



## APPENDIX K – NAWSCL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION



**NAVY - NAVAL AIR WEAPONS STATION, CHINA LAKE**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
FOR THE  
DIGITAL 395 MIDDLE MILE PROJECT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>SECTION 1.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. NOISE .....	5
1.1.1 Preferred Alternative .....	5
1.1.2 No Action Alternative.....	5
1.2. AIR QUALITY.....	5
1.2.1 Preferred Alternative .....	5
1.2.2 No Action Alternative.....	5
1.3. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS .....	6
1.3.1 Preferred Alternative .....	6
1.3.2 No Action Alternative.....	6
1.4. GEOLOGY AND SOILS .....	6
1.4.1 Preferred Alternative .....	6
1.4.2 No Action Alternative.....	6
1.5. WATER RESOURCES .....	6
1.5.1 Preferred Alternative .....	6
1.5.2 No Action Alternative.....	6
1.6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	6
1.6.1 Preferred Alternative .....	6
1.6.2 No Action Alternative.....	7
1.7. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	7
1.7.1 Preferred Alternative .....	7
1.7.2 No Action Alternative.....	7
1.8. AESTHETIC AND VISUAL RESOURCES.....	7
1.8.1 Preferred Alternative .....	7
1.8.2 No Action Alternative.....	7
1.9. LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE.....	7
1.9.1 Preferred Alternative .....	7
1.9.2 No Action Alternative.....	7
1.10. INFRASTRUCTURE .....	8
1.10.1 Preferred Alternative .....	8
1.10.2 No Action Alternative.....	8

1.11. SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES / ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE .....	8
1.11.1 Preferred Alternative .....	8
1.11.2 No Action Alternative.....	8
1.12. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY .....	8
1.12.1 Preferred Alternative .....	8
1.12.2 No Action Alternative.....	9
<b>SECTION 2.0 – CUMULATIVE EFFECTS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1. NOISE .....	10
2.2. AIR QUALITY.....	10
2.3. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS .....	10
2.4. GEOLOGY AND SOILS .....	10
2.5. WATER RESOURCES .....	10
2.6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	10
2.7. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	10
2.8. AESTHETIC AND VISUAL RESOURCES.....	10
2.9. LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE .....	11
2.10. INFRASTRUCTURE .....	11
2.11. SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES / ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE .....	11
2.12. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY .....	11
<b>SECTION 3.0 – RECORD OF NON-APPLICABILITY (TO BE PROVIDED BY NAWSCS).....</b>	<b>12</b>

The Proposed Project is located on NAWSCL at Highway 178, as shown in Appendix K.1, Project Maps Through China Lake. Aerial distribution lines connect to the following schools and buildings: Michelson Lab, Pierce Elementary School, Burroughs High School, Vieweg Elementary School, Richmond Elementary School, and Murray Middle School. The routes to Burroughs High School and Pierce Elementary School will also contain a small amount of buried fiber. The distribution line to Michelson Lab will be aerial along Inyokern Road, followed by installation into existing conduit. If seed is used for erosion control or revegetation work on NAWS China Lake, the seed mix would be approved by a Navy biologist.

Construction proposed to occur on NAWSCL will be subject to circumstances and procedures that comply with base operations on NAWSCL. The Proposed Project will appoint a Point of Contact (POC) that will coordinate construction efforts with the NAWSCL Environmental Management Division. This POC will be responsible for communicating with POC of the NAWSCL Environmental Management Division to coordinate the approval of a proposed construction schedule, identifying the precise location of construction and the methodologies to be employed, identifying construction personnel to complete the construction efforts on NAWSCL and coordinate the approval for their access. The Proposed Project POC and the NAWSCL Environmental Management Division POC will also arrange for a “tailgate” briefing on the morning that construction is to begin on NAWSCL. Lastly, Unexploded Ordinance Technician (UXO) escorts may be required to access particular areas of NAWSCL.

## **SECTION 1.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

### **1.1. NOISE**

#### **1.1.1 Preferred Alternative**

With implementation of the stated mitigation measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts associated with noise. Refer to sections 3.1 and 4.1 of the Final EA/IS.

#### **1.1.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact associated with noise from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.1 and 4.1 of the Final EA/IS.

### **1.2. AIR QUALITY**

#### **1.2.1 Preferred Alternative**

There would be no significant impact associated with air quality from implementation of the Proposed Action. Refer to sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the Final EA/IS.

#### **1.2.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact associated with air quality from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the Final EA/IS.

### **1.3. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

#### **1.3.1 Preferred Alternative**

There would be no significant impact associated with greenhouse gas emissions from implementation of the Proposed Action. Refer to sections 3.3 and 4.3 of the Final EA/IS.

#### **1.3.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact associated with greenhouse gas emissions from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.3 and 4.3 of the Final EA/IS.

### **1.4. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

#### **1.4.1 Preferred Alternative**

With implementation of the stated Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts associated with geology and soils. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Final EA/IS.

#### **1.4.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact associated with geology and soils from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Final EA/IS.

### **1.5. WATER RESOURCES**

#### **1.5.1 Preferred Alternative**

With implementation of the stated Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to water resources. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Final EA/IS.

#### **1.5.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact to water resources from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Final EA/IS.

### **1.6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

#### **1.6.1 Preferred Alternative**

With implementation of the stated mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to biological resources. Refer to sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Final EA/IS. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been consulted regarding impacts to biological resources.

**1.6.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact to biological resources from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Final EA/IS.

**1.7. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**1.7.1 Preferred Alternative**

With implementation of the mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to historic and cultural resources. Refer to sections 3.7 and 4.7 of the Final EA/IS. The State Historical Preservation Office consulted regarding impacts to cultural resources.

**1.7.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact to historic and cultural from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.7 and 4.7 of the Final EA/IS.

**1.8. AESTHETIC AND VISUAL RESOURCES**

**1.8.1 Preferred Alternative**

With implementation of the mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to aesthetic and visual resources. Refer to sections 3.8 and 4.8 of the Final EA/IS.

**1.8.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact to aesthetic and visual from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.8 and 4.8 of the Final EA/IS.

**1.9. LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE**

**1.9.1 Preferred Alternative**

With implementation of the mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to land use and agriculture. Refer to sections 3.9 and 4.9 of the Final EA/IS.

**1.9.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact to land use and agriculture from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.9 and 4.9 of the Final EA/IS.

**1.10. INFRASTRUCTURE**

**1.10.1 Preferred Alternative**

With implementation of the Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to infrastructure. Refer to sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the Final EA/IS.

**1.10.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact to infrastructure from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the Final EA/IS. However, the No Action Alternative would not provide the high-speed internet and communications connectivity to areas of the two states that are populated and presently unserved or underserved.

**1.11. SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES / ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

**1.11.1 Preferred Alternative**

With implementation of the mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to socioeconomic resources / environmental justice. Refer to sections 3.11 and 4.11 of the Final EA/IS. Local economies would be positively impacted by the Proposed Project as construction and installation crews would be staying in hotels, making purchases and using services.

**1.11.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact to socioeconomic resources / environmental justice from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.11 and 4.11 of the Final EA/IS. However, the No Action Alternative would not gain the socioeconomic benefits through the provision of high-speed internet and communications connectivity to areas of the two states that are populated and presently unserved or underserved.

**1.12. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY**

**1.12.1 Preferred Alternative**

The China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS) has a number of Installation Restoration Program (IRP) hazardous waste sites in the vicinity of the Proposed Project route. Any of these sites could be of concern to the safety of the project construction workers if soil or groundwater contaminated with hazardous wastes was within the trench depth of the cable installation. A report of contamination at a former gas station about 1,400 feet from the cable route (IRP-Site 70, *Workplan, Site Assessment for Petroleum contamination at the Former PW Gas Station, Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California, June 4, 2010*) contained hydrological information for the local area documenting depth to groundwater below the ground surface from 42 to 44 feet. Other site contamination assessment reports on IRP sites in the vicinity found groundwater to be at approximately 45 feet below ground surface. Because groundwater is far below the depth of a 4-foot trench in which the proposed project fiber optic

cable will be buried, contaminated groundwater in the China Lake vicinity will not be a concern for the safety of the project's construction workers.

For hazardous waste contaminated soils to pose a threat to construction workers' safety, the construction must go through the contaminated area. Two IRP sites, #69 and #32, are within the Proposed Project ROW in the area of aerial distribution line and will not be disturbed. A China Lake NAWS IRP site is IRP-Site 12, SNORT Road Landfill, is approximately 400 feet away at the closest edge of the landfill to the Proposed Project route. A Navy remedial investigation of this site determined that the site posed no risk to human health or the environment. However, land-use restrictions at this site and improvements to the landfill cover and drainage were recommended and have been implemented (*Final Management Plan, Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California, March 2006*).

With implementation of the Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant impacts to human health and safety. Refer to sections 3.12 and 4.12 of the Final EA/IS.

#### **1.12.2 No Action Alternative**

There would be no significant impact to human health and safety from implementation of the No Action Alternative. Refer to sections 3.12 and 4.12 of the Final EA/IS.

## SECTION 2.0 – CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

### 2.1. NOISE

With implementation of the stated mitigation measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts associated with noise. Refer to sections 3.1 and 4.1 of the Final EA/IS.

### 2.2. AIR QUALITY

There would be no significant cumulative impact associated with air quality from implementation of the Proposed Action. Refer to sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the Final EA/IS.

### 2.3. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

There would be no significant cumulative impact associated with greenhouse gas emissions from implementation of the Proposed Action. Refer to sections 3.3 and 4.3 of the Final EA/IS.

### 2.4. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

With implementation of the stated Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts associated with geology and soils. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Final EA/IS.

### 2.5. WATER RESOURCES

With implementation of the stated Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts to water resources. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Final EA/IS.

### 2.6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

With implementation of the stated mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts to biological resources. Refer to sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Final EA/IS.

### 2.7. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

With implementation of the mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts to historic and cultural resources. Refer to sections 3.7 and 4.7 of the Final EA/IS.

### 2.8. AESTHETIC AND VISUAL RESOURCES

With implementation of the mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts to aesthetic and visual resources. Refer to sections 3.8 and 4.8 of the Final EA/IS.

## **2.9. LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE**

With implementation of the mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts to land use and agriculture. Refer to sections 3.9 and 4.9 of the Final EA/IS.

## **2.10. INFRASTRUCTURE**

With implementation of the Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts to infrastructure. Refer to sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the Final EA/IS.

## **2.11. SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES / ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

With implementation of the mitigation measures and Applicant Proposed Measures (e.g., noise, traffic, air quality, and other environmental mitigation measures) as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts to socioeconomic resources / environmental justice. Refer to sections 3.11 and 4.11 of the Final EA/IS.

## **2.12. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY**

With implementation of the Applicant Proposed Measures as described in Appendix B, the Proposed Action would not result in significant cumulative impacts to human health and safety. Refer to sections 3.12 and 4.12 of the Final EA/IS.

**SECTION 3.0 – RECORD OF NON-APPLICABILITY (TO BE PROVIDED BY NAWSCCL)**



C H A M B E R S G R O U P

## APPENDIX K.1 – PROJECT MAPS THROUGH NAWSCl















