progress made in implementing the RMPA. The Army’s INRMP and ICRMP contain provisions for agency coordination and revision as necessary every 5 years. Together, these regulatory requirements, policies, and procedures will ensure opportunities for both public and agency input into the future.
204. Thank you for being involved in the public participation process. The Army will consider your comment. Many military activities that occur on McGregor Range prevent the concurrent use of the land for public recreation. There are safety issues that would occur should military training and testing occur in areas that are open for recreational purposes.

205. Alternative 1, the Army's proposed action, would continue to provide public access to McGregor Range consistent with public safety, the military mission, and the BLM management of nonmilitary activities.
the escarpment which are already degraded and off
limits to the public.

Finally, it should be noted that at some point
in the future, however distant, this area, as well
as all other military installations will be used for
other purposes. It should be a matter of policy
that the military, or any other contaminating entity
be required to clean up their mess as it occurs
rather than let these areas be ongoing dumping
grounds for potentially highly dangerous materials
and explosives. We must not jeopardize the
well-being of future generations and their quality
of life because of our own present
shortsightedness.

MR. RUFFENBACH: Thank you, Mr.
Bates. Our next speaker is Tony Popp.

MR. POPP: My name is Tony Popp. I
live at 455 El Prado in Las Cruces, New Mexico,
88005. I am president of the Dona Ana County
Associated Sportsmen. I want to thank you for the
opportunity to make comments concerning the McGregor
Range Land Withdrawal Renewal Legislative
Environmental Impact Statement.

You have heard from me before and should not be
surprised by my comments. The first comment I would
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
do not suggest that the rest of the range will be
used this extensively; however, the plan is to
increase the use of the other areas of the range.

The protection of the Otero Mesa and Sacramento
Foothills portions of McGregor Range are of primary
interest to the group. Any additional use by the
military increases the possibility of long-lasting
damage to the habitat in these portions of the
range; therefore, the Dona Ana County Associated
Sportsmen would support alternatives three through
six. Any of these alternatives would ensure no
damage to areas of primary concern and would allow
access to the public, since the areas would be
returned to unrestricted public use.

If either alternative one or alternative two is
selected, there are some things that still can be
done to protect habitat and ensure access by the
public. First of all, the area must be co-managed
by the military and BLM.

The BLM has done a great job in managing the
area for public use. In particular, the grazing
management practices provide an excellent example of
how all grazing allotments could be managed.

Second, access by the public must be assured.
While I must commend the military in its efforts to
207. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
wilderness study area in the Sacramento Foothills.

Otero Mesa and the Mountain Foothills is presently managed jointly by the BLM and the U.S. Army, Ft. Bliss, until the year 2001. The BLM manages Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills for multiple uses—wildlife, recreation, grazing, and hunting. The U.S. Army uses portions of the area occasionally for multinational force training and as a buffer zone for live-fire missile training. These military training programs expire with the temporary withdrawal of McGregor Range in the year 2001.

Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills are recognized as an historic landscape under the rules of the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Offices, with designation to the National Registry of Historic Places. This historic landscape includes 10 historic homosites an over 100 prehistoric sites. The area is being evaluated by the Mescalero and Tigua Indians for potential historic sacred sites.

Alternative six in the legislative RIS, the withdrawal of McGregor Range for 50 years, would have Congress designate Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills as a national conservation area and Culp Canyon as a BLM wilderness area.

We support alternative six. The German Air
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Force wants it for a bombing range complex. The
Army wants it for missile training. Alternative
sites for these activities exist. We think
Congressional designation of Otero Mesa and Mountain
Pothills as a national conservation area, and Culp
Canyon as a BLM wilderness area is very important
and needed. Thank you.

MR. RUFFENBACH: Thank you very
much.

That concludes the speakers who have registered
this evening. Is there anyone at this point in time
that did not register that would like to make a
comment?

Once again, I'll allow five minutes on these
comments? Anyone? Not seeing anyone, again, that
concludes the formal portion of the meeting;
however, a member of the BLM paneled, and Fort Bliss
folks are here this evening, and will be more than
happy to answer any questions you might have. Just
a reminder, though, that those questions and the
exchange of information does not become part of the
permanent records; so, therefore, we again encourage
you to provide your comments to us in writing By
February 9th to the address listed up there.

Or again, you can FAX us to the number listed on
208. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
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Dear Madam/Sir:

I want to thank for the opportunity to testify concerning the McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Renewal Legislative Environmental Impact Statement. You have heard from me before and should not be surprised by my comments.

The first comment I would like to make is that I am pleased to see that the alternatives do not include the actual permanent transfers of land to military use. This assures that the public will have another chance to have unrestricted access to the area in question in the future.

The members of the group I represent are concerned with two aspects of the renewal. The first is that we would like to maintain the integrity of land that makes up McGregor Range and second we would like to maintain and, in fact, increase public access to the Range. In light of these concerns we would like to support the No Action Alternative. This may not be a reasonable alternative since it would severely restrict Fort Bliss in accomplishing its military training missions.

As we all know the Tularosa Basin portion of McGregor Range cannot be used by the public because of the presence of unexploded ordinance. The possibility of this area being rehabilitated to the extent of allowing public use is very low. Even if it could be done the price is prohibitive. We do not want the rest of McGregor Range to become like the Tularosa Basin. The alternatives presented do not suggest that the rest of the Range will be used this extensively. However the plan is to increase the use of the other areas of the Range.

The protection of the Otero Mesa and Sacramento Foothills portions of McGregor Range are of primary interest to the group. Any additional use by the military increases the possibility of long lasting damage to the habitat in these portions of the Range. Therefore, the Doña Ana County Associated Sportmen would support alternatives three through six. Any of these alternatives would ensure no damage to the areas of primary concern and would allow access to the public since the areas would be returned to unrestricted public use.
If either Alternative one or Alternative two is selected, there are some things that still can be done to protect habitat and ensure access by the public. First of all, the area must be co-managed by the military and BLM. The BLM has done a great job in managing the area for public use. In particular, the grazing management practices provide an excellent example of how all grazing allotments could be managed.

Second, access by the public must be assured. While I must commend the military in its efforts to assure access, the amount of access is usually determined by the sitting commander. These access issues should be addressed in, and access guaranteed, in legislative withdrawal documents.

Thank you for allowing me to present these comments for your consideration.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Tony Popp, President
Doña Ana County Associated Sportsmen, Inc.
P.O. Box 1417
Las Cruces, NM 88004
Marianne Thaeler
Written Follow-up to Support Spoken Comments at Las Cruces Public Hearing

TESTIMONY McPHERG RANGE LEIS HEARING
Hilton Hotel, Las Cruces, New Mexico
January 13, 1999, 6:30 PM

My name is Marianne Thaeler.
I am an Affected Interest on the 14 grazing units of McGregor Range.
I am here representing myself.

It is time to stop the long and bitter historic battles between the military and
the citizens of southern New Mexico over acquisition of lands for military
purposes which began during the WWII era. Some acquisitions were made by
adverse condemnation. Therefore, it is ironic and insensitive to the history of
McGregor Range for the German and Japanese militaries to both desire to use
the area - one flying into the path of the other.

The one and only way to put things right is to support the LEIS
Alternative #6.

This Alternative allows Congress to designate the Otero Mesa and Mountain
Foothills (which includes Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area) as a National
Conservation Area with its Culp Canyon WSA as BLM Wilderness.

NCA designation would take Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills "OFF THE
MARKET."

I say "off the market" because the military solicits customers and tenants for
ranges. Foreign governments and multi-national forces can choose from
those sites which are said to be available. COST IS THE MAJOR FACTOR..
Presently, the German AF wants to use Otero Mesa grasslands to construct a
bombing range tactical target complex, Japan wants to continue to use the
Otero Mesa grasslands as a buffer zone for live PATRIOT missile training,
and the US Army wants to use the grasslands for PATRIOT missile training.
While the public presently uses the area for historic uses - grazing, hunting
and recreation, and desires to continue to do so.

There are alternative sites for military activities, but they cost more to use.
Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills with its Culp Canyon Wilderness area qualifies as a National Conservation Area, because it is unique:

- it is a National Historic Landscape with National Historic and Archeologic Sites.
- it has vast grasslands and mountain ecosystems.
- it has unique populations of plants and animals, eagles, fox, prairie dog towns, aplomado falcons, and unique cacti, and tall yucca.
- it has unique topography. Otero Mesa is 1200 feet above the Tularosa Basin floor. The Mountain Foothills are rise above the Mesa and provide spectacular views of two states, Texas and New Mexico.
- it has grazing units with no resident ranchers, and thus can be managed for the best interests of the natural resources.
- it is presently managed for historic uses - grazing, hunting, and recreation.
- it can be, and should be, managed as a Show Case for the historic custom and culture of southern New Mexico, an historic landscape where ranchers fought the military, where there homes, corrals, wells and cisterns, and grave site still exist.

The unique tall yucca habitat, which is nesting habitat for the endangered aplomado falcon, is presently used for a buffer zone for live PATRIOT missile training. Every time a missile lands it causes a hot range fires. (Hot fires are caused by burning propellant, cold fires are naturally caused by lightning fires. On the ground it is easy to see the difference.) These fires need to be stopped. The buffer zone should be eliminated. There are alternative sites for the training.

Hunting seasons are regulated by the New Mexico Dept. of Game and Fish,
which also regulates hunting on the DOD PERSONELL ONLY hunting area. Pronghorn herds are uniquely large and docile, and hunts are limited to the use of antique mussel loaded guns and bow-and-arrow.

The Culp Canyon Wilderness Study Area was not initially recommended for Wilderness status, solely because of the temporary withdrawal under BLM/US Army Ft. Bliss joint management. This temporary withdrawal of Otero Mesa and Mountains Foothills area of McGregor Range should not be renewed and Congress should act to permanently resolve the public vs. military conflicts.

For these reasons, the LEIS includes Alternative #6, the designation by Congress of the Otero Mesa and Mountains Foothills NCA, and designation of the Culp Canyon WSA as Wilderness.

I strongly support Alternative #6. I do not object to the continued use by the military of the portion of McGregor Range which is in the Tularosa Basin, as long as activities no longer impact Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills.

Thank you.
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ORIGINAL
MR. RUFFENNACH: If I can have everybody take their seat, we're going to begin.

Let me first begin by welcoming you here this evening to -- this is a public hearing on the McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement. My name is Ron Ruffennach and I will be facilitating this evening's meeting. This meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA and the regulations that are published by the Council on Environmental Quality.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive your comments about the adequacy of the environmental analysis and the environmental impacts associated with the proposals that were studied in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement or DLEIS.

Before proceeding with the overview briefings this evening, I would like to explain my role tonight. I do work for the U. S. Army; however, I've had no involvement in the development of this document. My role is simply to ensure that we have a fair, orderly and impartial hearing and that all who desire to be heard have the opportunity to do so.

This hearing will be conducted in two parts. The first part will be briefings by the Army and the Bureau...
of Land Management. Dr. Andy Vliet and Mr. Tim Sanders
will discuss the findings of the DLRIS and the importance
of your participation at this hearing whether by
providing oral or written comments tonight or simply
listening to our presentation and providing your comments
later.

The second part of the hearing takes up the
remainder of the evening. This will be your time to come
up to the microphone and present your comments on the
draft document. In order to accommodate everyone who
wishes to speak, we will limit individual comments to
five minutes. Elected officials and representatives will
have ten minutes. The time limits are necessary so that
everyone wanting to speak will have an opportunity to do
so. And at this point this time I think it’s important
to point out the fact that the format for this meeting
this evening is being done the exact same way we’ve done
the two previous evening meetings, the one in Alamogordo
on Tuesday night and the one last evening in Las Cruces.

When you registered you were asked if you’d like to
speak and we have those cards this evening and we’ll take
the speakers in the order in which they registered.
However, if you do not want to speak this evening, you
can also provide your comments to us in writing and we’ll
have a date up on the screen later on and an address
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where you can mail your comments. There are comment
sheets in the back of the room where you can actually
take those with you, complete them and mail them in to us
or provide your comments in any way you’d like to by a
date that we’ll tell you later.

Our presenters for this evening are Dr. Andy Vliet
who is the program manager of the McGregor Range land
renewal and Mr. Tim Sanders, who is the interagency
coordinator for BLM in the Las Cruces field office. Also
here this evening is Colonel Jeff Gault, who is the chief
of staff at Fort Bliss. Following their presentations I
will go over the procedures for the public comment
period.

I’d like to now turn it over to Dr. Andy Vliet.

MR. VLIET: Thanks, Ron. I’m Dr. Andy Vliet. I’m
the program manager and responsible for the preparation
of the draft LEIS. Tonight I’m going to briefly discuss
the results of the environmental impact analysis that we
have undertaken over the past year, but before I get into
that, I’d like to take a minute and go over a little bit
of background of the McGregor Range land withdrawal
process of which this draft LEIS is a part.

The Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986
authorized the use of McGregor Range for military
purposes through the year 2001 and requires among other
things the preparation of an environmental impact statement to address the effects continuing the withdrawal, in this case for 50 years, until 2051, if there is a continuing need for McGregor Range. The Army believes there is a continuing need for the military training and testing activities that take place on the range and has filed an application for extension of the withdrawal.

The application includes several studies and reports in addition to the LEIS. These studies and reports are submitted to the Department of Interior and comprise the case file for renewal of the land withdrawal. That information, including proposed legislation prepared by the Army and the BLM, is then transmitted to Congress for legislative action prior to November 2001.

Congress makes the decision through legislation on the future of McGregor Range. The draft LEIS serves as a tool to evaluate environmental effects of renewing the existing military land withdrawal and reasonable alternatives. So with that as background, I'd like to provide you a summary of the findings of our environmental impact analysis for the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range.

We examined six alternatives including our proposed
action to renew the withdrawal as it currently exists and
the no-action alternative, to let the withdrawal expire
and return to the public domain of 608,000 acres of
McGregor Range that are currently subject to the Military
Lands Withdrawal Act. We also did an analysis of
environmental impacts of four other alternatives to the
proposed action including one that was proposed during
scoping. Each alternative describes different portions
of McGregor that Congress could renew and what lands
would be returned to the public domain.

The Army has been conducting studies to identify
potential contamination of McGregor Range. Prior to the
return of currently withdrawn land under any alternative,
the Secretary of the Army would prepare a report on lands
contaminated with explosive, toxic or other hazardous
substances and then decide along with the Secretary of
Interior what level of cleanup is feasible given
different future uses and relative risks. Following this
decision the Army would continue with studies and pursue
cleanup actions at McGregor Range to the degree resources
are available.

The LEIS alternatives are compared to the existing
or baseline environment in 14 broad categories of
environmental resources including land use, water
resources, biological resources, noise, cultural
resources and socioeconomics. Here's a summary
highlighting the main findings of our environmental
analysis for each of the six alternatives.

Under alternative one, the proposed action would
renew the McGregor Range land withdrawal under the same
conditions as provided in Public Law 99-606. McGregor
Range currently encompasses approximately 697,000 acres;
608,000 acres are withdrawn under public law.

The Army owns 71,000 acres. In addition, the Army
uses 18,000 acres of U. S. Forest Service land as a
safety buffer and for ground training. This additional
acreage is not included in the withdrawal but would
continue to be used through an agreement with the Forest
Service. There would be no change to the McGregor Range
boundary under the proposed action.

If alternative one is chosen impacts to
environmental resources would not change significantly
from current conditions, but there could be a slight
increase in water demand on public supplies in El Paso.
If use of the McGregor Range camp increases during the
renewal period, land management would continue as present
including continuation of nonmilitary land uses and the
beneficial effects on the regional economy.

Operationally the military's activities would
continue and could expand in the future as additional
training needs arise. Any potential new military uses of McGregor Range would require additional project-specific environmental analysis.

Alternative two would renew the withdrawal of the Tularosa Basin and Otero Mesa portions of McGregor Range for continued military use. This is approximately six hundred -- correction -- 569,000 acres of public land.
Under this alternative the land returned to the public domain would total about 40,000 acres and includes the Sacramento Mountains foothills portion of McGregor Range and the public land in the Culp Canyon Wilderness study area. The Army would retain fee-owned lands within the area returned to public domain for specialized training.

Selection of this alternative would result in an increase in public access to the Sacramento Mountain foothills area for nonmilitary users. There would be no significant impacts to resources such as biological resources or to public safety.

Impacts to military operations would include a 33 percent reduction in Patriot missile training scenarios and reduction in military ground activities in the Sacramento Mountain foothills. Training on Army-owned lands would continue.

Alternative three would renew the withdrawal of approximately 429,000 acres of public land for continued...
military use. This is in the Tularosa Basin portion of McGregor Range. The area returned to the public domain, about 180,000 acres would include public land on the Otero Mesa and in the Sacramento Mountain foothills portions of McGregor Range, Culp Canyon Wilderness study area and the McGregor black grama grasslands area of critical environmental concern.

The withdrawn area of McGregor Range would encompass areas within the Tularosa Basin and the escarpment of Otero Mesa. Army-owned property within the lands returned to the public domain would be retained by the Army for training.

If alternative three is selected, military activity on Otero Mesa would be reduced and the tactical training complex proposed by the U. S. Air Force would no longer be used resulting in less aircraft noise for residents north and east of Otero Mesa. The air space over McGregor Range would continue to be used for military aircraft training, however.

Public access to the returned areas would increase and there would be fewer closures of New Mexico Highway 506. There would be no significant impacts to other resources.

Operationally the military would have an 89 percent reduction in its Patriot missile training scenarios.
There would be a reduction in field training exercise sites, on-road vehicle maneuver areas and reduction in ground training activities in the Sacramento Mountain foothills and on the Otero Mesa. Training on Army-owned land would continue.

Alternative four would renew the withdrawal of about 365,000 acres for continued military use. This includes the Tularosa Basin portion of McGregor range south of New Mexico Highway 506. This alternative would not renew the withdrawal of any portion of McGregor Range north of New Mexico Highway 506 or on Otero Mesa. The lands returned to the public domain, about 244,000 acres, are comprised of all the existing leased cattle grazing units in currently withdrawn lands, the Culp Canyon wilderness study area and the black -- McGregor black grama grassland area of critical environmental concern.

The portion of grazing unit two south of New Mexico Highway 506 would be exchanged for the area between New Mexico Highway 506 and grazing unit three. Army-owned property within the lands returned to the public domain would be retained for specialized training.

Environmental impacts would be the same as under alternative three, but there would be no closures of New Mexico Highway 506 for military reasons. There would be a reduction in aircraft noise because the land north of
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Highway 506 that currently has a bombing range would be returned to the public domain and military use would cease. The tactical target complex proposed by the Air Force on Otero Mesa would also cease to be used; however, military aircraft training in the air space over McGregor Range would continue.

From a military operational standpoint impacts on Patriot missile training would be the same as under alternative three. There would be no military ground operations on public lands on Otero Mesa north of New Mexico Highway 506. The training would continue on Army-owned lands within these areas.

Alternative five, the no-action alternative, would not renew any portion of withdrawn land on McGregor Range. All currently withdrawn lands would return to the public domain. Army-owned parcels surrounded by public land would be exchanged for public lands in the southern part of McGregor Range to retain training capability and essential infrastructure around the McGregor Range camp, the McGregor ammunition supply point and the Meyer Range complex.

The installation facilities on McGregor Range that would have to be relocated elsewhere include the Oro Grande Range, SHORAD Range and McGregor Range firing complex. There would be no further military use of the
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lands returned to the public domain. Restricted air
space above the land area would continue to be used for
aircraft training by the military units in the region.

In addition to the environmental impacts that would
occur if alternative four were selected, there could be
increased soil erosion in the Tularosa Basin portion of
the range from cleanup activities and grazing under the
no-action alternative; however, erosion from military
activities would be less and there would be a reduction
in noise associated with military activities.

Unless public access to portions of Tularosa Basin
is restricted prior to cleanup there could be increased
safety risks. A minor economic impact would result from
the decrease in military employment and purchases.

Operationally the military would continue aircraft
training in the air space above McGregor Range, but there
would be no military ground operations except at the
south end of the range.

Alternative six was developed using public comments
submitted during scoping. It was suggested that Congress
designate the Culp Canyon Wilderness study area as a
wilderness area. In addition it was suggested that
Congress could designate the Otero Mesa and Sacramento
Mountains foothills including in-holdings owned by the
Army as a national conservation area. The affected
Army-owned in-holdings would be exchanged for other
public lands elsewhere within McGregor Range.

This alternative would require further
Congressional action separate from the Army's proposed
renewal of the military land withdrawal and could alter
the management practices associated with the area
included in the national conservation area. Existing
grazing area would continue to be available for multiple
uses to the extent that the areas have productive value.

The land would be managed in accordance with public
land loss and Congressional specifications of the
national conservation area. The area as envisioned could
be designated along with alternatives three, four or
five. Environmental impacts would be the same as those
that would occur if alternatives three, four or five were
selected plus some changes to land use designations would
be required.

Military operational impacts would be the same as
those under alternatives three, four and five except no
military training would occur within the national
conservation area.

To sum up, the draft LEIS did not identify any
significant environmental impacts with any of the
alternatives compared to current conditions.

Operationally the renewal is needed to meet our nation’s
training requirements now and into the future, but as I 
mentioned earlier the Congressional decision on the 
Army’s proposal will be in effect the record of decision 
for the LEIS.

Comments we receive tonight will be used to prepare 
the final LEIS which is scheduled for completion by 
August 1999. While the Military Lands Withdrawal Act 
only required a draft document, the Army has chosen to 
complete a final LEIS that considers public comment on 
the draft LEIS. The final LEIS will be distributed to 
local libraries, individuals, agencies, local governments 
and organizations. All of your comments on the draft 
LEIS will be considered for the final.

Again, thank you for your time and attention and 
now Mr. Tim Sanders from the BLM will discuss their role.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Andy. My name is Tim 
Sanders. I’m the assistant field manager for the Las 
Cruces office of the Bureau of Land Management. I’d like 
to talk to you tonight about BLM’s involvement in the 
McGregor Range LEIS.

McGregor Range is a part of the public lands and is 
administered jointly by the Las Cruces field office of 
Bureau of Land Management and the U. S. Army/Fort Bliss.
The BLM manages McGregor Range much like the adjacent 
public land provided for such uses as public access,
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hunting and livestock grazing.

The BLM is a cooperating agency in the McGregor withdrawal project. In this capacity we have reviewed draft documents and provided input for the development of the withdrawal LEIS.

McGregor Range offers a spectacular assortment of natural resources. McGregor Range contains three distinct regions. If I could withdraw your attention to the map to my right, going from the lower elevation to the higher, we have the Tularosa Basin portion of McGregor Range, the Otero Mesa portion and the mountain foothills.

The area of McGregor Range known as Otero Mesa and the mountain foothills contains some of New Mexico’s most spectacular cultural, recreational, livestock, wildlife and biological resources. Otero Mesa and the foothills contains a nationally recognized wilderness study area, the Culp Canyon Wilderness study area, a black grama and grassland area of critical environmental concern and extensive deer and antelope herds. The area also provides an important grazing resource and is one of the few military withdrawals where the public is allowed access.

As co-manager of McGregor Range the BLM has focused its management on the protection and the enhancement of...
the range's valuable public resources. The BLM worked with Fort Bliss to develop the EIS alternatives presented to you tonight. Alternative three is the most compatible with resource values and public use interest of the Bureau of Land Management. Under alternative three Otero Mesa and the mountain foothills would be returned to public land status and would be available for unrestricted public use.

Congress will ultimately decide which boundary to select for McGregor Range. Congress may very well select an alternative other than alternative three. If this were to occur there are five items that should be addressed in whichever alternative is ultimately selected by Congress.

These five items are, number one: Because of the uniqueness of Otero Mesa and the mountain foothills, the alternative selected must protect this valuable area. Second, if an alternative withdrawing Otero Mesa and the foothills is selected, the alternative must restrict the types of military uses which would be allowable on Otero Mesa and the foothills.

Third, the existing 1990 memorandum of understanding between the BLM and the Army should be incorporated into the alternative. This would ensure continued public access and natural resource management.
by the BLM. Incorporation of the MOU would clearly
declare management responsibility and would address
allowable lands and minerals uses on the range, wildlife
and cultural protection measures and livestock grazing
practices.
Fourth, the selected alternative must ensure
continued public access and, lastly, the withdrawal terms
should be commensurate with the foreseeable uses of the
range. The Fort Bliss mission master plan EIS indicates
a military planning horizon of 20 years. If there is a
withdrawal renewal, we believe it should be commensurate
with the military’s own 20-year planning horizon.
In closing, I would like to say that the public,
BLM and the Army have had a long relationship on McGregor
Range. This is a critical moment in determining the fate
of over one-half million acres of land in southern New
Mexico. It is crucial that the BLM and Army work at the
local level with the public’s input and support to craft
an alternative which will protect the public use and the
natural resources of McGregor Range.
Thank you very much.
MR. RUFFENACH: Thank you, Tim. At this time we
would normally take a break to allow our speakers to
prepare or clarify any information or ask any questions
that they have of the presenters. With your permission I
have one speaker who has expressed an interest to speak
this evening. I’d like to dispense with the break if
that’s okay with everyone and just proceed directly to
the public comment period.

Once again oral comments taken are no more or less
important than the written ones so again for those who
are in the audience and they’re not comfortable coming to
the microphone to speak, we strongly encourage you to
provide your written comments to the address that’s shown
on the screen. Those comments are required to be in by
February 9th of this year so that they become part of the
official record. You may have noticed that we do, in
fact, have a court reporter here this evening who is
documenting this meeting as it has been done at the other
two locations that I mentioned to you earlier.

For those of you who are going to come to the
microphone to speak we ask that you please state your
name and your address and speak clearly so that the court
reporter can, in fact, get our comments. Once again we
will ask that you limit your comments to five minutes.
Even though we only have one speaker we are trying to
remain consistent in the way in which we conduct all
these meetings allowing others at the two locations only
five minutes as well.

So with that I will ask our first and only
registered speaker at this point in time, Mr. Mark
Bentley to come to the microphone.
I'm sorry, Mr. Bentley, the one in the center of
the room.

MR. BENTLEY: I'm sorry. My name is Mark Bentley
and my address is 695 Segewood Drive, Chaparral, New
Mexico, 880217418, and I was asked to represent the El
Paso Archaeological Society and I would like to first
mention what my credentials are so that some of the
things I'll be mentioning it will be obvious that it
isn't just top-of-the-hat sort of comments.
I just finished working out at the U. S. Army Yuma
Proving Grounds on their range YEIS and out there at the
Yuma Proving Ground. I was the senior archaeologist. I
was in charge of field projects, NEPA documentation. I
completed 19 projects in 22 months as well as being a
core team leader for the range YEIS. I was in charge of
the cultural resources out there as well as the
socioeconomic analyses for Yuma and Yuma Proving Ground
to see what its effect would be at various levels.
My experience out there lasted two-and-a-half
years. Prior to that I lived in the El Paso region, and
I'm probably one of the most knowledgeable people of the
culture resources on McGregor Range. I worked out at
Fort Bliss before there was an environmental office and
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professionally I've worked out in the field on many surveys. Some of the largest surveys conducted out there I worked out there as a crew chief.

I worked on the Anapra information for the Corps of Engineers, St. Louis district, for Fort Bliss, which is the Native American grazing Repatriation Act. I also worked on the National Register of Site Study for Fort Bliss and I also worked on the site file project, which was assessing all of the site projects -- all of the projects that were conducted on Fort Bliss including McGregor Range and compiling computerized data base. I worked on that for a year with three other people.

I started working out there in 1977 on the survey maneuver area 1 and 2, which is 198 square miles. I also participated in the McGregor Range survey which was conducted in 1978 by people from UT-Austin.

I've worked on the Paleo-Indian site excavation up in maneuver area 3. I worked in Dona Ana ranges, all the ranges 2, 3, 47, 49, 51, 52 surveying those, and as for McGregor Range, I've surveyed a 36-square-kilometer area north of the initial bombing range and I worked with the Air Force engineers from Holloman on the installation of that bombing range and we did have to move the location for the reason that I'll mention in a moment.

McGregor Range -- Approximately 25 percent of
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McGregor Range is comprised of alluvial fans and these
are probably the most active geomorphological units of
McGregor. And there’s a zone, it’s an interface between
the alluvial fans and the desert floor and it’s called a
transition season and it’s -- the lower gradients of the
alluvial fan are the most critical because that’s
where -- if you’re dealing with cultural resources
because that’s where the majority of the populations were
living along doing agriculture out there. There are
prehistoric reservoirs out there. I wrote up the Hot
Well Pueblo Reservoir, which is in maneuver area 2
immediately south of McGregor less than a quarter of a
mile and also worked on other pueblos out there and also
used remote sensing in situations looking for additional
pueblos out there in the course of my official
responsibilities.

And the point that I would like to make is
irrespective of which of these alternatives is chosen,
the interface of these alluvial fans needs to be taken
under consideration because the majority of the Native
American remains are going to be found in -- in among
those rooms of those pueblos, and the only other comment
I’d like to make is that the El Paso Archaeological
Society fully supports Fort Bliss continued use of
McGregor Range.

209. The Army complies with the environmental laws and
regulations that require archaeological surveys and
environmental assessments of areas that may be disturbed
by training and testing activities.
Thank you very much.

MR. RUFFENACH: Thank you, Mr. Bentley. Once again if I could have confirmation that no one else has registered to speak.

I'll ask now if anyone from the audience would like to come to the microphone and make a comment, they may do so now.

Ma'am? And again please state your name and your address very clearly for us.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Sally Savage, 829 Cloudburst Drive, El Paso, Texas, 79912. I'm representing the Sierra Club of the El Paso regional group, and we'd like to go on record supporting alternative number 6. I guess the simplest way of stating it is we basically believe that this area has been stressed enough over the years and so therefore we support the action of turning it into a national conservation area. Thank you.

MR. RUFFENACH: Thank you very much. Anyone else who would like to make a comment, please. At this time?

With no other comments from the floor, that will actually draw the meeting to a conclusion this evening. Once again a reminder that written comments can be made to the address on the screen through February 9th, and we would like on behalf of BLM and the U. S. Army to thank
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210. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
you all very much for coming this evening. There are
officials from both of those agencies here who would be
more than happy to stay behind and talk with you and
ask -- answer any questions or provide you with any
additional information.

    Again, thank you very much for coming.
      (Proceedings concluded.)
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APPENDIX A

LETTERS OF SUPPORT
January 5, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager
McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Renewal
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

Enclosed please find a copy of the City of Alamogordo’s Resolution No. 1999-25 which reaffirms our support for the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range, and which supports Alternative 1 of the Legislative Environmental Impact Statement. Said Resolution was unanimously approved by the Commission at its Regular Meeting of December 22, 1998.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Donald E. Carroll
Mayor

Enclosure
RESOLUTION No. 1998-25

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE MCGREGOR RANGE LAND WITHDRAWAL

WHEREAS, on December 23, 1997, the City Commission of Alamogordo, New Mexico passed Resolution No. 1997-28 supporting the reauthorization of the McGregor Range Land Withdrawal; and

WHEREAS, the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico Withdrawal Renewal identifies six alternatives for the withdrawal; and

WHEREAS, five of the alternatives studies would severely limit or curtail the use of McGregor Range for military operations; and

WHEREAS, McGregor Range is vitally important to our nation’s military training and test and evaluation capabilities, as well as to the long term stability of our area’s military installations, including Holloman Air Force Base, White Sands Missile Range, and Fort Bliss; and

WHEREAS, only Alternative 1 will allow the continued use of McGregor Range as it currently exists; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO that we reaffirm our support for the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range; and

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the City Commission of the City of Alamogordo, New Mexico supports Alternative 1 of the Legislative Environmental Impact Statement.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 22ND DAY OF DECEMBER 1998.

CITY OF ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO
a New Mexico municipal corporation

By: ________________________________
    Donald E. Carroll, Mayor
ATTEST:

Angie J. Trujillo, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Rebecca W. Ehler, City Attorney
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January 12, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
PO Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Plus, please keep in mind that this deals with the life-blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternative 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

George Abbott
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February 3, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Arturo Alvarez
General Manager

6400 Montana Ave.  •  El Paso, Tx. 79925  •  Ph. (915) 772-4231  •  Fax (915) 779-2918
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Private Citizens/Organizations

February 1, 1999

M. V. Vlitis
Director, Arizona NA
Base

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for test sites
were

McGregor Range and Holloman Air Force Base of

McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for
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The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental
analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered
during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional
review.

McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Public Comment and Response Document

216
217. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 3, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
ATTN: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Ft. Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Mr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 30 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Thanking you for your immediate attention, I remain

Very truly yours,

Victor Apodaca, Jr.
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January 12, 1999

Dr. Andy Vlieet  
Attn: ATZC-CSA  
PO Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vlieet:

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Plus, please keep in mind that this deals with the life-blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense ever and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

Bert Atkins
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January 12, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
PO Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Plus, please keep in mind that this deals with the life-blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

S. W. Atkins
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February 4, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 79906
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

VIA FAX

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the Range for military use.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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KENNETH L. BASS  
BROADCAST CONSULTANT  
P. O. Box 1109  
Alamogordo, NM 88311-1109  
Phone: 505-585-6405  Cell: 505-433-9902  
Fax: 505-585-6506  
Email: klbass@waaco.com  

February 3, 1999  
Dr. Andy Vlisi, Program Manager  
US Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss  
ATTN: AZEC-CSA (LEIS Comments)  
P.O. Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, TX 79906  

Dear Dr. Vlisi:  

I am one of the more than 600 members of the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Alamogordo Committee of Fifty. I am writing to express my support for the Alternative I (One) listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative I states that current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonetheless activities would continue under the BLIM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.  

It is my opinion, based on many discussions on this matter, that the vast majority of people in Otero County support this Alternative since it deals with the future of Holloman AFB, one of the major economic cornerstones of Alamogordo and Otero County.  

The target complex proposed for the Otomexi and McGregor Range and associated flight routines fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.  

I join the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce in voicing my strong support for the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Ranges. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile range and Holloman AFB. These installations are not only critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region, but also serve as a vital element in our nations military defense system.  

I would appreciate your support for Alternative I in which the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.  

Respectfully submitted,  

Kenneth L. Bass  
Broadcast Consultant  
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From: BentleyMT
Sent: Saturday, December 12, 1998 10:13 AM
To: Dr. Vliet
Subject: McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Renewal

This document is submitted to affirm full support to Fort Bliss and particularity herein, its efforts to successfully complete the McGregor Range/Otero Mesa EIS.

I am familiar with many other Federal Governmental EIS's. After leaving Fort Bliss as an IPA through UT El Paso in the Fall of 1995, I became an EIS core team leader at U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG). I was responsible for both cultural resource and socio-economic analyses directly related to YPG's EIS. This included reviewing the working and problematic EIS's of other agencies. I also directly dealt with current native American issues from ten tribes living in Arizona and eight tribes living in California. I worked in direct coordination with the YPG JAG office, and one of those JAG lawyer associates is now at the Pentagon in the Environmental Department's Superfund Division.

Dr. Vliet, we first met in 1994 while I was working at Fort Bliss. During that time, as Project Director I was in charge of the Fort Bliss National Register Site Evaluation and investigated Fort Bliss NAGPRA issues for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - St. Louis District (at the request of Mr. Bowman and Mr. Landreth). I also prepared the cultural resource assessment for Castner Range at the request of Mr. Bowman and conducted official JTF-6 related assignments on South McGregor Range.

I am familiar with all of McGregor Range, Otero Mesa, the southern Sacramento Mountains, and the Tularosa Basin/Hueco Bolson for I was assigned many cultural resource assignments in those regions. Some earlier assignments date back to the early 1970s. (That was before any environmental office existed and projects originated from the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer Office Fort Worth and Albuquerque Districts - and the local implementation was facilitated through the Fort Bliss DRR.)

On official project assignments in North McGregor I surveyed large tracts and excavated prehistoric pueblo villages hidden in the alluvial fans. I assisted the U.S. Air Force engineers stationed out of Holloman in the survey, placement and construction of the 1st Air Force Bombing Range located in North McGregor. I completed many cultural resource surveys in the SHORAD Range and employed none of the 1st commercially available GPS equipment during those assignments. In the South McGregor area I conducted numerous archeological surveys, tests, and excavations. I prepared numerous documentation related to the largest recorded pueblo village known for the State of Texas. It lies immediately south across the state line in MA II from South McGregor and contains affiliated materials lightly extending northward into South McGregor.

For land management I have extensive cadastral and remote sensing experience, I employ innovative, GPS equipment and techniques in tracking locational placement and creating X,Y and Z coordinate maps from field information. In addition, I possess land management skills implementing GIS. Through my official project assignments I have discovered field applications that I never fully researched, but perhaps may be of real benefit to Federal Governmental agencies.
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First and foremost the continued military mission of Fort Bliss and in this case particularly on McGregor Range, Otero Mesa must be maintained. If I may be of assistance let me know.

Sincerely,
Mark T. Bentley
Archeologist

695 Sagewood Drive
Chaparral, New Mexico
88021-7418
phone: (505) 824-0005
e-mail: BentleyMT@aol.com
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February 2, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ben W. Bradford
President / C.E.O.
January 12, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
PO Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Plus, please keep in mind that this deals with the life-blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Brusuelas
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233. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
PO Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

January 12, 1999

Dear Dr. Vliet,

On behalf of the members of the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce Committee of Fifty, we are writing to express our support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

We understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. We want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Plus, please keep in mind that this deals with the life-blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

We, the Committee of Fifty have voiced our strong support for the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

We would appreciate your support for Alternative 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Burt
Chairman
Committee of Fifty
234. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
235. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
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236. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 29, 1999

Dr. Andy Vljet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Ft Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vljet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U. S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely yours,

Walter H. Bunter
General Manager
Landry’s Seafood House
237. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
238. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 1, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 8020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet,

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range to use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Ruby Cicirelli
Operations Manager

Siemens Energy & Automation, Inc.
Distribution Products Division
1420 Henry Boren Drive
El Paso, TX 79906
Tel: 915-857-4290
Fax: 915-857-8251

239. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 8, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager  
McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Renewal  
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center & Fort Bliss  
Attn: ATZC-CSA  
P.O. Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, Texas  79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

We are writing to express our support for Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

McGregor Range is a vital resource to White Sands Missile Range, Ft. Bliss and Holloman Air Force Base. These installations, especially Holloman, are vital to our economy.

We would appreciate your support for Alternative 1 where the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same.

Sincerely,

Marcia A. Clark  
Larry E. Clark

240. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
241. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Conrad Conde

242. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
243. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 28, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Carmen Contreras
President & CEO
244. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
245. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Department of the Army

Re: McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal

I am writing to express my support for Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. We want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Plus, please keep in mind that this deals with the lifeblood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I continue to have strong support for the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternative 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

Pete Cook
President & CEO

First National Bank in Alamogordo
414 10th Street / Post Office Box 9 / Alamogordo, New Mexico 88310-0009 / (505) 437-4880
246. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
247. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
248. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 12, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager
McGregor Range
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Gentlemen:

I hereby state that I favor Alternative No. 1, regarding the McGregor land dispute.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Quinton E. Daniel

249. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 1, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: AZCC-CSA
PO Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the US Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Richard E. Dayoub
President

250. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
251. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
252. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
253. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
254. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

Mrs. Doris Duggan
P.O. BOX 1522
ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO
88311-1522

January 14, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I wish to express my full support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal.

Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range. I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM.

The vast majority of people in Otero County support this project. Holloman Air Force Base is the lifeblood of our community.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Very truly yours,

Doris Duggan

The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
256. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

February 2, 1999

Dr. Andy Vilet
Attn: AT&CE-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vilet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) and Holloman Air Force Base, is of the utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

The Greater Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce has always been and will continue to be a major supporter of the three (3) military bases mentioned above. The economies of El Paso, TX; Las Cruces, NM; Alamogordo, NM; and our surrounding communities depend a great deal upon these three (3) military bases.

The Greater Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning in 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter or our support, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Patty Durant
Chair of the Board

Tom Hutchinson
Vice President Government Relations Division

P.O. Drawer 519 - Las Cruces, New Mexico - USA - 88004-0519
Tel: (505) 534-1968 - Fax: (505) 327-5046
http://www.lascruces.org
January 12, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
PO Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 53,000) support this project. P.S., please keep in mind that this deals with the life-blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Eaton

257. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

James D. Edge & Associates
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
4100 RIO GRANDE, SUITE 200
EL PASO, TEXAS 79902-1048

MEMBER
AMERICAN INSTITUTE
OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

MEMBER
DIVISION FOR CPA Firms
PRIVATE COMPANIES PRACTICE SECTION

January 29, 1999

Dr. Andy Viet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Viet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is vital to our nation’s defense and to the West Texas and Southern New Mexico economy.

I understand that some groups want the land used for other purposes. I personally am strongly opposed to using this land for any other purpose. I support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U. S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Very truly yours,

James D. Edge

258. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 1, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATCZ-CSA
PO Box 6020
Ft. Bliss TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the Range for military use.

Sincerely,

George Ernst

259. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 2, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

[Signature]

James Rion Ervin
Vice President and Manager
Tactical Operations & Test Group

JRE:jv

260. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
261. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 13, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico. Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Non-military activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Please, please keep in mind that this deals with the lifeblood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Very truly yours,

George E. Fettiger

GEF:cp
January 14, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Plus, please keep in mind that this deals with the lifeblood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Very truly yours,

R. Nell Fetinger
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
264. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Comment Sheet</th>
<th>McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Renewal Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please Print</td>
<td>DATE Dec, 16, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keep the McGregor Range as is. It is needed for the kind of launching that is done there. There are not many places there is enough space for this. And for the sake of the ecology, it should be retained as is. The grass and the other plant life has not been as lush as it is for decades. I am old enough to remember when the grasses, the fennel and a couple of other varieties were just before over grazing left little but a few desert plants. It has taken all these years to recover. I see nothing wrong with the arrangements for limited grazing, permits for hunting and other outdoor pastimes that are allowed. If the cattlemen had their way it would soon be overgrazed, how. Buggies would be tearing up the fragile desert terrain as they have done in Southern California with unrestricted hunting, there would soon be nothing left to hunt.

Let's keep the status quo.

Gerald R. Fitzgerald...2405 Westwing...El Paso...79930...265-2106

NAME:
ADDRESS:
CITY:
STATE, ZIP CODE
PHONE NUMBER ( )
Area Code

Please check if you would like to receive a copy of the Final LEIS (Phone Number Required for Federal Express Delivery)

Please Hand This Form In or Mail BEFORE FEBRUARY 6, 1999

Dr. Andy Vllet, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
ATTN: ATZC-CSA (LEIS Comments)
P.O. Box 6920
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906
Email: mcgregor@emh10.bliss.army.mil

265. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 2, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet  
Attn: ATZC-CSA  
P. O. Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Cordially,

RGF-vp

266. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
LETTER OF SUPPORT

January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Viets
Altn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 5020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Viets:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Signature

Chuck French
Lin Pac Inc 421 Frederick
El Paso, TX 79905

267. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
268. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 12, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
PO Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 53,000) support this project. Plus, please keep in mind that this deals with the life-blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Kenneth Garland

269. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
270. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

From: FRANCIS P GAUTHIER [SMTP:gbgaut@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, February 01, 1999 12:07 PM
To: mcgregor@emh10.bliss.army.mil
Subject: McGregor Range Withdrawal

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager,
ATZC-CSA (LEIS Comments)

Dear Dr. Vliet,

As a citizen of Otero County, NM, I want to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range. This range is vital to our national security and to the economy of Alamogordo and Otero County. I am also in favor of using the Otero Mesa area for construction of a bombing range for Holloman Air Force Base.

Sincerely,
Gus Gauthier
Private Citizens/Organizations

271. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 28, 1999

Dr. Andy Vilet
Attn: AT2C-CSA
P.O. Box 6070
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vilet,

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001: that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

William E. Gerber
McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Public Comment and Response Document

January 29, 1999

Dr. Andy Vilet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vilet,

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Respectfully,

Howard Goldberg
President

272. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
273. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
274. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 29, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet,

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries for the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Signature

TOTAL P. 62
February 02, 1999
Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Iceda Gonzalez
Operations Manager

275. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
276. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
277. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager  
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center & Fort Bliss  
Attn: ATZC-ESA (LEIS Comments)  
P.O. Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906  

January 12, 1999

I strongly support the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. This Alternative states that the boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same.

The range is a vital resource to the three installations of Ft. Bliss, Holloman AFB, and White Sands Missile Range. I believe that we need a strong national defense and these three installations have proven their value to this means.

Having served in the US Army I am much in favor of the national defense and training is so important on this range for all of our military services. Our economy depends on these installations.

John L. Green  
1019 Canyon Road  
Alamogordo, NM 88310  
505 437-4377

I would like to receive a copy of the Final LEIS
278. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dear Dr. Vilet,

As Past President of the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce, I support the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environment Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman AFB and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer. This is very important to our economy.

I strongly support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. These strategic decisions further strengthen the reciprocal relationship between all the area military installations—the strategic defense triangle formed by Holloman AFB, WSMR, and Fort Bliss. These installations have proven their value to our national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

Sincerely,

Toots Green, CEO
279. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Dr. Andy Viel
Attn: ATZC-CSA
Post Office Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Viel:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Bill J. Hammons, P.E.
Project Manager
BJ/kc

280. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
282. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

---Original Message---

From: GlassHartt@aol.com [SMTP:GlassHartt@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, January 15, 1999 9:19 PM
To: mcgregor@emh10.bliss.army.mil
Subject: McGregor Range

Dr. Andy Vlieet, Program Manager
McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Renewal
U.S. Army Air Defense Center
& Fort Bliss (Attr: ATZC-CSA)
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Sir,

I am writing in regards to the current issue with McGregor Range. I believe that the implementation of Alternative 1 would be in the best interest of both the Military and the land. The military control of the area restricts access to the land and therefore protects it from the abuses that many of the public areas in the country have sustained.

Sincerely,

Linda Hartt-Goggan
5620 Green Castle Rd
El Paso, TX 79932

283. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

MONTE VISTA TOWNHOMES
&
CORPORATE SUITES
1776 E. 1st STREET
ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO 88310

January 27, 1999
Representative Joe Skeen
1065-B S. Main Street, Suite A
Las Cruces, NM 88005

Dear Representative Skeen,

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that my constituents and I support this project. Please keep in mind that this deals with the life blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the taxpayer.

As a Chamber member, I am voicing strong support for the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

284. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
I would appreciate your support for Alternative 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Sincerely,

Sharon Haynes
Property Manager/JS Properties

cc
Chamber of Commerce
(form letter submitted by CC)
285. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
286. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn. ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 8020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

[Signature]

288. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Dear Sirs:
I am writing as a concerned community citizen, a person involved in a family business of over 42 years and a member of the Chamber of Commerce Board. Having been in this community for some time I can remember the late 1950's and early 1960's when the future of Holloman AFB was sometimes in question. This community and HAFB have survived several BRAC considerations. Team Holloman is an important and vital part of this community. This community is also fortunate, at this time, to have the German Air Force here. Their future here as well as that of a healthy future of WSMR is important to this community. For all of the reasons listed in this letter it is IMPERATIVE that the withdrawal of the McGregor Bombing Range continue. This community is a friend to the farm and ranch community as well as environmentalists and are grateful to have them in this community. However, the Future for some of us is NOW and we want a Healthy future for Alamogordo and this "combined community". I URGE you to weigh the seriousness of the actions at hand and continue the complete withdrawal of the McGregor Bombing Range.

Sincerely,

Janice E. Jeter, VP
The Ink Well, Inc.

289. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
290. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
291. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
Attn: ATZC-CSA (LEIS Comments)
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

We would like to urge adoption of Alternative One of the McGregor Range Withdrawal Renewal, for the following reasons:

1. We believe that military preparedness and training is of utmost importance, and is the best way to reduce the chances of a future war. All of the other alternatives result in a decrease in testing of the Patriot Missile, which is an important element in defense.

2. All other alternatives (except alternative 2) would result in the loss of the Otero Mesa as a potential bomb target area for Holloman Air Force Base. The Air Force has chosen the Otero Mesa as the most optimum site for the proposed bombing target site, and we support them in this. This bombing target site will allow Holloman to move forward with more training of the German Air Force personnel, and maybe with other allies in the future. We think that having allied military personnel train in this country helps strengthen our bonds as allies, and should be expanded at every reasonable opportunity.

3. The economy of the Alamogordo area needs the boost that will be provided by the influx of the additional German Air Force personnel, to offset the losses suffered recently by the transfer of personnel from Holloman to Arkansas and other locations.

4. The argument that the Otero Mesa provides some of the best hunting and recreational area is, in our opinion, a weak one, since there are thousands and thousands of acres of excellent hunting and recreation area in Otero and Lincoln Counties. Our national defense requirements are much more important than the desire for hunters to have more areas to hunt.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Jerry S. Johnson
Patricia A. Johnson
February 2, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

CFJ/bjk

292. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
294. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 29, 1999

Dr. Andy Vlet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 79006
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vlet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the US Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and, that there be no constraints applied to the Range for military use.

Sincerely,

Victor Kach
General Manager

295. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
296. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 1, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,
Gatekeeper Property Management, Inc.

By: Eddie W. Karam, Treasurer

297. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
298. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
299. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

300. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dr. Andy Vliet
ATTN: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

February 2, 1999

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. KELLER

JAK/smc
301. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
302. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
303. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 28, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

As you know MacGregor Range, a training and testing site for Ft. Bliss, is essential and important to Ft. Bliss and the surrounding community.

If the government decides to use Mac Gregor Range for something other than military training, it would hurt Ft. Bliss greatly as well as the economy of the community.

I ask that the range be used as it is today with no limits applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Amanda LeBarre
Manager
304. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

January 28, 1999
Dr. Andy Vliet
P.O. Box 6020
Attn: ATZC-CSA
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet,

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Anne B. Leutze

305. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
306. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

February 1, 1999

Dr. Andy Vlet
AHS: ATCC-CSA
P.O. BOX 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vlet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Respectfully,

[signature]

307. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 28, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range is an essential training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base. Not only is McGregor Range of extreme importance to our nation’s defense, it is also an important factor in our region’s economic vitality.

I strongly support the continuance of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for fifty years beginning in 2001. The boundaries of the Range should remain as they are today and no constraints must apply to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Dennis Lukehart
Vice President

308. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Private Citizens/Organizations
January 12, 1999

Dr. Andy Vilet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
PO Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vilet:

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Please keep in mind that this deals with the lifeblood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Jim Lynch

309. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 28, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Olga M. Mapula
President/CEO

OM/ee

310. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Dr. Any Viet
Attr: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Viet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Doug McNeely
Chief Executive Officer

311. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
312. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
313. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

I prefer Alternate #1, so that we can have a well trained military, with McGregor Range boundaries as they are today.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

68 McDonald Road,
Alamogordo, NM 88310
February 19, 1999

Dr. Andy Viesi
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6070
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Mr. Viesi,

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the United States Army for a period of 50 years (beginning 2001), that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mike Mendoza-Flores
Auction Manager
El Paso Auto Auction

314. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 29, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the United States Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today and there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Excel Storage Marina

315. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
316. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
317. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

February 2, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

As a member of this community, I am writing this letter to express my concerns regarding the future of McGregor Range. McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

MOORE NORDERL KROEGER ARCHITECTS, INC.

Mervin Moore, AIA
President

318. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 27, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
FO Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Art Moreno, Jr.
President

319. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
320. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
321. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dr. Andy Vilet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

January 14, 1999

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I, as well as the majority of people in Otero County, would appreciate your support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range. Holloman AFB is the lifeblood of our community.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. W.C. Myers

Mrs. W. C. Myers
323. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
324. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

February 1, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is not only of utmost importance to our nation's defense but also to our region’s economic well-being.

I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

ROBERT NAVARRO & ASSOCIATES ENGINEERING, INC.

[Signature]

Robert Navarro, P.E.
President
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
I would appreciate your support for Alternative 1; the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted.

Brian Nelson
President
Sadderth Nelson, Inc.

1 copy filed
January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Viet
Alt. ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Viet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Lester Otega

326. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
327. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
328. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

January 14, 1999

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I support the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal.

Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range. I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM.

The vast majority of people in Otero County support this project. Holloman Air Force Base is the lifeblood of our community.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Very truly yours,

V. Elaine Painter
329. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
330. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
331. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
332. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years, beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Amie Pederson
VP of Operations
February 2, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet

McGregor Range, as training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Ed Plaia

333. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
334. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
335. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
336. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
337. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 19, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

On behalf of the 600+ members of the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce, we are writing to express our support for the Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

We understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. We want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Please, please keep in mind that this deals with the life-blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

As a Chamber, we have voiced our strong support for the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

We would appreciate your support for Alternative 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Rabon
Vice President
Mesa Verde Enterprises, Inc.
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

**Written Comment Sheet**
McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Renewal
Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your input

**DATE Jan 25, 1999.**

I AM IN TOTAL FAVOR OF RE-WITHDRAWING McGregor Range in its entirety for a timeframe of 50 years, with absolutely no changes to the re-withdrawal, and no conditions imposed on it. We need to keep it as we have it now.

The communities of Las Cruces and Alamogordo, New Mexico, and El Paso, Texas, have joined to support this.

The El Paso community is solidly behind this, and I, as mayor, support this.

**NAME**
Carlos M. Ramirez, P.E. (Environmental Master's Degree)

**ADDRESS**
1 Civic Center Plaza

**CITY**
El Paso, TX

**STATE, ZIP CODE**
TX 79901

**PHONE NUMBER**
(915) 541-4015

Please check if you would like to receive a copy of the Final LEIS (Please Number Required for Federal Express Delivery)

Please Hand This Form In or Mail BEFORE FEBRUARY 5, 1999

Dr. Andy Visel, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
ATTN: ATTEC-CSA (LEIS Comments)
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906
Email: mcgregor@enet10.bliss.army.mil
January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 8020
Fort Bliss, Texas  79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Signature

339. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
340. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
341. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Viet
Attn: ATTC-CSA
P. O. Box 6220
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Viet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range, and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the Range for military use.

Sincerely,

Alberto Rios

ALBERTO RIOS

342. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Viet
Attn: ATZ-C-2SA
P.O. Box 0020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Viet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

[Signature]

343. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
344. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Dr. Andy Vliet  
Attn: ATZC-CSA  
P.O. Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906  

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future. The vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project.

I support Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

I support the continued withdrawal of the entire McGregor Range. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternate 1: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Very truly yours,

Patti Rivera

345. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
346. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Location in Document (include page and line numbers or broader information)</th>
<th>Comment and Suggested Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT. 1: THE ARMY'S PROPOSED ACTION WOULD RESULT IN A PERIOD OF 50 YEARS BEGGINING IN 2021. MCGREGOR RANGE'S BOUNDARIES AS THEY ARE TODAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please print the name Edith Ramon:

**Please check if you would like to receive a copy of the draft LEIS.**

**Please hand this form in or mail before February 9, 1999 to:**

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
Attention: ATZC-CSA [LEIS Comments]
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906
Email: mcgregor@eme10.bliss.army.mil
347. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
348. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
349. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6920
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U. S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
C. J. Roberts
350. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
351. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
352. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
353. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 4, 1999

VIA FACSIMILE - 568-6643

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
El Paso, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet

McGregor Range, as training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the Range for military use.

Regards,

THE MESA GROUP, INC.

Scott M. Schwartz
Chief Executive Officer

354. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
355. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
356. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 21, 1999

Dr. Andy Vllet, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
Attention: ATZC-CSA (LEIS Comments)
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vllet,

I am writing to express my support for the Alternative I listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative I states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (population 55,000) support this project. Please, please keep in mind that this deals with the life-blood of our community, Holloman AFB.

The target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman noted by the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

I would appreciate your support for Alternative I: the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same, and for the McGregor Range target complex.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tom Slape
Thrifty Nickel Want Ads
357. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

February 3, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATCEC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2003; that the current boundaries of the range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Robert E. Smasey

Robert E. Smasey
358. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
359. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
360. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Dear [Name],

Thank you for your input on the McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Renewal Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement.

[Body of the letter discussing the comment and how it was incorporated into the final document.]

NAME: [Name]
ADDRESS: [Address]
CITY: [City]
STATE, ZIP CODE: [State, Zip Code]
PHONE NUMBER: [Phone Number]

Please check if you would like to receive a copy of the Final LEIS (Phone Number Required for Federal Express Delivery)

Please Hand This Form in or Mail BEFORE FEBRUARY 5, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
ATTN: AT22-DSA (LEIS Comments)
P.O. Box 6202
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906
Email: mcgregor@cmnh10.bliss.army.mil

[Signature]
361. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 1, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is very important to our great nation’s defense and also very important to our region’s economic well-being.

Because of this, we at AccuStaff, strongly support the continued use of McGregor Range by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use. El Paso has always supported its defense personnel in every way and we will continue to do so.

Thank you,

Jackie Stacks
Manager of Operations

362. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
364. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

---

From: lnmstokespc@aol.com [SMTP: lnmstokespc@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 29, 1998 8:37 PM
To: mcgregor@emh10.bliss.army.mil
Subject: desert property

Dear parties involved in the review process,
I understand & appreciate the importance of having a maneuver area for our (and other) armed forces in our area. Aside from the fact that the forces have an incidental (and fortuitous) beneficial effect on the El Paso economy, I am also VERY pleased that another incidental effect is that, as a sportsman, the Army’s (et al) effect of using this area is (other than some relatively unnoticeable minor debris) to preserve the natural integrity of the area. I’m sure there are some naturalists who will argue to the contrary, but I’ve seen a great deal of this area, and I’m pleased to say the army does a much better job than many property, if not most, property owners. I would STRONGLY urge that this area be left to the good stewardship of the army, with no limited request that it make access to the property a matter of easy contact with the appropriate personnel, so they may be contacted by phone, mail, fax, or internet without having to make a 20-30 mile drive for an access permit.

As a general rule, MOST people want to comply with the rules provided they remain consistent and don’t change. Just let the public know when they need to stay out of the area and they will keep up the good work.

Thanks for the good work, L. Stokes
365. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
366. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Mr. Glenn W. Talley  
1516 Serrano  
ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO 88310  

January 20, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet  
Attn: ATZC-CSA  
P.O. Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906  

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I understand that the McGregor Range is under the joint jurisdiction of the US Army and the BLM. I want you, as a decision-maker in this process, to know that the vast majority of people in Otero County (pop. 55,000) support this project. Plus, please keep in mind that this deals with the lifeblood of our community, Holloman AFB.

I would appreciate your support for Alternative 1 listed in the Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Alternative 1 states that the current boundaries of McGregor Range would remain the same. Nonmilitary activities would continue under the BLM Resource Management Plan, McGregor Range.

The last Base Realignment and Closure Commission noted that the target complex proposed for the Otero Mesa and McGregor Range and associated flight routes fill a shortcoming of Holloman. Holloman and the USAF need this range space for force readiness and training. The range is a vital resource to the installation triangle of Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman AFB. The fact that the German Air Force is willing to pay for much of the infrastructure provides tremendous savings to the US taxpayer.

These installations are critical components of our economy, providing jobs and a tax base to a relatively sparsely populated and industry-poor region. These installations have proven their value to national defense over and over, and will continue to be vital assets in the future.

Sincerely,

Glenn W. Talley

367. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 1, 1999

Mr. Andy Vliet  
Attn: ATZC-CSA  
P.O. Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well being.

I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the Range for military use.

Sincerely,

Adolfo R. Telles

368. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
February 4, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas  79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Tellez
Call Center Manager

369. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 66270
Fort Bliss, Texas 79986

Dear Dr. Vliet

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Signature

General Manager

370. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
371. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Viet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Viet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

[Signature]

372. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
373. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
374. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

Please Hand This Form In or Mail BEFORE FEBRUARY 5, 1999

Dr. Andy Viset, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
ATTN: ATSC-CSA (LEIS Comment) P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79901
Email: mcgregor@email10.bliss.army.mil
375. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
376. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
377. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 26, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation’s defense and to our region’s economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001, that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today, and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

[Signature]

EL PASO DIVISION
4705 PERSHING, EL PASO, TEXAS 79903
(915) 566-9380 FAX (915) 566-9409
January 28, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
ATTENTION ATZC-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Ft. Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, along with Ft. Bliss, White Sands Missile Range, and Holloman Air Force Base, comprise the largest contiguous training and testing area in the United States. It is extremely important to our nation’s defense, that the Range remain as a training and testing site, with unlimited access to the military. It is also vital to our region’s economic well being.

I very strongly am in favor of continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army, for a period of fifty years, beginning in 2001. The current boundaries of the Range should remain as they are, and there should be no constraints applied to McGregor Range for military use.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

MNW/PO

378. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 29, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attention: ATZA-CSA
P. O. Box 6020
Ft. Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

I strongly favor and support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of fifty years beginning 2001. I support the current boundaries of the Range, and that there be no constraints applied to the Range for military use. There are already several other recreational opportunities in the area, including the Gila National Forest, Sacramento Mountains, Hueco Tanks State Park, and the Franklin Mountains State Park.

I am a native El Pasoan, very familiar with the importance of Ft. Bliss, McGregor Range, White Sands Missile Range, and Holloman Air Force Base, to our nation's defense and to our region's economy. Specifically, the use of McGregor Range for training and testing is paramount for our nation's security and defense. When combined with Ft. Bliss and White Sands, this area provides one of the largest, if not the largest, free fire areas in the free world.

Very truly yours,

Patrick B. Wieland

PBW/po

379. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
January 28, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range, and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our economic well-being. The fact that troops from Air Defense units here at Fort Bliss, and aircraft and crews from Holloman Air Force Base, were called upon to support the last actions in the middle east supports the need for this training site. Where else could they go for essential training?

Therefore, being retired military myself, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of fifty (50) years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Ken Willoughby
Director
Dismas El Paso

380. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
381. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

American Airlines

January 30, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

McGregor Range, as a training and testing site for Fort Bliss, White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base, is of utmost importance to our nation's defense and to our region's economic well-being.

Therefore, I strongly support the continued withdrawal of McGregor Range for use as directed by the U.S. Army for a period of 50 years beginning 2001; that the current boundaries of the Range remain as they are today; and that there be no constraints applied to the range for military use.

Sincerely,

Bruce A. Wingren
General Manager
AMERICAN AIRLINES
El Paso

BW/gh
382. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

January 28, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet
Attn: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Dear Dr. Vliet:

We believe McGregor Range should be maintained as a military reserve, both for our national defense and for the good of the local economy.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Wright
Principal
Wright & Dalbin Architects, Inc.

Frederic Dalbin
Principal
Wright & Dalbin Architects, Inc.
383. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Re: McGregor Bombing Range

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have been a resident of Alamogordo since 1956. I have a business and raised my family here. Because of the excellent economy of Alamogordo, my children have decided to make Alamogordo their home. Holloman AFB has always been a vital part of the Alamogordo economy and we have enjoyed the comradeship of Holloman and now the German Air Force.

This community and Holloman AFB have survived several BRAC considerations. Holloman AFB is the principal support of Otero County.

The German Air Force arrival has been essential to our continued business health. I urge you to continue with the complete withdrawal of McGregor Bombing Range, including Otero Mesa and Culp Canyon. This continuation of the withdrawal is vital to Alamogordo, NM, and is the best use of this land for the majority of its citizens.

Sincerely yours,

Jerald Yates
President
The Ink Well, Inc.

384. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
385. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Private Citizens/Organizations

TELECOPIER TRANSMISSION
COVER PAGE

TO: Or Andrew Vite - Fax # (928) 568-6643
FROM: Martha Coody
DATE: 2/2/99
SUBJECT: Legislative Environmental Impact Statement

COMMENTS ABOUT THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT:
On the page to follow are my comments on the L.E.I.S. for McGregor Range, New Mexico, Land Withdrawal Renewal. Please include them in your final L.E.I.S.

NUMBER OF PAGES TO FOLLOW THIS COVER PAGE: 1

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CALL: (505) 963-2263
TELECOPIER NUMBER: (505) 963-2450
CONTACT PERSON: Martha Coody
P.O. Box 247 / 8410 N Ranch Road
Alamogordo, NM 88310
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
387. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
The Southwest Consolidated Sportsmen consists of approximately 1500 outdoors-oriented men and women in the Las Cruces area. We support Alternative #3 for the proposed withdrawal. It is our position that there are adequate areas in the Tularosa basin to carry out military objectives, including the proposed bombing range. However, recognizing the past history of McGregor Range, we feel that the chance of the military returning the Otero Mesa/Sacramento Foothills portion of the range to public ownership is remote.

Therefore, our secondary position on this issue is that, assuming the Otero Mesa and Sacramento Foothills area is again withdrawn, that the military be required, under the agreement, to act cooperatively with the Bureau of Land Management, NM Department of Game and Fish, and Forest Service to insure that this portion of the range is not degraded or contaminated. Further, our organization strongly feels that public access to the range for recreational purposes, including hunting, should be guaranteed as part of the withdrawal. Under no circumstances should any military activity be allowed which would preclude the use of this area by the public. All such activities should be confined to areas west of the escarpment which are already degraded and off-limits to the public.

Finally, it should be noted that, at some point in the future, however distant, this area, as well as all other military installations, will be used for other purposes. It should be a matter of policy that the military, or any other contaminating entity, be required to "clean up their mess" as it occurs rather than let these areas be an on-going dumping ground for potentially highly dangerous materials and explosives. We must not jeopardize the well-being of future generations and their quality of life because of our own present short-sightedness.
389. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Location in Document (include page and line numbers or broader information)</th>
<th>Comment and Suggested Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR. ANDY VLIET AND MR. TIM SAUERS FOR THEIR PRESENTATION IN ALAMO-GORDO ON JANUARY 12, 1993. I THOUGHT IT WAS OUTSTANDING. THANKS FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS MY THOUGHTS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Christy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
390. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

**Written Comment Sheet**
McGregor Range Land Withdrawal Renewal
Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your input

DATE 1/26/1999

PLEASE PRINT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Location in Document</th>
<th>Comment and Suggested Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative S.</td>
<td>...I believe we should use Alternative S... which would return our land back to the public domain and let the military use some other place possibly...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGregor Range</td>
<td>...I am a native New Mexican and have lived in the area for many years and have watched as money hungry people have sold New Mexico off to foreign and military interests such as nuclear waste dumps, toxic dump sites, military bombing ranges, and now...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Domain</td>
<td>...I want to make sure our public domain is protected and not given away to private interests. If we lose our public domain, I will stand up for the people of our community and fight for our rights to our public domain. I wish my family had fought back to save their ranch...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** CONTINUE ON BACK FOR MORE SPACE ****

NAME: CASSEY N. TYLEK
ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 909
CITY: HOLLoman AFB NM 88330
STATE, ZIP CODE: (505) 479-2527
PHONE NUMBER: (505) 479-2527

PleASe check if you would like to receive a copy of the Final LEIS (Phone Number Required for Federal Express Delivery)

PLEASE HAND THIS FORM IN OR MAIL BEFORE FEBRUARY 9, 1999 TO:

Dr. Andy Vliet, Program Manager
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
Attention: AT2CC-CSA (LEIS Comments)
P.O. Box 6520
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906
Email: mcgregor@embl10.bliss.army.mil
Private Citizens/Organizations

YOUR NAME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Location in Document (Include page and line numbers or broader information)</th>
<th>Comment and Suggested Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TAKEN AND THEY WERE REMOVED FROM THEIR HOMES WITH MACHINERY Guns & TRUCKS (American) | Many of them are now dead from cancer, or course the army prevented them they would return their ranches in good shape, but that was all lies. We even had to have a military escort to even return to a ranch to claim a check from the demolition for a headline of yet another cancer victim who spent his life trying to get his ranch back. At range land, we'll be returned to the public domain for the public use. There are plenty of other areas that are barren where the army is free. Sometimes we are not fighting to protect our citizens and our freedoms & rights. What are we fighting for? The changes being done to New Mexico need to stop. A friend of mine was a student from Quick, who stated that the army didn't care and he is absolutely right. The military job is to kill people and destroy property and the only thing they don't care about it weapons, weaponry, or their property (except it wasn't right). Military doesn't care about our history, our beautiful natural world. We need to stop the noise, air pollution, water pollution, ground pollution. As a marine, German troops they didn't kill enough of us. I have family friends and children, babies, women & men need as young during previous wars so it seems unlikely the need American help. Police killing, they excuse, we accept. President Johnson's response to the Vietnamese was a blanket denial for these millions of human beings. Please keep our public domain back to our citizens. Hand our natural resources freedom to enjoy our beautiful state before the military destroys anymore of it. End a license issued as just flatly or desert westland instead of few pristine areas.
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Dr. Andy Vlott  
USA ADAC Center & Ft. Bliss  
Attn: ATZC-CSA  
PO Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, TX 79905

19 January 1999

Dear Dr. Vlott,

This letter is in support of Alternative 6 in the Legislative Environmental Impact Statement on the McGregor Withdrawal. It is the position of the New Mexico Wilderness Alliance that Culp Canyon is deserving of full wilderness designation and that Otero Mesa should be designated as a National Conservation Area. The historical, cultural, recreational and biological values of the areas (Culp Canyon and Otero Mesa) are simply too important to sacrifice them as a bombing range or a missile training ground. Other areas exist which can meet the nation’s need for military training. However a wilderness like Culp Canyon is, once lost, lost forever. We cannot afford to lose any more wilderness in New Mexico. It has become too rare, and consequently, too precious a resource.

Sincerely,

Martin Heinrich  
for the New Mexico Wilderness Alliance

392. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
Jennifer Johnson  
PO Box 327  
Los Alamos, NM 87544  
February 3, 1999

Dr. Andy Vliet  
USA-ADAC Center and Ft. Bliss  
ATTN: AT7C-CSA  
P.O. Box 6020  
Fort Bliss, Texas 79906

Re: McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Renewal

Dear Dr. Vliet,

I am writing to let you know that I support Alternative 6 in the Legislative EIS which would re-withdraw McGregor Range for 50 years, and would have Congress designate Otero Mesa and Mountain Foothills as a NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA and Culp Canyon as a BLM Wilderness Area.

This seems to me to be the highest and best use for land recognized as an Historic Landscape, with potential historic sacred sites and managed for Multiple Use, wildlife, recreation, grazing and hunting.

The concept that the US Army uses portions of the area occasionally for multi-national force training and as a buffer zone for live fire missile training is ludicrous. These military programs should be allowed to expire, as should the temporary withdrawal of all of McGregor Range, in the year 2001.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Johnson

394. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
395. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
396. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.

JAN 23 203
Waiting for your support for alternatives. For the Congressional designation of Onewheel and maintain football field, Conservation Area and Camp, Camp as a BLM Withdrawal area. No more bombing!!! I will write my congressmen as well. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Elizabeth McDonald RN
101 East Queen St
Goshen, IN 47903.
McGregor Range Military Land Withdrawal Renewal
U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss
ATTN: ATZC-CSA
P.O. Box 6020
Fort Bliss, TX 79906

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you concerning the McGregor Range Land Withdrawal EIS. I favor Alternative 6, which would establish Otero Mesa and Sacramento Foothills as a National Conservation Area. These areas are in good condition and I would like to see them released as an NCA, preserving one of our most shrinking assets—open space and wilderness.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Gary Simpson
4946 Quail Ridge Dr. NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114

397. The Army appreciates your involvement in the environmental analysis process for the renewal of the McGregor Range military land withdrawal. Your comment was considered during preparation of the final LEIS and has become a part of this public comment response document for congressional review.
APPENDIX B

LIST OF ACRONYMS
## LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAF</td>
<td>Army Air Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEC</td>
<td>Area of Critical Environmental Concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Air Defense Artillery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB</td>
<td>Air Force Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIP</td>
<td>Army Stationing and Installations Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Ammunition Supply Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATACMS</td>
<td>Army Tactical Missile Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>Best Management Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>U.S. Department of the Army</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Defense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICON</td>
<td>Federal Interagency Committee on Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIREX</td>
<td>firing exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLPMA</td>
<td>Federal Land Policy and Management Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONSI</td>
<td>Finding of No Significant Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTX</td>
<td>field training exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAF</td>
<td>German Air Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAFB</td>
<td>Holloman Air Force Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRMB</td>
<td>Hazardous and Radioactive Material Bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRMP</td>
<td>Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INRMP</td>
<td>Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>Installation Restoration Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTX</td>
<td>Joint Training Exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCTA</td>
<td>Land Condition Trend Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEIS</td>
<td>Legislative Environmental Impact Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICOM</td>
<td>U.S. Army Missile Command</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLWA</td>
<td>Military Lands Withdrawal Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>National Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>National Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESHAPs</td>
<td>National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMED</td>
<td>New Mexico Environmental Protection Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSPS</td>
<td>New Source Performance Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEIS</td>
<td>Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Public Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>Resource Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMPA</td>
<td>Resource Management Plan Amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROD</td>
<td>Record of Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>region of influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>right-of-way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPMP</td>
<td>Real Property Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDZ</td>
<td>Surface Danger Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Training Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TADC</td>
<td>Training Area Development Concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBM</td>
<td>tactical ballistic missile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>U.S. Air Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSA</td>
<td>Wilderness Study Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSMR</td>
<td>White Sands Missile Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>