



**FINAL COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
EVALUATION FOR
CONTINUATION AND MODERNIZATION OF MCMURDO
STATION AREA ACTIVITIES**

August 2019

For further information regarding the CEE process, please contact:

Dr. Polly A. Penhale, Senior Advisor, Environment
National Science Foundation, Office of Polar Programs
2415 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
E-mail: CEE.comments@nsf.gov

**National Science Foundation
2415 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22314**

This page intentionally left blank.

**FINAL COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION FOR CONTINUATION AND
MODERNIZATION OF MCMURDO STATION AREA ACTIVITIES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Non-Technical SummaryNS-1

1. Introduction, Purpose and Need..... 1-1

 1.1 National Science Foundation and United States Antarctic Program Background 1-1

 1.1.1 History of Program and Development at McMurdo 1-1

 1.1.2 Scientific Goals of the USAP at McMurdo and Field Locations
 Supported by the Station..... 1-1

 1.2 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Activity 1-2

 1.3 Scope of the Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation 1-3

 1.3.1 Scoping Process 1-3

 1.3.2 International and Domestic Obligations 1-3

**2. Operational Developments in the USAP During the Past Three Decades in the
McMurdo Area 2-1**

 2.1 Introduction..... 2-1

 2.2 McMurdo Station Developments 2-1

 2.2.1 Initial Station Layout and Operation..... 2-1

 2.2.2 Improvements to McMurdo Area 2-4

 2.2.3 Current Layout of McMurdo Station and Supported Facilities 2-7

 2.3 International Collaborations..... 2-10

3. Proposed Activity and Alternatives..... 3-1

 3.1 Introduction..... 3-1

 3.2 Implement AIMS Projects under the McMurdo Master Plan 3-1

 3.2.1 Summary Description of AIMS Projects 3-4

 3.2.2 General Aspects of AIMS Construction and Operation Phases..... 3-6

 3.3 Implement McMurdo Master Plan..... 3-9

 3.3.1 Summary Description of McMurdo Master Plan Projects..... 3-9

 3.3.2 General Aspects of McMurdo Master Plan Project Construction and
 Operation 3-11

 3.4 Continued Operation of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities..... 3-12

 3.4.1 McMurdo Station Facilities and Operations (Baseline Conditions) 3-12

 3.4.2 McMurdo Station Facilities and Operations (During Construction and
 Post-Construction) 3-14

 3.5 Closure and Demolition of McMurdo Station Facilities..... 3-18

 3.6 Alternatives Considered..... 3-18

 3.6.1 Alternative B: No Action/Maintain Current Level of Activity..... 3-18

 3.6.2 Alternatives Considered but Not Carried Forward 3-18

4. Initial Environmental Reference/Affected Environment 4-1

4.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.2	McMurdo Station and Ross Island.....	4-1
	4.2.1 Environmental Resources	4-1
	4.2.2 Ecological Resources	4-2
4.3	McMurdo Dry Valleys (MDV).....	4-7
	4.3.1 Environmental Resources	4-7
	4.3.2 Ecological Resources	4-7
4.4	Deep-Field Sites.....	4-8
	4.4.1 Environmental Resources	4-8
	4.4.2 Ecological Resources	4-8
4.5	McMurdo Sound and the Ross Sea.....	4-8
	4.5.1 Environmental Resources	4-8
	4.5.2 Ecological Resources.....	4-9
4.6	Protected Areas and Other Sites of International Significance.....	4-13
4.7	Prediction of Future Environmental Reference in the Absence of Proposed Activity	4-16
5.	Identification and Prediction of Impacts	5-1
5.1	Introduction.....	5-1
5.2	Methodology and Data Sources	5-1
5.3	Impacts from McMurdo Station Modernization	5-2
	5.3.1 Building Demolition and Construction.....	5-2
	5.3.2 Site Preparation, Fill, and Fines Harvesting and Use	5-4
	5.3.3 Drainage Improvements.....	5-6
	5.3.4 Blasting and Explosives Use.....	5-6
	5.3.5 Import of Material.....	5-7
	5.3.6 Vehicle Use.....	5-7
5.4	Impacts from Continuing Existing McMurdo Area Activities and Operating Existing Facilities During and After Modernization Projects.....	5-7
	5.4.1 Building Use	5-8
	5.4.2 Helicopter and Fixed Wing Operations	5-8
	5.4.3 Traverse Operations.....	5-8
	5.4.4 Vessel and Ice Pier Operations	5-8
	5.4.5 Support Facility Operations	5-8
	5.4.6 Field Camp Operations	5-9
	5.4.7 Water and Wastewater Operations.....	5-9
	5.4.8 Power Operations.....	5-10
	5.4.9 Solid Waste Operations	5-10
	5.4.10 Hazardous Waste Operations.....	5-10
	5.4.11 Fuel Use and Storage	5-10
	5.4.12 Hazardous Material Storage and Use.....	5-11
	5.4.13 Explosives Use.....	5-11

5.4.14	Fines and Fill	5-11
5.4.15	Materials Storage and Use	5-12
5.4.16	Vehicle Use.....	5-12
5.4.17	Science Support	5-12
5.5	Climate Change Implications.....	5-12
5.6	Unavoidable Impacts	5-12
5.7	Cumulative Impacts	5-13
5.7.1	Introduction.....	5-13
5.7.2	Impacts of Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects	5-13
5.7.3	Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Activity	5-14
5.8	Summary of Impacts	5-14
6.	Mitigation Measures	6-1
6.1	Introduction.....	6-1
6.2	Mitigation during McMurdo Infrastructure Modernization Activities	6-1
6.2.1	Building Demolition and Construction.....	6-1
6.2.2	Waste Management.....	6-2
6.2.3	Site Preparation, Fill, and Fines.....	6-3
6.2.4	Explosives.....	6-3
6.2.5	Importation and Transfer of Materials, Equipment, and Personnel.....	6-3
6.2.6	Vehicle Use.....	6-4
6.2.7	Historic Sites and Monuments.....	6-4
6.3	Mitigation Measures During Continuing Existing McMurdo Area Activities and Operating Existing Facilities.....	6-4
6.4	Environmental Reporting and Review.....	6-4
7.	Environmental Monitoring	7-1
7.1	Overview of Past Monitoring Studies and Assessments.....	7-1
7.2	Monitoring Plan	7-2
7.2.1	USAP Environmental Monitoring Program.....	7-2
7.3	Verification of Predicted Impacts of the Proposed Activities.....	7-3
8.	Decommissioning of United States Antarctic Program Facilities in the McMurdo Area	8-1
9.	Gaps in Knowledge and Uncertainties	9-1
9.1	Uncertainties in Methodology.....	9-1
9.2	Uncertainties in Construction and Demolition.....	9-1
9.3	Uncertainties in Future Science	9-2
10.	Conclusions.....	10-1
11.	CEE Preparers and Reviewers	11-1
12.	Glossary	12-1
13.	References.....	13-1
14.	Appendices.....	14-1

Appendix A : Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Units of Measure	14-3
Appendix B : Supplemental Information.....	14-5
Appendix C : Comments Solicited and Responses to Comments	14-23

List of Tables

Table 2-1. Typical Annual Aircraft Support to the USAP	2-9
Table 2-2. Typical Field Camp Characteristics in the USAP	2-16
Table 3-1. Anticipated Impact Sources of AIMS Construction Phase.....	3-7
Table 3-2. Replacement Airfield-Support Buildings	3-11
Table 3-3. Anticipated Impact Sources of the McMurdo Master Plan Projects Construction Phase.....	3-12
Table 3-4. Key Impact Sources of McMurdo Station Operations, Averaged Over Previous Five Years	3-13
Table 3-5. Anticipated Impact Sources from Continuing McMurdo Station Operations and Facilities During Construction and Post-construction ¹	3-15
Table 4-1. ASMA and ASPAs in the McMurdo Area	4-14
Table 5-1. Criteria for Assessment of Potential Impacts on the Environment.....	5-15
Table 5-2. Impacts of McMurdo Station Modernization (AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan) Activities	5-16
Table 5-3. Impacts of Continued Operations of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities	5-20
Table 6-1. Mitigation Measures Implemented during Continuing Operations and Modernization Activities	6-5
Table B-1. EIAs for USAP Activities Representative of Programmatic Activities and Facility Construction, General Operations, and Selected Long-Term Research Efforts.....	14-7
Table B-2. Fauna Occurring in the Vicinity of McMurdo Station.....	14-10
Table B-3a. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Power-Generation Sources at McMurdo Station (Existing Conditions).....	14-11
Table B-3b. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Heating- and Water-Production Sources at McMurdo Station (Existing Conditions).....	14-12
Table B-3c. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Fuel-Powered Equipment at McMurdo Station and Outlying Facilities (Existing Conditions).....	14-13
Table B-3d. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Aircraft (Existing Conditions)	14-13
Table B-4a. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Power-Generation Sources at McMurdo Station (Maximum during Modernization Activity)	14-14
Table B-4b. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Heating- and Water-Production Sources at McMurdo Station (Maximum during Modernization Activity).....	14-15
Table B-4c. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Fuel-Powered Equipment at McMurdo Station and Outlying Facilities (Maximum during Modernization Activity).....	14-16
Table B-4d. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Aircraft (Maximum during Modernization Activity)	14-16
Table B-5a. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Power-Generation Sources at McMurdo Station (Average during Modernization Activity)	14-17
Table B-5b. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Heating- and Water-Production Sources at McMurdo Station (Average during Modernization Activity)	14-18
Table B-5c. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Fuel-Powered Equipment at McMurdo Station and Outlying Facilities (Average during Modernization Activity).....	14-19
Table B-5d. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Aircraft (Average during Modernization Activity)	14-19

Table B-6a. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Power-Generation Sources at McMurdo Station (Post-Modernization)..... 14-20

Table B-6b. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Heating- and Water-Production Sources at McMurdo Station (Post-Modernization)..... 14-21

Table B-6c. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Fuel-Powered Equipment at McMurdo Station and Outlying Facilities (Post-Modernization)..... 14-22

Table B-6d. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Aircraft (Post-Modernization) 14-22

List of Figures

Figure 1-1. Location of McMurdo Station on Ross Island and within the McMurdo Area.....	1-4
Figure 2-1. Map of McMurdo Area with Map of McMurdo Station in 1989	2-3
Figure 2-2a. McMurdo Station Existing Facilities and Topography in 2018	2-14
Figure 2-2b. Aerial Photo of McMurdo Station Existing Facilities.....	2-15
Figure 3-1a. McMurdo Station Current Layout and Planned Demolitions.....	3-2
Figure 3-1b. McMurdo Station Following Modernization under AIMS (2027).....	3-3
Figure 3-2. Estimated Fuel Consumption During Modernization Activities (AIMS) by Construction Year	3-16
Figure 3-3. Timing of Modernization Activities During AIMS	3-17
Figure 4-1a. Environmental Values Surrounding McMurdo Station, Ross Island	4-4
Figure 4-1b. Environmental Values at McMurdo Station.....	4-5
Figure 4-2. Distribution of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) Concentrations Observed in Soils at McMurdo Station (Klein et al. 2012).....	4-6
Figure 5-1. Fines Harvesting Areas at McMurdo Station	5-5

This page intentionally left blank.

Non-Technical Summary

Introduction, Purpose and Need

The United States has conducted scientific and educational programs in Antarctica continuously since the International Geophysical Year of 1957-1958 and is dedicated to continuing this mission as a matter of national policy¹ and to foster international cooperation. Over the last 60 years of United States research in Antarctica, science has increased in complexity and extent, requiring greater support over time.

McMurdo Station was established in 1955 on Ross Island in the southwestern Ross Sea, in the southernmost area of Antarctica accessible by ship. The station serves as a gateway to Antarctica for most United States scientific field teams and as a hub for most United States scientific activities on the continent. Much of the infrastructure at McMurdo Station supporting these programs dates back several decades and is nearing or has exceeded its intended life expectancy. Today, many components of the McMurdo Station infrastructure need to be upgraded to ensure that United States activities in Antarctica can continue uninterrupted. The National Science Foundation (NSF) proposes to modernize McMurdo Station while continuing the United States Antarctic Program (USAP) science and operational activities at McMurdo Station and at field sites and associated facilities the station supports.

The purpose of the proposed activity is to ensure that USAP's resources at McMurdo Station continue to serve as viable and flexible platforms to support evolving scientific research efficiently and effectively. The proposed activity would implement modernization projects under the McMurdo Master Plan, including the subset of McMurdo Master Plan projects in the Antarctic Infrastructure Modernization for Science (AIMS) project, by replacing or substantially upgrading assets at McMurdo Station that are nearing or have exceeded their life expectancy. Proposed modernization activities would provide facilities and equipment that meet energy efficiency standards, logistical requirements, and environmental stewardship goals. In addition, the proposed activity would continue USAP's science and operations at McMurdo Station and the facilities supported by the station at or near current levels.

Based on a preliminary environmental review, NSF determined that the proposed activity is likely to have a more than minor or transitory impact on the Antarctic environment. In response to this determination, NSF has conducted an in-depth environmental impact assessment (EIA), termed a Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE), to evaluate the potential impacts of implementing the proposed activity.

This CEE has been prepared in accordance with applicable provisions of Annex I, Article 3 of the *Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*² (the Protocol); the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica*³ (ATS 2016a); the Antarctic Conservation Act, as amended by the *Antarctic Science Tourism and Conservation Act of 1996*, 16 United States Code (U.S.C.) § 2401 *et seq.* (ACA); and implementing regulations set forth in *Environmental Assessment Procedures for National Science Foundation Actions in Antarctica*, 45 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) § 641.

¹ Presidential Memorandum 6646 (1982) and Presidential Decision Directive/NSC-26 (1994).

² *The Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (1991); <http://www.ats.aq/e/ep.htm>.

³ Antarctic Treaty Secretariat (ATS), *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (2016); http://ats.aq/documents/recatt/Att605_e.pdf

Using the EIA process, the USAP has assessed and continues to assess the potential environmental impacts of specific, proposed projects while other assessments evaluate the impacts of recurring activities (e.g., deployment of remote equipment and automatic weather stations, establishment of field camps, building maintenance, and use of explosives). Informed by the EIA process, and with a focus on environmental stewardship in Antarctica, the USAP mitigates impacts from common sources, preventing and/or minimizing

- spills or other accidental releases;
- the introduction or distribution of non-native species;
- the release of materials or wastes to terrestrial or marine resources;
- physical disturbance of terrestrial areas;
- disturbance or contamination of sensitive environments (e.g., McMurdo Dry Valleys, subglacial lakes, geothermal resources);
- disturbance or injury to Antarctic flora and fauna;
- the release of emissions to the atmosphere;
- alteration to the terrain, either through expanding existing facilities or occupying new sites; and
- alteration to the visual landscape, aesthetic and wilderness value of the Antarctic environment.

Proposed Activity and Alternatives

The proposed activity (Alternative A) would implement modernization projects under the McMurdo Master Plan (including AIMS), while continuing USAP's science and operations at McMurdo Station and locations supported by the station. Proposed modernization projects would involve demolishing, constructing, renovating, and operating buildings and structures at McMurdo Station. Ongoing science and operations at McMurdo Station (and locations supported by the station) would be maintained at or near current levels throughout the approximately 15- to 20-year construction phase of modernization projects. Proposed modernization projects address

- construction and operational features to enhance safety and health for USAP's participants and visitors;
- building placement to increase operational efficiency and function;
- energy conservation to increase efficiency and the incorporation of renewable energy sources;
- support functions, such as fire protection, materials storage and distribution, and electrical distribution to optimize infrastructure in support of research and operational activities;
- support for a population that should not exceed 1000 people during the austral summer;
- logistics management to optimize warehousing and delivery processes; and
- quality of life upgrades to improve the living and working experience of McMurdo Station residents.

The proposed new facilities and infrastructure would be built within the current footprint of McMurdo Station. Some facilities and functions at the station would be consolidated into new, centralized buildings to meet modernization objectives. When complete, it is estimated that the proposed improvements would

result in enhanced safety, greater fuel use efficiency, lower air emissions, reduced power and heat requirements, fewer vehicle operation hours, and fewer support and maintenance personnel. For example, McMurdo Station modernization projects would yield an estimated 35% reduction in diesel fuel consumption (for heat, power, and water) compared to current levels, due to facility consolidation and reductions in terrestrial fleet vehicle use.

It is anticipated that science and operational activities at McMurdo Station and outlying facilities supported by the station would continue at or near current levels during the construction phase of modernization projects. It is also anticipated that baseline impact levels would remain relatively constant when implementing these modernization projects. In some cases, efficiencies gained through implementing modernization projects may extend to existing facilities, once construction is completed.

In Alternative B, no infrastructure modernization would be implemented and McMurdo Station would continue science support and operational activities. Alternatives Considered but not Carried Forward included building design and configuration options.

Initial Environmental Reference

The affected environment where the proposed activity would be implemented includes McMurdo Station and surrounding areas where remote facilities and activities are supported from McMurdo Station, including

- Ross Island;
- McMurdo Sound and the Ross Sea;
- McMurdo Dry Valleys; and
- Deep-field sites across the Polar Plateau, the Transantarctic Mountains, glaciers, basins, and ice shelves.

McMurdo Station is located on Ross Island, at the southern tip of the Hut Point Peninsula and within Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region 9 and Environment S of the Environmental Domains Analysis. McMurdo Station, which encompasses approximately 2.5 km² (1 mi²), and its surrounding area are characterized as heavily disturbed. Ross Island holds many important ecological resources, such as algae, fungi, lichen, mosses, small invertebrates, seal colonies, and seabird colonies. Emperor penguins (*Aptenodytes forsteri*), Adélie penguins (*Pygoscelis adeliae*), and south polar skua (*Catharacta maccormicki*) breed at Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) on Ross Island, including ASPA No. 124, Cape Crozier and ASPA No. 121, Cape Royds. The McMurdo Dry Valleys, within Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region 9, encompasses approximately 17,500 km² (6760 mi²), comprises the largest relatively ice-free area on the Antarctic continent, and includes Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) No. 2, the largest ASMA in Antarctica. The McMurdo Dry Valleys are a cold desert ecosystem that contains important microbiological communities, including colonies of moss, algae, cyanobacteria, and nematodes. ASMA No. 2 also includes special geological features and minerals. Lakes within the McMurdo Dry Valleys support abundant, widespread growth of benthic cyanobacteria-dominated mats, which influence overall lake geochemistry.

The Ross Sea, including McMurdo Sound, is one of the most biologically productive regions in the Southern Ocean and includes a variety of benthic communities, marine mammals, penguins, fish, and

invertebrates. Snow- and ice-covered deep-field sites in the Antarctic interior are generally devoid of flora or fauna. Numerous protected areas are present in the affected environment, including 18 ASPAs and five historic sites and monuments near McMurdo Station.

Identification and Prediction of Impacts

Potential impacts were evaluated by considering the context in which they would occur, as well as their extent, duration, intensity, and probability. Impacts from construction activities were evaluated, including building demolition, site preparation, soil fill and fines management, explosives use, importation of materials (as a potential introduction of non-native species), building construction, vehicle/heavy equipment use, traverse operations, and aircraft operations. Impacts were evaluated with respect to

- wildlife disturbance;
- air quality;
- noise;
- altered land contours;
- quality of terrestrial or marine environments;
- introduced non-native species;
- waste management;
- historic or aesthetic resources; and
- cumulative impacts resulting from relevant past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects.

Impacts resulting from the proposed activities could potentially be less than the impacts analyzed in this CEE. Impacts would be spread across the approximately 15- to 20-year construction phase of modernization projects. As a result of efficiency gains from modernization projects, impacts from continuing science and station operations are expected to be reduced compared to existing impact levels, while providing improved support for science.

Impacts from proposed modernization activities at McMurdo Station would include altering and modernizing the visual characteristics of the station and physically disturbing rock and soil in work site areas, including the generation of fines, releasing airborne pollutant emissions from construction vehicles and equipment, and generating construction waste, which requires handling and removal from Antarctica. These impacts would generally be confined to proposed project sites and would cease upon completion of modernization activities. Mitigation measures would further reduce potential impacts from the proposed activity.

Following the completion of demolition and construction activities, disturbed areas would either be regraded to the approximate original contour or prepared for new construction. The station modernization activities would improve visual sightlines when approaching the station from McMurdo Sound, thereby resulting in a beneficial impact to the aesthetic values of Ross Island.

During the multi-year construction phase, the proposed modernization activities would generate construction and demolition debris in excess of the non-hazardous solid waste currently generated

annually at McMurdo Station. All construction and demolition waste would be packaged and removed from Antarctica. Following completion of proposed modernization improvements, the amount of solid waste generated by ongoing science and operational activities would return to an amount similar to or below the amount currently generated. Thus, the proposed activity would have no long-term impacts from waste generated at McMurdo Station during modernization projects.

The use of mechanized equipment and associated fuel combustion would result in the unavoidable release of exhaust byproducts into the atmosphere during both modernization activities and ongoing science and operational activities. However, the multi-year timeframe for modernization activities would allow emissions to effectively disperse and only cause a localized impact that is consistent with normal emissions at McMurdo Station. Thus, emissions would not degrade local or regional air quality. Further, efficiencies gained through modernization activities, including an anticipated reduction of the vehicle fleet, would result in reduced fuel use and thus a reduction in associated air emissions from ongoing science and operational activities.

Proposed modernization activities would ultimately result in a reduction of impacts by

- consolidating and replacing aging structures;
- constructing new, better-insulated, and more-efficient facilities;
- upgrading power distribution to include smart grid systems;
- consolidating existing functions into a smaller developed footprint;
- reducing the amount of fuel used to generate heat and electricity;
- reducing the vehicle fleet and associated air emissions; and
- slowing snowmelt runoff drainage, thus reducing the scouring and erosion of drainage canals at McMurdo Station.

Cumulative and Unavoidable Impacts

Cumulative impacts are the effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities that may interact with the proposed activity over time and space. McMurdo Master Plan (including AIMS) construction activities would be phased over time and would only occur on previously disturbed land within the McMurdo Station footprint to minimize impacts to the environment. Reasonably foreseeable activities are activities that are separate from the proposed activity and likely to occur in the same area and time as the proposed activity. Continued science and operations during and after modernization would result in impacts to the environment and contribute to cumulative impacts in the area. Continuing mitigation measures, monitoring, and cleanup of past-contaminated areas would reduce these impacts.

Unavoidable impacts directly resulting from implementing the proposed activity include physical disturbance of surfaces (fines and rock harvesting) in the McMurdo Station facility zone, air emissions (including fuel use and dust generation), releases to the environment (including spills and wastewater releases), waste generation, and noise. The proposed activity would not result in impacts that are substantively new or different from those already occurring. The USAP is committed to making the proposed improvements to better serve new and continuing research and to enhance stewardship of the Antarctic.

Mitigation Measures and Monitoring

As applicable, personnel implementing proposed modernization improvements would adhere to established general and/or facility-specific procedures, best management practices, and mitigation measures to minimize impacts from building demolition and construction, site preparation, explosives use, import of materials, and vehicle use. These measures would be consistent with procedures routinely implemented by the USAP and would be documented accordingly. As necessary during implementation, activities would be monitored to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented and that resulting impacts are consistent with those identified in this CEE.

Gaps in Knowledge and Uncertainties

Uncertainty and unknowns are inherent in the environmental analysis of the proposed activity. The greatest uncertainties and gaps in knowledge relate to the methodology used to estimate impact parameters, the precise timing of modernization activities, construction conditions, weather, and future science requirements. Impacts described in this CEE account for a range of conditions during facility modernization, including the service life of the facility. Therefore, variations or uncertainties that do not involve major changes to the proposed activities are not expected to significantly affect the impacts of those activities or alter the conclusions of this CEE. Additionally, if project-specific plans are refined or changed, USAP's EIA process would be implemented and updated or new EIA documentation may be prepared to meet the requirements of Annex I of the Protocol and in accordance with the ACA and its implementing regulations set forth in 45 C.F.R. § 641.

Conclusions

This CEE identifies impacts potentially resulting from the proposed activity, which would implement modernization projects at McMurdo Station over a period of approximately 15-20 years and continue ongoing science and operations at McMurdo Station and the area it supports.

The proposed activity (modernization and continuing operations) is not anticipated to expand the operational footprint of McMurdo Station or fixed facilities supported by McMurdo Station. Similarly, the proposed activity would not result in impacts that are substantively new or different from those that have already occurred. Impacts from the proposed activity are projected to be localized and either contained and removed from the continent (e.g., solid and hazardous waste) or at a level that the environment is able to absorb without change at the regional level (e.g., wastewater effluent and air emissions). However, some impacts would result in more than minor or transitory impacts, even with proposed mitigations. Therefore, the proposed activity is likely to result in some long-term, adverse impacts on the Antarctic environment, although any such impacts would be less than current operations.

The proposed activity would result in substantial improvements in environmental performance, and consistent use of mitigations and monitoring would further minimize impacts. Benefits would include continuing substantive scientific and logistic collaboration with other Antarctic programs and increased potential for enhanced international collaboration as new science and logistical opportunities arise.

The major benefits of modernization components of the proposed activity are

- improved capacity for USAP's research in concert with continuing international collaborations in scientific and operational activities;
- enhanced safety performance in the USAP;
- increased operational efficiency (12% reduction in support staff; 40% reduction in maintenance staff);
- increased logistical efficiency (20% reduction in building square footage);
- reduced outdoor storage to reduce the risk of material being released to the environment;
- reduced energy consumption (35% reduction in station fuel consumption; 20% reduction in vehicle fuel use);
- reduced carbon emissions; and
- reduced long-term environmental impact.

This page intentionally left blank.

1. Introduction, Purpose and Need

1.1 National Science Foundation and United States Antarctic Program Background

The National Science Foundation (NSF) Office of Polar Programs (OPP), which operates the United States Antarctic Program (USAP), has prepared a Final Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with the modernization of McMurdo Station infrastructure and the continuation of USAP's activities in the McMurdo Station area.

1.1.1 History of Program and Development at McMurdo

The USAP was established in 1959, following the success of scientific activities around the world during the International Geophysical Year of 1957–1958. United States policy regarding Antarctica is set forth in Presidential Memorandum 6646 (1982), and Presidential Decision Directive/National Security Council (NSC)-26 (1994), which provides that “The United States Antarctic Program shall be maintained at a level providing an active and influential presence in Antarctica designed to support the range of United States Antarctic interests.”

McMurdo Station was established in 1955 on Ross Island in the southwestern Ross Sea, the southernmost area of Antarctica accessible by ship. The station serves as a gateway to Antarctica for most United States scientific field teams, as a hub for most United States scientific activities on the continent, and is required to support South Pole Station. McMurdo Station has evolved over a period of 60 years, based on changes in research needs and operational requirements. McMurdo Station currently occupies a developed footprint of approximately 2.5 km² (1 mi²) on Ross Island, as well as two airfield facilities located on the nearby McMurdo Ice Shelf (Figure 1-1).

The McMurdo area USAP population is primarily present during the austral summer (October through February). Based on the most recent five-year average, the typical McMurdo Station austral summer population is approximately 975 personnel, and the typical McMurdo Station austral winter population is approximately 140 personnel.

1.1.2 Scientific Goals of the USAP at McMurdo and Field Locations Supported by the Station

USAP's scientific goals are to

- understand Antarctica and its associated ecosystems;
- understand the region's effects on and responses to the global system, such as climate, space weather, and sea level; and
- use Antarctica's unique features as a platform to conduct research in areas of scientific interest that cannot be studied elsewhere.

USAP research encompasses wide-ranging areas of science, including astrophysics and geospace science, Antarctic earth sciences, glaciology, Antarctic integrated system science, Antarctic ocean and atmospheric sciences, and Antarctic organisms and ecosystems. Each research discipline is represented in the McMurdo area or at field locations supported by McMurdo Station, including one Long-Term Ecological Research (LTER) program (established in 1992) in the McMurdo Dry Valleys (MDV).

1.2 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Activity

NSF proposes to modernize McMurdo Station and continue McMurdo area operational activities. Much of the McMurdo Station infrastructure is 30-50 years old and is nearing or has exceeded its life expectancy, thus requiring frequent maintenance and repair. Existing McMurdo Station facilities are degraded, unsafe, inefficient (e.g. leak air), and are in various states of disrepair due to their age. Currently, McMurdo Station has more than 100 buildings. Many of the aging facilities, originally constructed on an as-needed basis, have been repurposed throughout the years and were not designed to meet energy efficiency standards or provide effective support for scientific research. The purpose of implementing the proposed activity is to provide facilities and support at McMurdo Station that effectively, efficiently, and safely support current and evolving NSF Antarctic science objectives and meet USAP's goals of environmental stewardship in Antarctica.

Proposed modernization activities would provide facilities, equipment, and infrastructure to replace or substantially upgrade assets that are nearing or have exceeded their life expectancy. Providing facilities, equipment, and infrastructure that meet or exceed current energy efficiency and logistical requirements also meets the goal of providing viable support for USAP's science and operational activities at McMurdo Station and the areas directly supported by the station.

Over the last 60 years of United States research in Antarctica, science has increased in complexity and extent, thus requiring increasingly sophisticated support over time. During each of the past five austral summers, the USAP supported an average of 80 science projects from McMurdo Station, including more than 40 field camps and remote operational facilities outside of the station footprint, as well as both airlift and overland traverse support. The demand for scientific and educational programs in Antarctica is expected to continue to evolve over the next few decades.

Recent studies by the National Research Council, the USAP Blue Ribbon Panel (BRP), and the National Academies that analyzed USAP's mission to support and pursue science in Antarctica have guided development of the modernization plan at McMurdo Station. In particular, the BRP report *More and Better Science in Antarctica through Increased Logistical Effectiveness* (BRP 2012) identified steps to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of logistics and the operational support of science in Antarctica. Recommendations in the report included

- increasing the efficiency of science support by upgrading or replacing aging facilities at McMurdo Station;
- broadening environmental stewardship programs;
- increasing energy efficiency; and
- enhancing renewable energy technologies to reduce operational costs.

In response to the study recommendations, the USAP updated the McMurdo Master Plan in December 2015 (NSF 2015a). The McMurdo Master Plan aims to guide consolidating and modernizing facilities at McMurdo Station to more effectively and efficiently support NSF Antarctic science objectives. The proposed activity in this CEE includes implementing the planned modernization projects under the McMurdo Master Plan, including the McMurdo Master Plan subset of projects in the Antarctic Infrastructure Modernization for Science (AIMS) project, and continuing USAP science and operational activities. Modernization projects included in the AIMS subset of the McMurdo Master Plan would entail an approximately eight-year effort to replace and modernize critical infrastructure and facilities at

McMurdo Station. Additional improvements and modernization activities identified in the McMurdo Master Plan would be implemented over the seven years following AIMS completion. Modernization projects would also support USAP's goal of continually improving environmental stewardship in Antarctica, thereby meeting the purpose and need for the proposed activity in this CEE.

1.3 Scope of the Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation

This CEE has been prepared in accordance with the applicable requirements in Annex I, Article 3, of the *Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Protocol; Antarctic Treaty Secretariat [ATS] 1991); the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (ATS 2016a); the Antarctic Conservation Act, as amended by the *Antarctic Science Tourism and Conservation Act of 1996*, 16 United States Code (U.S.C.) § 2401 *et seq.* (ACA); and implementing regulations set forth in *Environmental Assessment Procedures for National Science Foundation Actions in Antarctica*, 45 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) § 641. The USAP considers the McMurdo Station modernization (both AIMS projects and Master Plan projects that are in the conceptual planning phase) and science activities supported from McMurdo Station to be interlinked to such a degree that a holistic approach is required to fully understand potential environmental impacts.

1.3.1 Scoping Process

A Notice of Intent was published in the *Federal Register* on August 24, 2016 to announce the beginning of the scoping process to solicit public comments and identify issues to be analyzed in the CEE (NSF 2016). A Notice of Availability of the Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for Continuation of the United States Antarctic Program was published in the *Federal Register* on April 19, 2019 (NSF 2019).

1.3.2 International and Domestic Obligations

USAP activities are conducted in accordance with applicable international and domestic laws, including, but not limited to, the Antarctic Treaty of 1959, the Protocol (ATS 1991), and the ACA and its implementing regulations.

Environmental protection has been a central theme of cooperation among the Antarctic Treaty Parties. The adoption of the Protocol in 1991 (ATS 1991) and its entry into force in 1998 provided a modern framework for the comprehensive protection of the Antarctic environment. Annex I of the Protocol defines the requirements for an environmental impact assessment (EIA) and is implemented domestically by the ACA (45 C.F.R. § 641).

The USAP implemented and has continued to execute a comprehensive EIA process to provide a systematic review of all proposed USAP research and operational activities and to identify potential impacts to the Antarctic environment. Typically, the USAP reviews between 100 and 200 proposed operational and research projects annually. The EIA process is consistent with the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) EIA guidance (ATS 2016a).




Figure 1-1. Location of McMurdo Station on Ross Island and within the McMurdo Area

2. Operational Developments in the USAP During the Past Three Decades in the McMurdo Area

2.1 Introduction

The USAP's facilities and operations based at McMurdo Station have evolved over the years in direct response to the changing needs of scientific research conducted in Antarctica. The evolution has included integrating environmental protection measures and best management practices into operations and science support to reduce the impact of these activities. Environmental stewardship in the USAP incorporates the EIA process (ATS 1991, 2016a), mitigation measures, training, and impact monitoring. These changes have increased operational efficiencies and environmental protection at McMurdo Station and in the McMurdo area.

Using the EIA process, the USAP has assessed, and continues to assess, potential environmental impacts from proposed activities, including those at McMurdo Station. Environmental assessments include reviews of McMurdo Station operations and facility construction to evaluate specific projects. Other assessments evaluate the impacts of recurring activities (e.g., deployment of remote equipment and automatic weather stations, establishment of field camps, building maintenance, and use of explosives). Informed by data provided in environmental assessments, the USAP's environmental stewardship program mitigates impacts from common sources and prevents and/or minimizes

- spills or other accidental releases;
- the introduction or distribution of non-native species;
- the release of materials or wastes to terrestrial or marine environments;
- physical disturbance of terrestrial areas;
- disturbance or contamination of sensitive environments (e.g., MDV, subglacial lakes, ice caves, geothermal areas);
- disturbance or injury to Antarctic flora and fauna;
- the release of emissions to the atmosphere;
- alteration to the terrain, either through expanding existing facilities or occupying new sites; and
- alteration to the visual landscape, aesthetic and wilderness value of the Antarctic environment.

2.2 McMurdo Station Developments

Over the last thirty years, changes implemented at McMurdo Station and associated support facilities have provided the logistical support systems and infrastructure for the current level of operations in the area. As a USAP research and supply hub, McMurdo Station provides resources to area support facilities, including the Black Island Telecommunications Facility (BITF) and the Marble Point Refueling Facility. In addition, McMurdo Station provides logistical support (e.g., personnel transport, fuel, cargo, and supplies) to field camps and the Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, via airlift and overland traverses.

2.2.1 Initial Station Layout and Operation

Since McMurdo Station was established in 1955, station growth and layout were developed on an as-needed basis, with certain facilities (e.g., warehouses, cargo yards) located away from the main station.

This non-optimal layout decreases efficiency by increasing transport time for storage, collection, or distribution of materials. In addition, older structures installed at the station were not energy efficient, and numerous buildings have been utilized for functions that differ from their original purpose.

Between 1955 and 1990, (prior to the Protocol) McMurdo Station grew to operate within a footprint of approximately 2.5 km² (1 mi²), with more than 100 structures and ancillary facilities. Key facilities included the Eklund Biological Laboratory and the Thiel Earth Science Center. The station also had several other science buildings, a Vehicle Maintenance Facility (VMF), a kitchen/dining facility, six dormitories, and temporary berthing in Jamesways (Figure 2-1).

Other structures and work areas included a power plant, water plant, waste handling facilities, storage yards, fuel tanks and associated pipelines, an ice pier, a helicopter pad, a skiway (Williams Field), and an annual (seasonal) sea-ice runway. Station power was provided by six diesel-electric generators, each having a capacity of 800-900 kW. The water plant contained two desalination units that could produce 277,000 L/day (74,000 gal/day) of potable water, and the water storage capacity was 760,000 L (200,000 gal).

By 1990, McMurdo Station was generating approximately 2,810,400 kg (6,195,871 lb) of solid waste and 134,600 kg (296,800 lb) of hazardous waste each year. Wastewater treatment was limited to maceration, and up to 300,000 L (80,000 gal) of effluent was discharged each day into Winter Quarters Bay from one outfall. McMurdo Station had 18 steel, bulk-fuel tanks with a combined capacity of 34,000,000 L (9,000,000 gal). These tanks were single-walled and had no secondary containment. Approximately 400 ground vehicles were used to transport people and material and to support construction projects. At that time, McMurdo Station supported an average population of approximately 1200 people during the peak of the austral summer (October to February) and up to 250 people during the austral winter.

Thirty years ago, intercontinental airlift support to McMurdo Station was provided by wheeled C-5, C-141, C-130, and ski-equipped LC-130 aircraft. During 1989, there were 18 C-141, two C-5, and 14 Royal New Zealand Air Force C-130 round trips between McMurdo Station and Christchurch, New Zealand. Intracontinental support was provided by LC-130s, Twin Otters, and UH-2N helicopters. Wheeled aircraft were supported at the seasonal sea-ice runway each year, while ski-equipped, fixed-wing aircraft operated from the Williams Field skiway. Both the sea-ice runway and Williams Field had support structures and resources (e.g., generators, fuel tanks) appropriate for the level of operations. Aircraft operations were limited to the austral summer months (August through February).

Sealift support to McMurdo Station was provided during each austral summer and consisted of a refueling tanker, a resupply vessel, and an icebreaker. The annual resupply vessel delivered material and removed waste, excess material, and equipment. The tanker would deliver fuel to McMurdo Station, and the icebreaker would deliver fuel to Marble Point.




Figure 2-1. Map of McMurdo Area with Map of McMurdo Station in 1989

Since 1972, an ice pier has been used for the annual resupply and refueling vessels to transfer cargo; this operation continues today. The ice pier consists of a matrix of steel cable over the ice surface that is subsequently flooded with water. Repeated frozen water layering results in a thickness sufficient to support operations and cargo. Each season before use, approximately 15 cm (6 in) of fines are spread over the top of the ice pier to provide a working surface and insulation against solar heating. This material is then scraped off at the end of each year for reuse. Periodically, the ice pier deteriorates and becomes separated from the shoreline and is released (following procedures approved through a permit issued by the United States Environmental Protection Agency), to be replaced by the construction of a new ice pier.

Two important remote facilities were constructed near McMurdo Station. Marble Point, located approximately 90 km (55 mi) from McMurdo Station near the MDV, continues to serve as a helicopter fueling area and logistic support area for science projects. The Marble Point facility contains three modular wood buildings and four fuel bladders, and is staffed by two workers during the austral summer. All waste from Marble Point continues to be contained and returned to McMurdo Station. Approximately 33 km (21 mi) southwest of McMurdo Station, BITF was established in 1985 as the satellite communication (SATCOM) link for all primary, off-continent communications. BITF was developed to include housing for a small austral summer staff and an antenna to send and receive communication signals and continues to operate in that capacity at present.

2.2.2 Improvements to McMurdo Area

Numerous improvements to McMurdo Station infrastructure and support resources have been completed since the early 1990s. These efforts were necessary to meet the changing needs of scientific research, replace old facilities, improve operational efficiencies, and enhance environmental stewardship. Potential environmental impacts from each of these planned improvements were assessed and appropriate mitigation measures were designed and implemented during construction and operation. Additionally, projects were monitored during implementation to ensure that mitigations were appropriate and effective. The following discussion highlights key improvements to illustrate the gains in efficiency and environmental stewardship and identifies the EIA documents that assessed potential impacts. Table B-1 (Appendix B) provides a comprehensive list of EIA reviews conducted between 1990 and 2018.

The Albert P. Crary Science and Engineering Center (Crary Laboratory) (NSF 1988, 1992a), the Science Support Center (SSC) (NSF 1999), and the Long Duration Balloon facility (LDB; NSF 1994a, 2004a, 2007a, 2014a) are three important science-support facilities that were constructed and have been in operation since the early 1990s. These facilities consolidated and improved or expanded science-support capabilities. The Eklund Biological Laboratory and Thiel Earth Science Center were demolished and removed from McMurdo Station and replaced by the Crary Laboratory, which provided expanded space (4320 m² [46,500 ft²]), aquaria facilities, and modern laboratories. The SSC replaced the USAP Garage that was constructed in 1958, expanding available space and consolidating activities from the Mechanical Equipment Center (MEC) and Field Safety Training Program. The LDB facility is located on the McMurdo Ice Shelf and consists of eight buildings that provide dedicated facilities space for 60-100 staff in support of National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) balloon launches and subsequent communications and control, tracking, and data processing activities.

Improvements in the storage and distribution of fuel have been a long-term effort at McMurdo Station (NSF 1992b, 1997a, 2000a, 2004b, 2006a, 2007b, 2007c, 2008a, 2009a, 2011a, 2012). Bulk fuel storage increased between 1990 and 2018 to 14 aboveground tanks that have a combined capacity of 50 million

L (13.2 million gal). This represented a 47% increase in fuel storage capacity at McMurdo Station. In addition, environmental protection during fuel off-load from vessels at the ice pier was reviewed and has been improved (NSF 2006b). The upgrades removed most small, single-walled tanks and consolidated fuel into new, larger tanks with leak detection, improved piping and hoses, and secondary containment. These improvements reduced the need for annual refueling (depending on annual usage rates) and the potential for spills. In addition, all day tanks throughout McMurdo Station now have secondary containment and are inspected as part of a spill prevention plan. Similar upgrades have been completed at Marble Point (NSF 1991a, 1994b, 1995a, 2004c, 2007d, 2013a), resulting in a bulk fuel capacity of approximately 567,000 L (150,000 gal) in six steel tanks.

Wastewater treatment has been improved since 1990 (NSF 1995b). The Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) now uses extended aeration technology, and treated effluent is disinfected with ultraviolet light before it is discharged into McMurdo Sound. The installation of the WWTP reduced pollutant discharge by approximately 85%, making wastewater discharge consistent with United States regulations (40 C.F.R. Part 122 and 40 C.F.R. Part 133). Wastewater treatment residues (e.g., biosolids) are digested, dewatered, containerized, and retrograded to the United States for disposal as non-hazardous solid waste. Additionally, a sewer system now connects plumbed buildings to the WWTP, and the floor drainage wastewater from the VMF is conveyed to an oil/water separator system before introduction into the sewer system. Oil from the wastewater is accumulated, containerized, and retrograded as hazardous waste, while the remaining water is discharged with sanitary wastewater. These improvements in wastewater processes and capabilities have reduced the toxicity of releases. Saline effluents (e.g., aquarium seawater, brine from potable water production, and unprocessed seawater) are conveyed in piping that bypasses the WWTP and is discharged into McMurdo Sound.

Electricity is now provided by five efficient diesel-electric generators (NSF 2004d). Two 1500 kW generators and one 1300 kW generator are in the station's power plant. Two additional 1500 kW generators at the water plant are used when other units are taken offline for maintenance or when unanticipated power outages occur. All five McMurdo Station generators are regularly used, including the two located in the water plant; all five are cycled to maintain an equal number of operational hours.

The power plant is equipped with a waste-heat collection system. Under average load levels, approximately 2270 kW of heat is produced and used to heat selected buildings, saving an estimated 935,000 L (247,001 gal) of fuel annually. Wind turbines cooperatively operated by Antarctica New Zealand (ANZ) and the USAP supply electrical power to a grid operated jointly by the USAP and ANZ. The turbines are at a site overlooking ANZ's Scott Base, approximately 3 km (1.9 mi) from McMurdo Station. Each wind turbine can generate up to 330 kW. Annually, the wind turbines produce approximately 22% of total Ross Island power.

Heat for buildings not included in the waste-heat system is provided primarily by petroleum-fueled furnaces. Fuel is provided to these buildings from small above-ground tanks (i.e., day tanks) that are filled approximately once a week, either by a tank truck or via a direct pipeline connection to bulk fuel storage tanks. The use of more efficient generators, alternative energy sources (e.g., wind turbines), and waste heat has reduced fuel use compared to 1990.

Since 1990, no major improvements have been made to the fresh water production system at McMurdo Station. Minor improvements include using low-flow toilets, implementing water conservation practices, and educating the McMurdo Station population on the need for water conservation. However, fresh water

production remains at approximately 277,000 L/day (74,000 gal/day), resulting in approximately 39,357,000 L/yr (10,370,000 gal/yr), and water storage capacity remains at 760,000 L (200,000 gal). The average daily water consumption per person at McMurdo Station is 254 L/day (67 gal/day) of fresh water during the austral summer and 348 L/day (92 gal/day) during the austral winter.

Environmental protection efforts focus on minimizing and managing waste at McMurdo Station and outlying facilities. Since 1990, waste minimization and recycling efforts have reduced the amount of waste produced (NSF 1990). On average, approximately 873,120 kg (1,824,900 lb) of non-hazardous solid waste is generated annually, which is a 61% reduction from the quantity of waste produced in 1990. Typically, 60% of the non-hazardous solid waste transported out of McMurdo Station is recycled. Approximately 230,920 kg (515,710 lb) of hazardous waste was generated and removed annually between 2014 and 2018. This volume is 66% greater than the volume from 30 years ago and is attributable to changes in research and hazardous waste handling procedures. Since the 1990s, hazardous waste handling and packaging has improved to reduce potential releases to the environment. In addition, per the United States implementation of the Protocol, all hazardous waste started to be packaged, shipped, and removed from McMurdo Station for disposal in the United States within 15 months of generation. To improve efficiency and limit the release of waste, waste handling was consolidated (NSF 1996, 1997b) and processed (to the maximum extent possible) in enclosed buildings. The USAP uses established procedures for demolishing buildings (NSF 1997c, 2014b) that minimize releases to the environment by highlighting waste management and minimization actions.

Fines have been and continue to be excavated for building foundations and road maintenance. To minimize disturbance, the USAP developed a management process to identify specific harvest areas. These defined areas and fines harvesting methods were reviewed to minimize environmental impacts (NSF 2003, 2004e, 2007e, 2010, 2011b, 2014c).

Aircraft fuel-use efficiency has been improved since 1990 by replacing C-5s and C-141s with C-17 aircraft and using improved engines and propellers on LC-130s. From 1990 through 2002, the USAP used a seasonal sea-ice runway (on the sea ice immediately adjacent to McMurdo Station). Williams Field skiway (on the ice shelf) has been in continuous operation since the early 1960s. Since the ice shelf is in continual motion toward McMurdo Sound, Williams Field has been moved multiple times as it approached the ice edge (NSF 1994c, 1995c, 2009b, 2018a). Beginning in 2002 and continuing through 2017, the Pegasus blue-ice runway was used in combination with Williams Field and/or the annual sea-ice runway. The USAP stopped using the sea-ice runway in 2015. Phoenix Runway (Phoenix), a new, packed-snow airfield was constructed in 2016 (NSF 2015b). Fixed-wing aircraft began using Phoenix in 2017, and operations at Pegasus ceased at that time (NSF 2017).

Improvements to BITF have resulted in a facility footprint of approximately 669 m² (7200 ft²) that includes a 15 m (50 ft) antenna radome; a 2 m (6 ft) antenna radome; a 6 m² (64 ft²) electronics equipment shelter; a 112 m² (1203 ft²) battery, generator, and communications building; a 102 m² (1100 ft²) living quarters; and a 27 m² (288 ft²) overflow bunkhouse. Power is supplied by a combination of solar panels, four small wind turbines, and generators with four 18,930 L (5000 gal) fuel tanks (with secondary containment). The site is reached by traverse and helicopter. In addition, two rhombic antennas to communicate with South Pole and Palmer stations are near the facility.

Improvements to Marble Point have resulted in a facility that covers approximately 59,000 m² (636,000 ft²) and includes three living quarter buildings totalling 172 m² (1848 ft²), a 27 m² (288 ft²) shop, a 28 m²

(300 ft²) generator building, a 13 m² (140 ft²) pumphouse, and a 11 m² (122 ft²) fuel shack. In addition, as a supply and helicopter refueling facility for the McMurdo Dry Valleys, Marble Point has several small, temporary cargo and waste storage areas, four helicopter pads, and six 94,635 L (25,000 gal) fuel tanks (with secondary containment).

In 2007, the USAP began using overland traverses to provide logistical support and fuel to Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station (NSF 2004f, 2008b), BITF (NSF 2005a), and Marble Point. Transporting fuel to South Pole via traverse each year uses 40% less fuel than would be used if delivered by aircraft alone. As of 2018, the USAP transports fuel to Marble Point via traverse at the beginning of the austral summer and operates three traverses to South Pole Station throughout the season. The South Pole traverses are also used to remove waste from South Pole, at a substantive fuel savings compared to using aircraft.

The USAP developed processes and evaluated the environmental impacts of routine field operations, including:

- Camp construction, operation, and closure (NSF 2008c)
- Deployment and management of fuel caches (NSF 1997d)
- Remotely deployed equipment use (NSF 2008d)
- Automatic weather station installation, maintenance, and removal (NSF 1995d, 2001a)
- Explosives use (NSF 1995e, 2004g, 2006c)

The development of standard procedures supported environmental protection and resulted in mitigations that were consistently applied. More recently, environmental training and tracking processes were put in place in the USAP to prevent and/or immediately mitigate the occurrence of non-native species in the Antarctic. (Refer to Section 6 for additional discussion on mitigations and environmental stewardship.)

2.2.3 Current Layout of McMurdo Station and Supported Facilities

Changes at McMurdo Station have resulted in a station footprint that is the same size as in 1990, but with some consolidation of similar functional areas (Figure 2-2a, Figure 2-2b). As described above, process efficiencies and new capabilities have improved waste handling and fuel use, lowered the risk of fuel spills, and improved wastewater discharge. The discussion below summarizes the current layout of McMurdo Station, BITF, MDV fixed facilities (Marble Point is discussed above), and field camps supported from McMurdo Station. Additional information on current operations at the station and outlying facilities is provided in Section 3.4. Fuller discussions of environmental stewardship mitigations and monitoring are found in Sections 6 and 7, respectively.

As of 2018, McMurdo Station consists of repair and maintenance facilities, dormitories, administrative buildings, a firehouse, a medical clinic, redundant power and water production plants, an ice pier, recreational facilities, warehouses, bulk fuel tanks, and laboratories/research facilities. The station has approximately 63,200 m² (680,000 ft²) of dedicated storage space for materials and supplies in 22 buildings. Eleven lodging facilities are located along the western side of the station and consist largely of two- and three-story dormitories. Additional lodging is located in the station core building (Building 155), along with administrative offices and the dining facility. Air traffic control, weather forecasters, and radio communication operators are co-located in one building with the McMurdo Station data center and NASA, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and Joint Polar Satellite System

(JPSS) ground station operations. Other station support facilities are the VMF, a flammables storage building, a building housing both fuel operations and an electrical warehouse, and the WWTP.

McMurdo Station hosts multiple communication systems, including local and off-continent telephone, radio-telephone, high frequency (HF) and very high frequency (VHF) radio, and SATCOM. Most communication facilities are concentrated at the HF Transmit Site (T-Site), which is located on a hillside 170 m (558 ft) above sea level and approximately 1 km (0.6 mi) east of the main station area. T-Site includes a transmitter operations building, satellite receptor radomes, 17 antenna towers, a data relay station, and various above-ground power cables and telecommunications lines. T-Site facilities are connected to the McMurdo Station electrical grid. For data transmission, fiber-optic and copper cables connect T-Site to various structures at the station. Additional capabilities and antennas installed since 1990 have been reviewed to identify and minimize environmental impacts (NSF 2000b, 2000c, 2000d, 2000e, 2007f, 2008e). Most recently, construction of a new satellite receptor station (also referred to as an “earth station”) at T-Site to potentially replace the earth station at BITF has been initiated (NSF 2018b).

In 2012, two earth stations began operation at McMurdo Station to receive data transmitted by satellites supporting the NOAA JPSS program. One JPSS receptor is approximately 600 m (1969 ft) north of the station, near the existing NASA McMurdo ground station antenna, and the other is approximately 600 m (1969 ft) east of the station, at T-Site. Both receptors operate passively and do not transmit data off the continent.

Aircraft operations and associated service areas for ski-equipped aircraft are based at Williams Field on the McMurdo Ice Shelf, about 11 km (7 mi) southeast of McMurdo Station. McMurdo Station is accessible by plane year-round. Wheeled aircraft (e.g., C-17) can land at Phoenix, which is approximately 18 km (11 mi) from McMurdo Station. C-17 landings may occur as frequently as every 4-6 weeks during the austral winter to deliver supplies, science teams, and personnel.

Williams Field and Phoenix operate 24 hours a day during the summer. A maximum of approximately 75-80 staff support flights and operate ground facilities at these airfields. Williams Field handles approximately 75 large aircraft intercontinental flights, while Phoenix handles approximately 52 large aircraft intercontinental flights each year. In addition, approximately 200 large-aircraft intracontinental flights (i.e., round-trips to South Pole Station and to deep-field camps) originate at the two airfields each season. A few intercontinental flights during the austral winter land at Phoenix each year. Both airfields handle small, fixed-wing aircraft (e.g., Twin Otter and Basler) throughout the austral summer, and Phoenix handles a few flights during the austral winter.

Bell 212 and AS-350-B2 (A-Star) helicopters have supported camps in close proximity to McMurdo Station, including sea ice camps, tent camps, and MDV camps. Helicopters for this support will be transitioned to Bell 412EP and Airbus 350 B3e helicopters during the 2019-2020 season. The helicopter landing area, hangar, and maintenance facilities are located south of the Crary Laboratory at McMurdo Station. Table 2-1 lists typical annual flight hours for each type of aircraft operated out of McMurdo.

Depending on the intensity of airlift operations, up to 950,000 L (251,000 gal) of fuel per week may be transferred to the airfields and stored in multiple 75,600 L (20,210 gal), double-walled, steel tanks. Diesel fuel for aircraft, equipment, and structures is transferred from McMurdo Station to the airfields via a 25 cm (10 in) diameter flexible hose. The hose is deployed along the runway access road at the beginning of each austral summer and retrieved at the conclusion of seasonal runway operations. Spill prevention

measures implemented during use of the flexible hose for fueling include consistent inspection and monitoring of the flexible hose, as well as monitoring hose pressure during fuel transfer operations.

Table 2-1. Typical Annual Aircraft Support to the USAP

Type of Aircraft	Flight Hours
LC-130/C-130	2,613
C-17	250
B-757	15
A-319	50
Twin Otter/Basler	1,632
Helicopters (all)	1,500

BITF has been upgraded since 1990 and is now composed of multiple, prefabricated buildings, radomes, communications towers, antennas, wind generator turbines, and fuel storage tanks (NSF 1991b, 1997e, 2001b, 2005b). BITF continues to support HF communications with field camps and with United States Air Force and Air National Guard aircraft operating in the Antarctic interior, and BITF receives recreational television programming for rebroadcast to the USAP facilities in Antarctica. Access to BITF is by helicopter during the austral summer and by traverse during the austral winter. The facility is staffed during the summer and operates in an automated mode in the winter, except when maintenance personnel are needed for emergency repairs.

Marble Point, discussed earlier, continues to serve as a helicopter fueling station and logistics support facility for science projects in the MDV. Marble Point consists of three modular wood buildings and six steel bulk fuel tanks with a capacity of approximately 567,000 L (150,000 gal). Marble Point continues to be staffed by two workers during the austral summer, and all waste continues to be contained and returned to McMurdo Station.

During the austral summer, the USAP typically supports approximately 80 research projects at 60 field camps. USAP's field camps are categorized by size: major camps, minor camps, tent camps, day-use facilities, and traverse/mobile camps. Camp categories and typical camp resources are presented in Table 2-2. An Initial Environmental Evaluation (IEE; NSF 2008c) evaluated the potential impacts of constructing, operating, and closing field camps, and identified applicable mitigation measures.

USAP field camps are located in remote areas in a variety of environmental settings (e.g., snow- and ice-covered terrain, dry land, coastal areas, and sea ice) and are supported from McMurdo Station. The size of each camp is designed to meet specific research needs and operational requirements and can range from tent camps occupied solely by researchers to major, semi-permanent facilities composed of multiple, rigid structures and occupied by several dozen personnel, including a camp manager, support personnel, and researchers. The USAP also partners with the Antarctic programs of other nations to share existing or purpose-built camps.

Field camps may be operated for one season or multiple seasons. Upon completion of research and support activities, field camps are decommissioned and removed. In the event a camp is needed for more

than one season, it is secured for the austral winter. Wastes generated at outlying facilities are placed in appropriate containers and transported via aircraft, vessel, or overland traverse to a primary USAP station. At some locations, sewage and other domestic liquid wastes are discharged to snow accumulation areas or in intertidal zones, consistent with Protocol requirements. In some instances, non-hazardous waste may be stored in the field over the austral winter in a manner that prevents their release to the environment and prevents damage to the containers when the wastes are removed, typically during the following austral summer.

The USAP manages seven camps within fixed facility zones in the MDV, Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) No. 2. Each facility zone has a small laboratory, a kitchen and common area structure, a helicopter landing area, a toilet facility, and sleeping tent sites. These facilities assist in limiting environmental impacts from repeated overnight visits by research teams. All of the USAP activities that occur within the MDV are conducted in accordance with the MDV ASMA Management Plan guidance. Table 4-1 provides web links to applicable management plans.

Deep-field sites are generally a significant distance from a permanent supply facility and require transportation by ski-equipped aircraft or overland traverse. The types of camps operated at deep-field sites are major field camps, minor field camps, and tent camps. In the Antarctic interior, these camps are located on the snow-covered Polar Plateau (in East and West Antarctica), mountains, glaciers, basins, and ice shelves. Major camps may support more than one field research project and/or serve as a logistical support facility. Such camps may include groomed skiways and fuel storage to support fixed-wing aircraft.

Scientific research activities in coastal or sea-ice areas near McMurdo Station are typically conducted from a minor camp, tent camp, or mobile camp. Some research sites on the McMurdo Sound sea ice have mobile huts for day use by personnel based at McMurdo Station. In a normal year, between 10 and 20 camps are established in these settings. A proposed major field camp in a coastal region or on seasonal sea ice would likely require a site-specific environmental impact assessment.

2.3 International Collaborations

International collaborations have been an important part of United States research activities for many years and would continue during the proposed activity. Such collaborations bring together expertise from various national programs and minimize impacts associated with redundant actions and resources. Collaborations involve joint science projects and sharing facilities or logistical resources, such as stations, airfields, cargo and fuel ships, field camps, traverse platforms, and research vessels, to avoid duplicated efforts and thereby minimize environmental impact. Below is a description of some international research and scientific collaborations that illustrate the diversity of United States engagement at McMurdo Station and surrounding areas where remote facilities are supported from McMurdo Station; however, it is not an exhaustive or complete list.

The United Kingdom and United States have initiated a joint research program (International Thwaites Glacier Collaboration) to improve decadal and longer-term projections of ice loss and sea-level rise originating from Thwaites Glacier. Eight research projects are being conducted from the 2018-2019 season through the 2021-2022 season and are focused on glaciological, geological, and marine science in the Thwaites Glacier and Pine Island Bay area of Antarctica. The United Kingdom and United States are sharing vessels, traverse capabilities, field camps, and aircraft. In addition, South Korea is collaborating

with the project through research being conducted on its research vessel, and other nations are expected to join the effort.

The United Kingdom and United States conducted research between the 2010-2011 and 2012-2013 seasons to study the oceanographic and glaciological characteristics of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet near Pine Island Glacier. The goal was to understand the interaction of the ocean and ice (heat, mass, and salt fluxes) at the sub-ice shelf interface. Shared resources included aircraft, camps, and traverse capabilities.

New Zealand and the United States collaborated on an international science project on Roosevelt Island to understand past, present, and future environmental changes in the Ross Sea sector of West Antarctica. The effort supported 27 different events, with over 105 scientists and 40 support staff. An international team that included United States researchers collected approximately 760 m (2493 ft) of ice core, conducted geophysical data logging of the borehole, and measured borehole temperatures during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 field seasons. Additional geophysical surveys at nearby sites were conducted during the 2012-2013 field season.

The United States built a field camp and helicopter facility to support collaborative, international research in the Central Trans-Antarctic Mountains (CTAM) near the Beardmore Glacier. Multi-disciplinary, international research teams from New Zealand, China, and the United States operated out of the camp during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 seasons.

The ANtarctic geological DRILLing Programme (ANDRILL) McMurdo Sound Portfolio was a research collaboration with over 150 scientists from New Zealand, Germany, Italy, and the United States. The project investigated the role of Antarctica in global environmental change and implications for future change through stratigraphic drilling of ice-marginal sedimentary basins in Antarctica. The United States provided drilling, aircraft, and other logistical support for the project during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 seasons and additional, similar support from the 2007-2008 through 2010-2011 seasons (ANDRILL Coulman High Project).

The Concordiasi program (2008-2010) was a joint initiative by France and the United States to study atmospheric science in the Polar Regions. Concordiasi used stratospheric balloons as research platforms to carry instruments for taking in-situ and remote measurements of the atmosphere over the Antarctic region. Concordiasi was similar to the Stratéole-Vorcore project, a previous campaign at McMurdo in 2005, where 27 balloons were launched to calibrate the European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites (EUMETSAT) weather satellites for improved global and regional forecast modeling.

The Antarctica Gamburstev Province (AGAP) project was a large International Polar Year effort to determine the role of the Gamburstev Mountains in the origin and dynamics of the East Antarctic Ice Sheet. Buried under 4 km of ice, the mountain range and associated subglacial aquatic system was studied through aerogeophysical surveys using ice-penetrating radar, gravimeters, magnetic sensors, and a network of seismic sensors. This project, conducted in the 2008/2009 field season, involved the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, China, Germany, Japan, and the United States.

In 2007-2008, an international team of scientists and teachers from Sweden, Chile, and the United States participated in a research cruise on the Swedish icebreaker Oden as part of the International Polar Year. While the primary mission of the Oden was to establish the re-supply channel into McMurdo Station, the ship's transit from Chile to the Ross Sea provided an opportunity for collaboration. Nine

projects studied ocean characteristics, sea ice, wildlife abundance and distributions, and pollutant presence.

The long-term, successful collaboration in ice core research at Vostok Station among Russia, France, and the United States (with support based from McMurdo Station) resulted in major advancements in understanding the climate history of the Earth over the past 420,000 years. In 1996, during the later years of ice coring, the discovery of the subglacial Lake Vostok underscored the value of this collaboration and heightened interest in subglacial lakes in the broader Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) community. Subsequent interest in subglacial lake environments resulted in broad community involvement in the development of the *SCAR Code of Conduct for the Exploration and Research of Subglacial Aquatic Environments* (SCAR 2011).

In the 1990s, scientists from the United Kingdom, Australia, Germany, Italy, New Zealand, and the United States conducted a joint research program to recover and analyze cores from sedimentary strata beneath the sea floor in the Ross Sea, about 12-14 km (7.5-8.7 mi) east of Cape Roberts. The team drilled three sedimentary cores and recovered about 1500 m (4921 ft) of core material.

The Dry Valleys Drilling Project (DVDP) was conducted from 1971 through 1976 as a predominately international project among scientists from New Zealand, Japan, and the United States. The project drilled 14 holes in the MDV (at Lake Vanda, Don Juan Pond, Lake Vida, Lake Fryxell, Lake Bonney, New Harbor, Marble Point, Lake Leon, and North Fork), on Ross Island (at Cape Evans, Cape Royds, and Cape Barne), in McMurdo Sound, and on the Walcott Glacier. The areas investigated have a series of independent analyses of Antarctic geochronology, paleoclimatology, and paleomagnetism. Other projects in the MDV that affiliated with DVDP involved extensive geochemical studies of soils, geothermal measurements in boreholes, a hydrogeological program in the boreholes and lakes, lake geochemistry, and a feasibility study for an earthquake seismology program.

Cape Hallett Station was a joint New Zealand and United States station built in 1956-1957 that had living spaces, a balloon-inflation building, geomagnetic huts, an aurora observation tower, and a landing area. The station was converted to a summer-only facility after the 1964 winter and was closed in 1973. Human impacts on the penguin colony were substantive, and the station was demolished and cleaned up between 1984 and 1986. However, several huts, fuel stores, a 378,541 L (100,000 gal) fuel tank, and debris remained. In 2001, a joint United States and New Zealand team carried out an environmental site assessment, which led to a multi-year remediation project for the station site and surrounding area. Several expeditions removed remaining buildings and the fuel storage tank. Removal of the station was completed in February 2010, with assistance from the Italian Antarctic program and the use of the supply ship *Marine Vessel Italica*.

The United States engages in collaborative efforts to manage Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) and the MDV ASMA. Collaboration and coordination of activities routinely occur at Arrival Heights, Cape Royds, and Cape Bird. Also, there is research coordination and information exchange within the MDV ASMA Management Group, which includes members and participants from New Zealand, Italy, China, Korea, the United Kingdom, SCAR, the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition, the International Association of Antarctica Tour Operators, and the United States (current chair). The ASMA website (<http://www.mcmurdodryvalleys.aq/>) provides another venue for international coordination. Below is a summary of some of the specific logistical field collaborations between the United States and other parties.

The United States has long-standing and annual agreements with several Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) members for cooperative logistics support. The longest United States agreement in the McMurdo Station area is with New Zealand. Resource collaborations include airport facilities and passenger/cargo processing in Christchurch, New Zealand, flights between Christchurch and Antarctica, airport facilities in Antarctica, helicopters, vessels (including a resupply vessel, fuel tanker, and icebreaker), joint on-ice search and rescue, medical and medical evacuation support, logistics support personnel, the Ross Island wind energy combined grid, and other cooperative agreements. Resource collaborations between the United States and New Zealand allows for smaller footprints of both McMurdo Station and Scott Base, collectively reducing the impacts to Ross Island and the surrounding area. New Zealand is currently considering options for redeveloping Scott Base and intends to submit a draft CEE to the CEP in early 2019. As Scott Base redevelopment plans move forward, opportunities for further collaboration would develop.

Other logistical agreements related to the activities of McMurdo Station have been made with Australia, China, Italy, Korea, France, and the United Kingdom, mostly involving the transport of people and fuel among various sites in Antarctica. These agreements serve to reduce redundancy and improve efficiency, which results in a reduced cumulative impact to the Antarctic environment.




Figure 2-2a. McMurdo Station Existing Facilities and Topography in 2018



Figure 2-2b. Aerial Photo of McMurdo Station Existing Facilities (gray hashed areas indicated missing satellite coverage)

Table 2-2. Typical Field Camp Characteristics in the USAP

Facility/Resource (approximate number/year)	Annual Population (person - days)	Fuel Consumption (L)	Resources ¹
Major Field Camps (up to 40 persons/day)			
Research or support camps (typically 6/year) ²	500 – 2000	50,000 – 200,000	Structures (≤ 15), generators, heavy equipment, vehicles, snowmobiles, all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), and bulk fuel storage and distribution devices (tanks, bladders)
Minor Field Camps (up to 15 persons/day)			
Research or support camps (typically 12/year) ³	100 – 600	10,000 – 50,000	Structures (≤ 5), generators, vehicles, snowmobiles, and ATVs
Tent Camps (up to 10 persons/day)			
Research camps (typically 40/year)	2 – 400	1000 – 10,000	Tents, generators, vehicles, snowmobiles, and ATVs
¹ Source: Environmental document <i>Construct and Operate New or Modified USAP Field Camps</i> (NSF 2008c). ² Major camps typically operated by the USAP each year include Lake Bonney and Lake Hoare in the MDV and Western Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS) Divide and Central Trans-Antarctic Mountains (CTAM) deep-field camps. ³ Common minor camps operated by the USAP include Bull Pass, F6, Lake Fryxell, Lower Erebus Hut, Mount Newall, and New Harbor.			

3. Proposed Activity and Alternatives

3.1 Introduction

The proposed activity would implement modernization projects under the McMurdo Master Plan (including AIMS projects) while continuing USAP's research activities and support operations (Alternative A). The following sections describe the three elements of the proposed activity.

Modernization projects incorporate three phases: construction, operation, and closure (decommissioning and demolition/removal). Similarly, continuing operations would be modified as necessary as modernization projects replace existing facilities and capabilities, until the final closure of McMurdo Station sometime in the future (as presented in Section 8).

The construction phase for the AIMS subset of McMurdo Master Plan activities would start in late 2019 and continue through approximately 2026 (a minimum of eight years). The construction phase for remaining McMurdo Master Plan projects would start in 2027 and continue through approximately 2033 (a minimum of seven years). Note that the construction schedule for modernization projects may be delayed or extended beyond the planned schedule, depending on weather, material procurements, and other factors. However, for the purposes of this impact assessment, the above schedule is used. Overall, the combined construction phase for modernization projects would be approximately 15-20 years. If the schedule is extended, impacts would be expected to be similar. All construction activities, including site preparation and demolition (Figure 3-1a), would occur within the existing highly disturbed footprint of McMurdo Station.

The USAP considered the timing of the proposed projects and sequenced them to enable ongoing scientific and operational activities during construction. Additional considerations that influenced work phasing included logistical challenges with delivering project materials via resupply vessel, laydown and storage space at McMurdo Station, a finite quantity of worker lodging, reduced airlift schedule during mid-summer, and seasonal weather variations. New or replacement facilities would be built and existing operations moved into the new buildings before existing buildings used by existing operations are vacated and demolished. Some existing facilities would be demolished prior to construction if the facilities are located in the footprint of proposed replacement buildings, in areas requiring access to construction sites, or in the way of equipment needed for construction.

3.2 Implement AIMS Projects under the McMurdo Master Plan

Implementing AIMS would provide increased flexibility to meet changing research requirements and improve support efficiency. Seven projects have been identified as part of AIMS: 1) the Vehicle Equipment Operations Center (VEOC), 2) one lodging building, 3) Central Services, 4) Emergency Operations, 5) Field Science Support, 6) Industrial Trades Building, and 7) associated utility improvements (Figure 3-1b). Functions that are currently located in 25 buildings would be consolidated into eight buildings. New buildings would have improved insulation to increase heat retention. Most buildings would be connected to the station's existing heat recovery loop, and combined heat and power systems are being considered for buildings where connecting to the main loop is impractical. In addition, utilities and drainage would be improved as part of the AIMS project. Seventeen buildings would be demolished during the construction phase of the AIMS project. The estimated amount of demolition debris that would be generated under AIMS projects of the Master Plan is summarized in Table 3-1.




Figure 3-1a. McMurdo Station Current Layout and Planned Demolitions




Figure 3-1b. McMurdo Station Following Modernization under AIMS (2027)

Potential impact sources resulting from implementing each phase (construction and operation) are described in Section 3.2.2.

3.2.1 Summary Description of AIMS Projects

The VEOC would centralize USAP's vehicle maintenance and repair activities and replace aging structures currently located across McMurdo Station (Figure 3-1b). It would serve as the maintenance and operations facility for all McMurdo-based USAP equipment and vehicles by integrating maintenance functions of the current MEC, aerospace ground equipment (AGE), traverse operations, and fleet operations. The VEOC would be a 5388 m² (58,000 ft²), split-level building with a wash bay, five heavy vehicle bays, and one light vehicle bay. The work area would include racks, workbenches, vehicle and welding exhaust systems, lubrication supply and return, pneumatic or hydraulic lifts, and cranes. Administrative offices and storage (1,115 m² [12,000 ft²]) for small parts and equipment would be in a mezzanine level above ground-floor tool and machine rooms. The VEOC building would be connected to existing station utility services through a new utility main. Wastewater discharge from the VEOC wash bays would be conveyed to an oil/water separator system prior to introduction into the sewer system. In addition, two 371 m² (4000 ft²) pre-engineered metal buildings (PEMB) may be constructed adjacent to the VEOC. One PEMB would serve as a temporary cold storage warehouse until new, permanent cold storage is available, after which this PEMB would be used for parts storage. The other PEMB would serve as unheated parts storage for VEOC. The approximate construction phase for VEOC and the PEMBs would be between November 2020 and June 2022. Three cold-storage warehouses would be demolished (Buildings 340, 341, and 342) and explosives would be required to prepare the site for footings.

The Lodging #1 building would increase energy efficiency and reduce maintenance requirements, compared to the three existing housing buildings it would replace. Lodging #1 would be located adjacent to existing dorms (Figure 3-1b) and would be a three-story structure with up to 285 beds (both single and double occupancy rooms). Dorm-style bathrooms (showers and toilets) and recreational/social lounges would be included, along with other support spaces, such as storage and janitorial space. The project would include mechanical, electrical, plumbing, communications, and fire protection systems that would extend to the McMurdo Station main utility trunk lines and heat recovery loop. The approximate construction phase would be between September 2021 and August 2023.

The Central Services and associated warehouse building would be located adjacent to the current Building 155 and would centralize existing operations by consolidating administrative and station support functions. Central Services would contain dining, food warehousing (dry, frozen, and refrigerated), commodity warehousing, and a multi-purpose lecture space. In addition, Central Services would contain the primary mission operations center for the station, which includes field and intercontinental communications, the fixed-wing aircraft service provider, air traffic control, and Fire Department dispatch. Secondary Information Technology and Communications (IT&C) infrastructure in Central Services would provide strategic redundancy and emergency backup capabilities to primary IT&C capabilities that would be housed in the IT&C primary operating facility (currently under construction and not an AIMS project). Central Services would also include collaboration and small group spaces, a contemplative space, and social gathering areas. The Central Services building would consist of two stories, each 17-18 m (55-60 ft) tall, with an overall area of 12,151 m² (130,792 ft²). The warehouse area within the Central Services building would be a high-bay structure that would accommodate frozen food, dry goods, and general commodities, and would include a small waste processing area. The approximate construction phase would be between 2021 and 2023. Central Services would consolidate capabilities

from four existing buildings that would be demolished, including the aerobics gym (Building 076), Southern Exposure (Building 107), Coffee House (Building 078), and the Joint Spacecraft Operations Center (Building 189).

The new 4902 m² (52,767 ft²) Emergency Operations Center would include a firehouse, a medical clinic, and a multi-use area. The Firehouse would include a protected staging area for emergency vehicles, berthing and a day room for firefighters on shift, administration areas, a training room, specialized capabilities for storing and servicing emergency breathing equipment, and storage for campus fire extinguisher stock and bunker gear. The Medical Clinic would feature administrative offices, exam rooms, a hyperbaric chamber for treating carbon monoxide poisoning and decompression illness, a dental exam and procedure space, and berthing rooms for patients requiring separation from the general population. The Emergency Operations Center would replace the existing Firehouse (Building 142), Medical Clinic (Building 182), and social area (Building 108). The approximate construction phase would be between January 2022 and May 2023, and three buildings (Buildings 155, 164, and 211) would require prior demolition.

The Field Science Support facility would be located across the road from the existing Crary Laboratory (Building 001) and next to the proposed Central Services building (Figure 3-1). Science field gear, field communications gear, and field mechanical gear would be issued from this facility. The Field Science Support facility would replace the Berg Field Center (Building 160), Science Cargo (Building 073), and Antarctic Terminal Operations (Building 140). The building would be 4986 m² (53,664 ft²) with an overall height of 14-15 m (45-50 ft), and would include training space, classrooms, administrative space, and staging areas for science, communications, and mechanical field gear. The approximate construction phase would be between January 2024 and December 2026.

The new 3731 m² (40,157 ft²) Industrial Trades Building would be located next to the proposed Field Science Support facility. The Industrial Trades Building would consolidate all light industrial trades into a single facility and replace the existing trades shops (Building 136), Carpenter Shop (Building 191), and several smaller, ancillary support administration and storage buildings. The term “light industrial trades” refers to trades that primarily maintain station facilities, assemble minor scientific equipment, and perform minor fabrication or repair of scientific components. Shops would include carpentry, sheet metal, plumbing, electrical, field camp alternative energy equipment maintenance, and others. The building would also have warehousing space for the trades. A minimum of five existing structures (Buildings 182, 142/085, 108, 002, and 003) must be demolished before construction of this facility can begin. Demolition and construction would occur between January 2024 and December 2025.

Utilities improvements under AIMS (power distribution, communications, sanitary sewer system, water storage, fire protection, cable plant) would include new construction and enhancements to existing infrastructure. Additionally, utilidors and drainage would be improved throughout McMurdo Station. Utilities improvements would include installing underground, concrete utilidors, to reduce maintenance costs and service disruptions; precast bulkheads and end walls; and aboveground racks, stanchions, structural bracing, and supports. Cleanouts, hydrants, fire pumps, pressure gauges, transmitters, and valves are included in this work. Switchgear, transformers, termination cabinets, pad-mounted switches, cabling (including aerial, above ground, and below ground), cable tray, conductors, emergency generators, heat trace cabling, and all other appurtenances also are included. Utilities and requisite conveyance would include fuel, combined potable and fire-suppression water, sanitary sewer, hydronic supply and return, electricity, and communications (fiber optic cable and copper wire), as well as the

insulated piping apparatus. Construction and improvements would occur throughout the AIMS construction phase. As part of construction, redundant utility pathways would be created around the station using existing and new utilidors, providing redundant service to user facilities along the route from a minimum of two directions, thus reducing service disruptions. Existing structures would be connected via fiber and copper cables to the new outside plant pathway, and the existing hub-and-spoke network would be disconnected.

During construction, temporary electrical grid modifications would be installed to ensure that power remains for downstream users as existing feeders are demolished and replaced with new feeders and medium voltage cabling. This work would include temporary re-routing of existing overhead power lines; removal and relocation of power poles; temporary modifications to existing electrical feeders; and removals, additions, and modifications to electrical circuits and transformers. An area of approximately 929 m² (10,000 ft²) within the existing, previously developed station footprint would be disturbed (i.e., excavated, graded, or otherwise displaced) during these actions.

Existing major drainages would be improved, including Gasoline Alley, Scott Base Road, and McMurdo River (Figure 3-1b). Redesigned drainages would take advantage of their existing placement but would include new slopes, contours, rock check dams, and culvert systems to better control and contain melt water, reduce suspended sediment, and prevent road washouts. Drainages would also channel melt water away from buildings and toward Winter Quarters Bay. The construction phase would be ongoing and performed sequentially throughout AIMS (2020-2026). Approximately 3252 m² (35,000 ft²) of surface area within the existing, previously developed station footprint would be disturbed during drainage improvements.

McMurdo Station's water supply is stored in four 189,500 L (50,000 gal) tanks, which are insufficient to ensure a reliable quantity for both fire protection and potable use. An additional 246,051 L (65,000 gal) water tank would be constructed outside the existing power plant to hold required fire suppression water for the station, ensuring that all buildings have robust and reliable fire protection. A new pump house would be constructed and would contain a diesel-driven, 5678 L/min (1500 gal/min), high-capacity pump to meet fire suppression and distribution pressure needs. The pump house would also contain smaller pumps and equipment to recirculate warmed water in the new tank, in existing tanks, and in a water loop connecting all storage tanks. For redundancy, the existing, electric, 3785 L/min (1000 gal/min) fire pump in Building 194 would be replaced by an electric 5678 L/min (1500 gal/min) pump. This modification would provide redundant pumping capacity and power diversification to allow full-capacity fire suppression in the event of an emergency.

In addition, utilidors would be upgraded to interconnect the new water tank, new pump house, emergency water distribution pump house (Building 194), power plant/water plant (Building 198), and existing utilidors. Upgrades would include the vertical pipe and horizontal C-channel supports needed to support above-ground, high-density polyethylene piping. This utilidor piping would contain conduits for combined potable and fire suppression water, electrical cabling, heat trace, and communications wiring. The approximate construction phase for the water tank and associated piping would be between November 2020 and February 2022.

3.2.2 General Aspects of AIMS Construction and Operation Phases

The construction phase for AIMS would start in late 2019 and continue through approximately 2026. The construction of modernization projects would require the steps described below. All demolition and

construction activities would be conducted within the existing, highly disturbed footprint of McMurdo Station (Figure 3-1a). Table 3-1 provides levels of potential impact sources by construction year. A limited number of specialty vehicles and equipment would be needed, including a rock crusher (to be used in the fines harvest), crane, dump trucks, loaders, and graders. However, the existing vehicle pool should be sufficient to simultaneously support construction, demolition, and continuing operations.

Site Preparation. Immediately before demolition, existing structures would be vacated and utilities to these structures isolated. Any materials stored outside but within the perimeter of the construction zone would be removed. The construction team would then demolish the buildings and branch utilities.

Demolition would include removing footers, which may require limited blasting to loosen the footers from encasement in the Antarctic soil. After demolishing a structure, site soils would be inspected for contamination (from building use) and remediated as needed (Section 6, Mitigation Measures).

Demolition waste would be sorted, segregated, and containerized according to USAP’s standards in order to facilitate future recovery and recycling and to minimize disposal costs. Containers of debris would enter USAP’s waste stream to be recorded and manifested for shipment to the United States for processing or disposal. Laydown space would be needed to unpack, organize, and deliver construction material. The laydown space would be approximately 15,250 m² (107,639 ft²; Figure 3-1a) and within the existing disturbance footprint of McMurdo Station (Figure 3-1a). Much of the proposed laydown space is currently used for equipment storage. Demolition waste would be handled as part of the solid waste management system. Waste would be packaged/contained and stored in the existing solid waste storage area until shipped to the United States for disposal.

Table 3-1. Anticipated Impact Sources of AIMS Construction Phase

Impact Source	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Average number of workers	135	189	139	111	40	59	38
Vehicle/equipment use (in hours)	6480	9720	11,880	9720	5400	3240	3240
Vehicle/equipment fuel use (L/gal)	98,040 / 25,900	147,180 / 38,880	179,880 / 47,520	147,180 / 38,880	81,765 / 21,600	49,060 / 12,960	49,100 / 12,960
Area disturbed (m ² /ft ²)	16,000 / 172,000	4830 / 51,990	19,320 / 207,980	11,334 / 121,998	9290 / 100,000	9290 / 100,000	0
Fill needed (m ³ /yd ³)	35,935 / 47,000	15,290 / 20,000	11,470 / 15,000	3820 / 5000	7645 / 10,000	2295 / 3000	0
Excavated soil (m ³ /yd ³)	13,750 / 18,000	3820 / 5000	3820 / 5000	2293 / 3000	15,290 / 20,000	765 / 1000	0
Solid (demolition) waste generated (kg/lb)	128,650 / 283,620	37,470 / 82,605	49,400 / 108,920	243,500 / 536,820	88,225 / 194,500	88,225 / 194,500	0
Number of buildings demolished	3	4	3	4	3	0	0

Fill and Fines Generation and Harvesting. Fill and fines required for construction would be acquired on-site (Table 3-1) and would be excavated from existing harvest areas (as discussed in Section 5.3.2). Native aggregate would be processed using a small, horizontal-impact-shaft rock crusher (purchased for modernization activities). Once fines are sieved to the required size and certified for use on building foundations, they would be placed and compacted as necessary (depending on results of soil density

testing) to establish the required strength and grade for construction. Dust mitigation measures would be implemented during soil-disturbing activities (Section 6, Mitigation Measures).

Blasting Operations. Blasting would be required to level construction sites, excavate foundation areas, prepare road crossings for buried utility lines, and harvest fines. Depending on existing conditions, blasting may be minimal (e.g., leveling the Emergency Operations site) or extensive (e.g., VEOC site preparation). Substantive blasting would also be required to loosen materials in order to install new, buried utilidors. Approximately 225 kg (500 lb) of explosives would be used annually to free up frozen areas as part of site work and preparation. An estimated 15,875 kg (35,000 lb) would be required to prepare the VEOC site. Once blasting (if needed) is completed, the site would be leveled, graded, and compacted to meet building construction requirements. In addition, approximately 37,060 kg (81,700 lb) of explosives would be used annually in the fines collection areas.

Construction Phase 1. Each building would be constructed in two phases. The first phase would usually begin after material delivery via vessel (January-February) and continue until April/May, when work would be suspended for the winter and resume again the following season. Phase 1 for each building would involve

1. completing exterior utility runs to the structure;
2. placing the structural foundation, which may include geofoam, precast slab panels, precast walls, retaining walls, and selected exterior features, including concrete stairs, railings, and grates; and
3. erecting the structural steel framework for the building shell, including steel columns, roof beams, and girders.

Construction Phase 2. Construction Phase 2 would commence in September and follow the general sequence below, with staggered starts and overlapping work among new buildings to maximize productivity. Phase 2 for each building would involve

1. building structure, including roof frame, exterior walls and bay doors, stairs, and precast floor panels;
2. building envelope, including structural insulated roof and siding panels, roof panels, hatches, windows, louvers, sealant, and exterior painting;
3. interior work, including rough and finish carpentry; installation of data, communications, and electrical wiring; installation of mechanical systems (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning, and plumbing);
4. adding furniture, fixtures, and equipment; and
5. startup and final commissioning, as the final step of the construction phase, which would involve energizing, testing, and operating mechanical, electrical, air temperature control, ventilation, life safety, and similar building systems.

AIMS projects would become operational in different years until all work is completed in approximately 2026. Once completed, operational improvements are anticipated. Centralization of station facilities would reduce fuel use, lower vehicle operation hours, reduce power and heat requirements, lower air emissions, and require fewer workers. These potential gains are summarized below and discussed as part of continuing operations during and after the construction phase in Section 3.4.2. When complete, each individual building would not rely on equipment or systems from other facilities to be functional.

The most substantial operational efficiencies would derive from consolidating the station's physical footprint into new, modern buildings. Modern building materials and mechanical systems would result in a 35% reduction in station fuel consumption due to a 20% decrease in building square footage, increased insulation, better surface area/volume ratios, and increased use of heat recovery systems. A 20% decrease in the number of ground vehicles is also anticipated due to consolidating and centralizing station resources, since this would result in less driving between buildings.

The number of science-support personnel (e.g., logistics, operations, science-support staff) would be 12% lower than current staff levels. Building, power, and mechanical system maintenance staffing would decline by 40% compared to current levels, due to consolidated mechanical systems, modern maintenance methods, and work planning that uses a computerized maintenance management system. Science and aviation personnel are expected to remain at current levels.

Facilities maintenance material budgets would be reduced by 34%. The station footprint was optimized using a physical snow accumulation model at a 1:240 scale to minimize road maintenance, snow removal, and drainage maintenance. Moving inventory inside into modern, high-density, high-bay warehouses co-located with work centers would improve efficiency on many levels.

3.3 Implement McMurdo Master Plan

Implementing McMurdo Master Plan projects would provide the flexibility needed to meet changing research requirements and improve support efficiency. Because the support requirements of future Antarctic research are not completely known, McMurdo Master Plan projects are not as well defined as the AIMS projects described in Section 3.2. Important details (e.g., mechanical, electrical, architectural controls) would be added as the project designs proceed. USAP's EIA process would consider these details prior to implementation of any future Master Plan projects to determine if the analysis in this CEE adequately assesses the environmental impacts. Generally, overall science needs and funding would influence the timing of these projects. Unless otherwise noted, it is anticipated that the majority of these projects would be implemented sometime after AIMS construction is completed.

The McMurdo Master Plan includes up to 11 projects involving the construction and operation of replacement and/or upgraded facilities and infrastructure for helicopter operations, waste processing, the Crary Laboratory, dive services, hazardous waste processing, fuel operations, power grid upgrades, and aircraft runway facilities. Additionally, existing unused buildings would be demolished as part of McMurdo Master Plan projects. Each action under the McMurdo Master Plan is summarized below. Potential impact sources that would result from implementing each phase (construction and operation) are described in Section 3.3.2.

3.3.1 Summary Description of McMurdo Master Plan Projects

A new, approximately 1858 m² (20,000 ft²) helicopter pad, hangar, and passenger terminal would be built in a new, yet-to-be-determined location to replace the existing facility. The new facility and helicopter flight patterns require further study to determine a final location. The 1.5 story hangar would take up most of the new facility, while the one-story administrative space would occupy approximately 279 m² (3000 ft²).

A new 279 m² (3000 ft²) waste processing facility would be built to increase waste handling, sorting, and packaging efficiency and to reduce the distance waste must travel from generation points. In addition, the new facility would improve operational safety for waste management personnel. The waste processing

facility would be a one-story structure, and its proposed location would be in the northwestern quadrant of McMurdo Station. Overall project design and funding would determine construction timing. The facility would replace several current buildings at the station, including the Waste Management Office (Building 170) and the waste sorting building (Building 185).

Renovating the Crary Laboratory would provide new or remodeled labs, office spaces, sample freezers, aquarium facilities, administrative spaces, storage areas, supply areas, and an IT&C data room. A new, 465 m² (5005 ft²) lower-level addition would house new mechanical, electrical, fire protection, direct digital control, and IT upgrades.

A new 93 m² (1000 ft²) Dive Services facility would provide better access and storage space for equipment. It would feature shelving space, fresh-water showers to rinse gear, and warm storage space. Siting has not yet been determined. It would replace the existing Dive Services facility (Building 144) and would be located south of the new Central Services building.

A new 279 m² (3000 ft²) hazardous waste processing facility and a 743 m² (7998 ft²) fuels processing unit would be located in the northwest quadrant of the station and away from inhabited structures, in compliance with physical safety standards. It would feature the mechanical, electrical, and architectural controls necessary to safely process, store, package, and ship hazardous waste. In addition, the new facility would improve operational safety for waste management personnel. The hazardous waste processing facility would replace current buildings, including Hazardous Waste Storage (Building HAZ03).

Two additional lodging buildings (#2 and #3) would be constructed. The buildings would be located in proximity to the proposed Lodging #1 and would be similarly designed. Each would be three-story structures with up to 285 beds (in both single and double occupancy rooms), dorm-style bathrooms (showers and toilets), and recreational/social lounges. The buildings would include mechanical, electrical, plumbing, communications, and fire protection systems that would extend to the main utility trunk lines and heat recovery loop.

Expanded and updated fuel distribution infrastructure would be co-located with utilities corridors for shared routing, support, and heating. Additional fuel piping would support new construction and reduce vehicular fuel deliveries to day tanks, provide usage metering, and replace existing, aging infrastructure. Proposed fuel distribution infrastructure upgrades would be added between 2020 and 2026.

Power grid upgrades would simplify maintenance and increase reliability by changing the medium voltage distribution system from overhead power lines to ground-based lines. Routing would coincide with other utilities where possible to minimize the amount of utilidor infrastructure required on station and reduce the possibility of accidental disruption. A ground-based infrastructure would increase maintenance and operational efficiencies and enhance reliability by eliminating the wind risk currently faced by a pole-mounted infrastructure. Locations to be upgraded would be determined by the power requirements of the new facility. Temporary feeders would be required to keep downstream facilities energized during the upgrade. Ultimately, these upgrades (including pad-mounted transformers) would result in a new, more reliable power grid. Upgrades would be implemented from 2020 through 2026.

While the existing centralized power plant would continue to be the primary power source, a new, distributed, combined heat power (CHP) generation with an alternative energy technology system may be installed in some buildings. CHP planning is in the preliminary stages. More complete evaluation

regarding return on investment and benefits of CHP technology would be needed and additional EIA review conducted before full CHP implementation. The CHP system would provide power to the building rather than the building relying only on a local grid, therefore improving energy efficiency by more fully integrating heat recovery with power generators to supply power. Other proposed facilities in the McMurdo Master Plan would be designed to accommodate future CHP systems.

Smart grid technologies would be used to automate the power distribution grid and integrate power sources, distribution, and loads throughout McMurdo Station. Smart grid technologies include the CHP, central energy plant, wind-farm power, and potential photovoltaic power, as well as future power generation and storage technologies. Excess energy from all sources, including the CHP and wind turbines, would be used to create a balance of energy between heating and power needs.

An expanded and new heat recovery loop would be co-located with other utility lines and/or vaults. The heat recovery loop would capture heat from power generation and use it to provide radiant heat to station buildings. This loop would be extended to new facilities as they are constructed. The work would be implemented between 2020 and 2026.

Replacing runway support facilities would create a single airfield complex at McMurdo Station. The primary goal of the single airfield concept is to enhance operational efficiency by reducing the cost and redundancy of facilities located across multiple airfields during the austral summer. Twenty-seven (27) airfield buildings, totaling 1471 m² (15,834 ft²), would be replaced by 14 airfield buildings, totaling 1821 m² (19,600 ft²) (Table 3-2).

Table 3-2. Replacement Airfield-Support Buildings

User	# of Buildings	m ² (ft ²)
Air National Guard	3	557 (6000)
AGE/Cargo/Fixed Wing	4	399 (4300)
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command	1	139 (1500)
Fleet Operations	2	130 (1400)
Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting	1	149 (1600)
Passenger Terminal	1	149 (1600)
Kitchen/eating and toilet facilities	2	297 (3200)
Total	14	1820 (19,600)

3.3.2 General Aspects of McMurdo Master Plan Project Construction and Operation

The construction phase for most of the McMurdo Master Plan projects would start in 2027 and continue through approximately 2033. Construction steps for McMurdo Master Plan projects are similar to the phases described in Section 3.2 for AIMS. Table 3-3 provides potential impact sources by construction year.

Operational improvements from implementing McMurdo Master Plan projects would be similar to those discussed for AIMS projects (e.g., fuel efficiency, lower air emissions, reduced power and heat requirements, fewer vehicle operation hours, and fewer workers). However, quantifying the operational gain is not currently possible because the designs are under development. Therefore, for the purposes of environmental impact analysis, current methods and levels of operations (excluding Master Plan

improvements) are used to bound potential environmental impacts from continuing operations, as described in Section 3.4.

Table 3-3. Anticipated Impact Sources of the McMurdo Master Plan Projects Construction Phase

Impact Source	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32	2032-33
Average number of workers	30	25	21	15	15	15	18
Vehicle/equipment use (in hours)	3240	1,250	2,650	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,800
Vehicle/equipment fuel use (L/gal)	47,100 / 12,440	13,100 / 3460	24,400 / 6450	23,500 / 6210	23,500 / 6210	23,500 / 6210	24,800 / 6550
Area disturbed (m ² /ft ²)	2140 / 23,0002,	6000 / 64,580	5250 / 56,510	500 / 5380	18,000 / 193,750	18,000 / 193,750	22,000 / 236,810
Fill needed (m ³ /yd ³)	12,250 / 16,020	1250 / 1635	3200 / 4185	0	0	0	0
Excavated soil (m ³ /yd ³)	8000 / 10,460	850 / 1110	1250 / 1635	0	0	0	0
Solid waste generated (kg/lb)	37,875 / 83,500	49,895 / 110,000	7030 / 15,500	5670 / 12,500	68,040 / 150,000	68,040 / 150,000	81,650 / 180,000
Number of buildings demolished	0	0	1	0	5	5	7

3.4 Continued Operation of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities

During implementation of modernization projects, it is anticipated that operational and research activities at McMurdo Station (and outlying facilities supported by the station) would continue at their current tempo (Section 2.2.3). Facilities and activities not modified by the proposed activity would continue to generate impacts similar to current levels. Those activities would also continue at similar levels once projects in the proposed activity are operational. Impacts from existing McMurdo area facilities would ultimately combine with those from the proposed activity.

Section 3.4.1 presents key potential impact sources of existing operations and activities at McMurdo Station and its outlying areas from the last five years in order to establish a baseline of impacts from ongoing operations. Potential impact sources of continuing operations and facilities during and post-construction for the McMurdo area are presented in Section 3.4.2.

3.4.1 McMurdo Station Facilities and Operations (Baseline Conditions)

It is anticipated that baseline levels would remain relatively constant throughout the implementation of the proposed action, as well as once projects are operational. In some cases, efficiencies gained through implementing the proposed activity may extend to existing facilities. Table 3-4 provides key impact sources from McMurdo Station operations averaged over the past five years.

The developed, previously disturbed footprint of McMurdo Station encompasses approximately 2.5 km² (1 mi²). Outlying areas supported by McMurdo Station cover an additional estimated 1.1 km² (0.4 mi²). Ongoing operational and research activities are confined to these disturbed areas. When it is determined necessary to establish new facilities or camps in undisturbed areas, the USAP prepares an EIA in accordance with its environmental stewardship program to evaluate potential environmental impacts.

Table 3-4. Key Impact Sources of McMurdo Station Operations, Averaged Over Previous Five Years

Impact Source (annual)	McMurdo Station		Outlying Facilities¹		Total	
Annual population	975		460 (total for season)		1434	
Fuel use (L/gal)	Power, heat, water	5,201,400 / 1,374,065	Deep-field camps	58,270 / 15,395	12,338,410 / 3,259,465	
	Vehicles / equipment	1,043,600 / 275,690	MDV and tent camps	49,290 / 13020		
	Aircraft	5,401,800 / 1,427,005	Traverse	536,640 / 141,765		
BITF and Marble Point			47,410 / 12,525			
Area disturbed (km ² /mi ²)	0.2 / 0.08		Fixed facilities	0.18 / 0.07	Fixed facilities	0.38 / 0.15
			Seasonal camps	0.95 / 0.37	Seasonal camps	0.95 / 0.37
Fill used/yr (m ³ /yd ³)	3060 / 4000		0		3060 / 4000	
Water generated annually (L/gal)	39,257,000 / 10,370,000		Not Applicable		39,257,000 / 10,370,000	
Wastewater released annually (L/gal) ²	26,385,160 / 6,970,220		122,480 / 32,355		26,507,640 / 7,002,580	
Waste generated (including demolition waste; kg/lb)	853,760 / 1,882,215		19,360 / 42,680		873,120 / 1,924,895	
Hazardous waste generated (kg/lb)	222,765 / 491,110		11,155 / 24,600		233,920 / 515,710	

¹ Outlying facilities include Marble Point, BITF, MDV fixed facilities, and field camps support by McMurdo Station.

² Water production and wastewater released values are not equivalent due to water being: a) incorporated into food and food waste; b) sent to field camps, traverses, runways; c) evaporated, d) metabolized by humans; e) used for dust suppression on roads in the summer at McMurdo Station.

Population changes, vehicle use, fuel and water consumption, land disturbance, waste generation, and other impact sources summarized in Table 3-4 are regularly occurring activities in the McMurdo area. These impact sources are highest during the austral summer and are considerably reduced during the winter. Overall, there is wide variation in staffing, fuel and water consumption, and emissions in the McMurdo Station area throughout the year, based on the character, intensity, and extent of ongoing operations and research.

As applicable, activities involving disturbance or other impacts are conducted in accordance with established USAP procedures. In particular, non-hazardous solid waste and hazardous waste (e.g., residual oil, lubricants, and fuel-contaminated rags, soil, and snow), generated through station operations and research activities are characterized, segregated, packaged, and shipped off-continent for disposal at appropriate facilities, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. To the extent possible, land

disturbance is limited to existing boundaries of McMurdo Station and outlying facilities. The USAP implements the EIA process and prepares the appropriate EIA documentation, per Annex I of the Protocol and in accordance with the ACA and its implementing regulations set forth in 45 C.F.R. § 641, to evaluate potential environmental impacts when projects outside the boundaries of McMurdo Station and its outlying facilities are proposed. Mitigation measures are routinely incorporated into proposed USAP activities to eliminate or minimize impacts on the Antarctic environment.

3.4.2 McMurdo Station Facilities and Operations (During Construction and Post-Construction)

As shown in Tables 3.1 and 3.3, modernization activities at McMurdo Station would reduce the number of buildings in the station footprint. This would contribute to gains in resource and operational efficiency, as there would be fewer individual buildings to heat and less need for vehicle trips between buildings. Labor efficiencies would also accrue, since functions would be consolidated among fewer structures and outdoor storage of materials and supplies would be reduced.

Table 3-5 presents the potential impact sources from continuing McMurdo Station operations and facilities during construction and post-construction periods. Estimated fuel consumption is shown on Figure 3-2 and the timing of modernization activities (under AIMS) is presented in Figure 3-3. Although several potential impact sources (e.g., fuel use, fill and cut material, and solid waste) would increase during the construction period, several others (e.g., water and wastewater generation and staffing) would remain similar to or below baseline levels. Once the proposed activity is completed, impact sources would generally remain at or below current levels (particularly staffing and fuel use) as a result of efficiencies gained.

Table 3-5. Anticipated Impact Sources from Continuing McMurdo Station Operations and Facilities During Construction and Post-construction¹

Impact Source	Pre-construction	AIMS (construction + continuing operations)		McMurdo Master Plan (construction + continuing operations)		Post-construction
		Average	Min-Max ²	Average	Min-Max	
Number of personnel (Science and Science Support)	975	1,078	1014 - 1165	996	991 - 1006	840
Vehicle/equipment use (in hours)	Not available	7097	3240 - 11,880	2490 +	1250 - 3240	~2490
Fuel use – power, heat, and water generation (L)	5,201,400	5,491,170	4,292,280 - 6,199,050	4,292,280	4,292,280	3,432,925
Vehicle and equipment fuel use (L)	1,043,600	1,340,290	1,092,700 - 1,223,480	1,069,300	1,056,700 - 1,090,700	834,880
Aircraft fuel use (L)	5,401,800	5,401,800	5,401,800	5,401,800	5,401,800	5,401,800
Traverse and outlying facility fuel use (L)	691,610	691,610	691,610	691,610	691,610	691,610
Total fuel use (L)	12,338,410	12,924,870	11,478,410 - 13,383,470	11,502,400	11,442,390 - 11,476,390	10,408,625
Water use – five-year average (L*10 ³)	39,257	43,355	40,060 - 46855	40,060	39860 - 40460	34,390
Fill needed (m ³)	3060	12,745	3060 - 38,995	8630	1250 - 12,250	3060
Wastewater generated – McMurdo (five-year average; L*10 ³)	26,385	29,140	27,410 - 31490	26,920	26,785 - 27190	23,111
Wastewater generated – outlying facilities (five-year average; L)	122,480	122,480	122,480	122,480	122,480	122,480
Solid waste (kg; includes demolition waste)	853,760	944,540	873,120 - 1,116,620	899,215	859,430 - 935,410	873,120
Outlying facilities solid waste (kg)	19,360	19,360	19,360	19,360	19,360	19,360
Total solid waste (kg)	873,120	963,900	892,480 - 1,135,980	918,575	878,790 - 954,770	892,480
Hazardous waste generated (kg) ³	233,920	>233,920	>233,920	>233,920	>233,920	<233,920

¹ Imperial (English) units not provided for better readability.

² Min-Max reflects annual variability (refer to Tables 3-1, 3-2, and 3-4).

³ Excavated contaminated soil is not included.




Figure 3-2. Estimated Fuel Consumption During Modernization Activities (AIMS) by Construction Year



Figure 3-3. Timing of Modernization Activities During AIMS

3.5 Closure and Demolition of McMurdo Station Facilities

The *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (ATS 2016a) advise that decommissioning a facility or resource should be considered if the facility or resource has reached the end of its service life or is no longer needed after a proposed activity is completed. The potential decommissioning of McMurdo Station, if it were to occur, is discussed further in Section 8 of this CEE.

The United States has conducted scientific and educational programs in Antarctica continuously since 1956 and is dedicated to continuing the USAP as a matter of national policy to foster international cooperation in science and education. As the largest national facility in Antarctica, McMurdo Station is a major research and resupply resource for the USAP and therefore, is likely to continue operations for the foreseeable future.

3.6 Alternatives Considered

The proposed activity to implement AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan projects while continuing USAP's research activities and support operations is defined as Alternative A in this CEE. One other alternative was evaluated.

3.6.1 Alternative B: No Action/Maintain Current Level of Activity

In Alternative B, current infrastructure and facilities at McMurdo Station and its outlying areas, represented by the baseline conditions described in Section 2, would continue to be used and maintained or replaced when no longer functional. Applicable environmental reviews would be conducted for each action, consistent with USAP's EIA process.

In this alternative, McMurdo Station would continue operations and science-support activities. However, as station systems deteriorate or fail, these operations and activities could decrease, risking the health and safety of personnel and increasing risk to the environment. Aging facilities would likely be replaced if adequate resources are available. Facility improvements needed to support evolving science requirements may be delayed or unachievable. The McMurdo Master Plan actions, which are designed to enhance energy efficiency on station, may be significantly compromised or not implemented. While the USAP would continue to function, the scale of science conducted would likely be reduced, particularly with respect to new research projects. Maintenance and upkeep requirements would continue to increase, while logistical support would be less efficient and likely become increasingly more expensive in the long term.

3.6.2 Alternatives Considered but Not Carried Forward

The USAP considered a number of options and alternatives related to the function, location, size, design, configuration, and other characteristics of facilities that would be built as part of AIMS in Alternative A. Building designs and locations were constrained by existing site conditions and footprints at McMurdo Station. Alternative configurations for VEOC, Lodging, and Central Services were considered. These configurations included different building locations, sizes, and orientations; different numbers of floors (e.g., two- versus three-stories); and different construction materials. In addition, alternative construction schedules were considered. In general, these alternatives were not carried forward due to higher cost, lower efficiency gain, or because the construction schedule would result in a loss of capabilities for at least one season. These alternatives would have similar types and scale of environmental impacts as described for Alternative A.

4. Initial Environmental Reference/Affected Environment

4.1 Introduction

Construction activities associated with AIMS and Master Plan projects would be confined within the previously disturbed footprint of McMurdo Station. However, continuing operations supported by McMurdo Station would cover a much broader area (Figure 4-1a). Therefore, the initial environmental state (i.e., existing conditions) of the McMurdo Station area, where the proposed activity would be implemented, includes locations on Ross Island, in McMurdo Sound, on the Ross Ice Shelf, in the MDV, and at deep-field sites supported by McMurdo Station.

4.2 McMurdo Station and Ross Island

McMurdo Station is located on Ross Island, along the shoreline of McMurdo Sound and at the southern tip of the Hut Point Peninsula, which is the southernmost area of solid ground in Antarctica accessible by ship. The station is within Environment S of the Environmental Domains Analysis (Morgan et al. 2007) and in Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region 9 (Terauds and Lee 2016). The developed, previously disturbed footprint of McMurdo Station encompasses approximately 2.5 km² (1 mi²). The station and its surrounding area are characterized as “heavily disturbed” (Geochemical and Environmental Research Group [GERG] 2003). The aesthetic and wilderness values of McMurdo Station are considered to be low due to the historically disturbed area within McMurdo Station and the limited wildlife presence in the area directly surrounding the station (Figure 4-1b). Section 2.2.3 provides more detail on the built environment of McMurdo Station. Historic petroleum product contamination has been observed during soil monitoring studies within McMurdo Station (Klein et al. 2012), and Figure 4-2 provides a summary of the areas where historic soil contamination has been observed within McMurdo Station.

4.2.1 Environmental Resources

The terrain on Ross Island consists of high ridges and sloping hills of barren volcanic rock, frozen soil with permafrost, and snow and ice fields. Soils are composed of weathered volcanic cinders and granular rock with little, if any, organic material (Campbell and Claridge 1987). Permeable soils consist of gravel with sand and silts. Land areas are generally ice-free during the austral summer. Surface materials in and around McMurdo Station have been heavily disturbed by human activity.

Annual mean temperature at McMurdo Station is -18°C (0°F), while temperatures may reach 8°C (46°F) in summer and -50°C (-58°F) in winter. Average wind speed is 22 km/hr (14 mph or 12 knots), with peak wind gusts around 72 km/hr (45 mph or 39 knots) in the summer and 126 km/hr (78 mph or 68 knots) in the austral winter. Recorded winds have exceeded 185 km/hr (115 mph or 100 knots; BRP 2012). Winds are predominantly from the east because the local terrain channels them around Ross Island.

Precipitation occurs only as snowfall, with an average rate of 18 cm (7.2 in) of water equivalent annually (Monaghan et al. 2005). Ice fog is common throughout the year and sometimes reduces visibility to zero. The extent of snow- and ice-free areas is variable and depends on ambient temperatures.

McMurdo Station is adjacent to McMurdo Sound, which is an embayment of the Ross Sea. Tides follow a 13-day cycle, with daily variations in water surface elevation ranging from about 0.1-1 m (0.3-3 ft; Robinson et al. 2010). Directions and speed of currents vary widely along the Ross Island coast. Seawater in McMurdo Sound is saline (34-35 parts per thousand) and cold, approximately -2°C (28.4°F). There is

little vertical variation in temperature and salinity in spring, but some stratification occurs in summer (Barry and Dayton 1988). Additional detail on the marine environment in McMurdo Sound is described in Section 4.5.

Most snowfall at the station sublimates or melts during the summer. Snowmelt runoff is channeled through a network of diversion ditches, culverts, pipes, and plastic lining that reduces erosion and controls soil and sediment transport. The snowmelt runoff drainage area is approximately 5.1 km² (2 mi²) and includes portions of a glacier adjacent to the station that may thaw and contribute to runoff. Runoff ultimately flows into Winter Quarters Bay and McMurdo Sound from four primary discharge points.

4.2.2 Ecological Resources

Terrestrial biota occurring on Ross Island may include algae, fungi, lichen, mosses, and small invertebrates (Broady PA. 1984, 1989; Duncan et al. 2010; Newman et al. 2018). The presence of wildlife in these areas varies depending on the region and may include seal colonies, penguin colonies, and seabird nesting sites (Ainley 1985; Croxall et al. 2002; Nie et al. 2015). Table B-2 (Appendix B) provides a list of species found in the McMurdo Station area. Sensitive habitats, including floral or faunal communities, are present on numerous islands and coastal regions in Antarctica. Many such areas have been designated as ASPAs or as an ASMA, as discussed in Section 4.6.

Six plant associations, including lichens, mosses, and algae, have been documented on Ross Island (Longton 1973). The most widespread vegetation type is a community of turf- and cushion-forming mosses found in habitats ranging from dry cinder slopes to areas adjacent to meltwater streams (Skotnicki et al. 1999; Ball and Virginia 2014). These communities are usually sparsely developed, with plant coverage ranging between 5% and 85%. Algal communities occupy wet areas around streams; small communities of crustaceous lichens occupy exposed rock (Longton 1973, 1985). Cryptoendolithic species (those that colonize the empty spaces or pores inside a rock) of lichens, algae, and fungi are the dominant plant and microorganism species in the MDV (Longton 1985).

Dominant terrestrial fauna on Ross Island consists of protozoans, insects, and mites. At least 140 invertebrate species have been documented in substrate and vegetation on the island (Somme 1985; Block 1984). However, these species are unlikely to occur in the immediate vicinity of McMurdo Station due to the area's previously disturbed character. Soils in and around penguin colonies on Ross Island contain a high level of organic matter, which can support invertebrate communities. However, the abundance and diversity of such communities are limited by the excessive accumulation of nutrients (Sinclair 2001; Porazinska et al. 2002).

Emperor (*Aptenodytes forsteri*) and Adélie (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) penguins breed in the southern Ross Sea region (Ainley et al. 2005). Adélie penguin breeding colonies, which are established in September and October, generally occur on ice-free coastal areas accessible from the ocean. Adélie penguins require open water to feed and can dive to a depth of 170 m (558 ft). ASPA No. 121, Cape Royds, is home to the southernmost Adélie penguin colony in the Ross Sea, although these penguins frequent other areas in the region later in the summer as the sea-ice edge retreats (ATS 2014a). Foraging distance from the colony increases as the season progresses (Ainley et al. 2004).

The southernmost emperor penguin colony is located in ASPA No. 124, Cape Crozier, on Ross Island. These penguins are dependent on annual fast sea ice (ice anchored to land) that does not break out until after the year's chicks have fledged, which occurs in late December. Foraging locations, depths, and diet

of emperor penguins and Weddell seals overlap, but seasonal differences in their use of resources enable the two species to coexist (Burns and Kooyman 2001).

The largest south polar skua (*Catharacta maccormicki*) colony in Antarctica is located at Cape Crozier on Ross Island, hosting over 1000 nesting pairs and representing approximately 15.7% of the global population of the species (Ainley et al. 1990; Harris et al. 2017). Four important areas with nesting south polar skuas have been identified on Ross Island, including Cape Crozier, Cape Bird (two sites), and Rocky Point (Harris et al. 2015). South polar skuas are opportunistic scavengers and predators; they often nest near other seabird colonies and forage on the remains of adult Adélie penguins and chicks. Refuse from McMurdo Station was a component of the south polar skua diet (for all Ross Island colonies) until waste management practices at McMurdo Station changed in 1992 (Mund and Miller 1995).

Ecological resources in the immediate area of McMurdo Station are limited. Similar to much of Ross Island, limited amounts of lichen, moss, and algae can be found in close proximity to the station. Within the town site, there is very little undisturbed area so vegetation is extremely limited. Skuas are occasionally observed at McMurdo Station. However, only three nests are known near the station. Two active nests were observed during the 2017-2018 season along Hut Point Ridge near Hut Point (Figure 4-1b). A third nest has been seen on Observatory Hill, though the nest was not active during the 2017-2018 season. Individual emperor and Adélie penguins are infrequently observed on the sea ice near the airfields. Similarly, Adélie penguins on rare occasion wander into the station town site. While Weddell seals are common on the sea ice, very few are observed within 1 km of McMurdo Station and are less commonly seen at the airfields. The nearest seals observed from McMurdo Station each season are hauled-out near the WWTP outfall (typically a single animal) and near the ice pier (typically a single animal) in Winter Quarters Bay. Small groups of seals can be routinely observed just beyond Hut Point, on the sea ice near Cape Armitage (the area between McMurdo Station and Scott Base), and near Scott Base.

Marine biota in Winter Quarters Bay are similar to those described for the Ross Sea area (Section 4.5). Marine communities near Cape Armitage and in Winter Quarters Bay are characterized by crustaceans including three ostracod species (*Philomedes* sp.), the amphipod *Haplocheira plumosa*, unidentified oligochaetes, the cumacean *Leucon* sp. and the tanaid *Nototanais dimorphus*. Winter Quarters Bay has been impacted by past practices. Sediments in Winter Quarters Bay and adjacent to the old wastewater outfall contain high concentrations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, polychlorinated biphenyls, total petroleum hydrocarbons, and selected metals (GERG 2011). The impacted community has higher abundances of the polychaetes *Leitoscoloplos kerguelens minutus* and *Tharyx cincinnatus* relative to communities sampled in unimpacted areas (GERG 2011). Findings from the long-term monitoring study found that after eight years of sampling, there were no statistically significant increases in contaminant concentrations, toxicity, and/or community structure. Further, the study found that following the installation of the WWTP in 2003, the macrofaunal community near the former wastewater outfall recovered and resembled surrounding sites.




Figure 4-1a. Environmental Values Surrounding McMurdo Station, Ross Island




Figure 4-1b. Environmental Values at McMurdo Station




Figure 4-2. Distribution of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) Concentrations Observed in Soils at McMurdo Station (Klein et al. 2012)

4.3 McMurdo Dry Valleys (MDV)

The MDV region, located in Environment S of the Environmental Domains Analysis (Morgan et al. 2007) and in Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Region 9 (Terauds and Lee 2016), is the subject of numerous USAP scientific research projects supported by McMurdo Station. A description of the environment in the MDV region is included in the environmental document *Initial Environmental Evaluation/Environmental Assessment (IEE/EA): Continuation of McMurdo Dry Valley LTER Program (MCM4): Increased Connectivity in a Polar Desert Resulting from Climate Warming* (NSF 2011c).

4.3.1 Environmental Resources

Encompassing approximately 17,500 km² (6760 mi²), the MDV region represents the largest relatively ice-free area on the Antarctic continent and the largest ASMA in Antarctica. MDV ASMA No. 2 contains ecosystems that encompass mountain ranges, glaciers, ice-covered lakes, ephemeral streams, and hyper-arid soils. ASPA Nos. 123, 131, 138, 154, and 172 are within MDV ASMA No. 2.

The MDV is a cold desert ecosystem. Weather patterns in the MDV region are strongly influenced by the region's location between the Transantarctic Mountains and the Ross Sea coast. The region is generally dominated by a strong, boundary-layer temperature inversion (cold air below, warm air above) during calm conditions (Doran et al. 2002). Strong katabatic winds descending from the Polar Plateau frequently disrupt this inversion, resulting in extremely arid conditions. Katabatic winds and seasonal water flow are the main drivers for moving material across the landscape (Šabacká et al. 2012; Michaud et al. 2012).

Glaciers that flow into the MDV are fundamental to the hydrology and biology of ecosystems in the area because they are the only significant source of water for valley streams and lakes (Doran et al. 2008). Glacier melt-off during the 6- to 12-week flow season may be limited by snow cover, which increases the albedo of the ice surface; an accumulation of a few centimeters of snow can largely eliminate glacial melt (Fountain et al. 1999, 2010). During the summer, glacial meltwater flows along well-established streambeds into closed basin lakes (Gooseff et al. 2002). Hydrologic inputs into MDV lakes are primarily from stream flow while outputs are limited to sublimation and evaporation (Doran et al. 2008).

In general, the aesthetic and wilderness values of the MDV are high. Impacts to these values from fixed facilities are limited to the area where the facilities can be seen. Tent camps are temporary (typically used for only one to two weeks) and therefore their impact to aesthetics and wilderness values is transitory. Noise from helicopter operations can reduce these values; however, they are transitory (typically occurring for only minutes to an observer at any given time).

4.3.2 Ecological Resources

In the MDV, microorganisms and fauna are found in soil, rocks, and water. The microscopic soil nematode (*Scottinema lindsayae*) is the apex organism of the MDV soil ecosystem (Poage et al. 2008). Tardigrades, rotifers, collembola, and mites can also be found in this arid ecosystem. Additionally, cryptoendolithic microorganism communities of bacteria, fungi, and algae live within surface pore spaces of ice-free, weathering sandstone and granite (Siebert et al. 1996; Archer et al. 2017).

Vertebrates and vascular plant species are not present in the MDV. However, numerous microbiological species may be found (Wei et al. 2016). Colonies of moss, algae, and cyanobacteria occur in wet areas

and streams (Andriuzzi et al. 2018). Lakes within the MDV support abundant, widespread growths of benthic cyanobacteria-dominated mats, which influence overall lake geochemistry (Zhang et al. 2015).

4.4 Deep-Field Sites

Deep-field sites are generally a significant distance from any permanent supply facility and reaching them requires transportation by ski-equipped aircraft or overland traverse. The types of camps operated at deep-field sites are major field camps, minor field camps, and tent camps. The locations of these camps in the Antarctic interior include the snow-covered Polar Plateau (in East and West Antarctica), the Transantarctic Mountains, glaciers, basins, and ice shelves. Similarly, the South Pole Traverse is similar to a series of minor temporary camps while in transit. In general, the aesthetic and wilderness values are high. Tent camps are temporary (typically used for only one to two weeks) and therefore their impact to aesthetics and wilderness values is transitory. Similarly, impacts from traverse operation are transitory and of shorter duration than those of camps. Noise from aircraft operations can reduce these values. However, they are transitory (typically occurring for only minutes to any observer at any given time).

4.4.1 Environmental Resources

The interior of the Antarctic continent includes the snow-covered Polar Plateau (in East and West Antarctica), mountains, glaciers, and basins. There are also numerous mountain peaks and ridges not covered with snow or ice (nunataks), and deep-field camps are often established on or near these exposed features. The weather on most of the elevated Polar Plateau is characterized by relatively low wind speed. However, strong katabatic winds can occur as the result of dense, cooler air blowing down from the ice sheet toward lower elevations at the edge of the continent.

4.4.2 Ecological Resources

Snow- and ice-covered areas in the Antarctic interior are generally devoid of flora or fauna.

4.5 McMurdo Sound and the Ross Sea

4.5.1 Environmental Resources

McMurdo Sound is a deep body of water within the Ross Sea, stretching 10 km (6 mi) west of McMurdo Station with depths reaching 900 m (2952 ft; Murray 2014). During spring and summer, the McMurdo Sound region is characterized by stable, fast sea ice. This ice occurs in the southern part of McMurdo Sound and in a 15-20 km (9-12 mi) wide strip along the western coast to Granite Harbor. Depending on location or time of year, certain areas in McMurdo Sound may contain either sea ice or open water.

Islands and coastal areas in the McMurdo Sound region may be snow-covered or ice-free and may contain mountainous peninsulas, rocky islets, spurs, nunataks, and glaciers. Shorelines may include pebble-covered beaches subject to coastal marine processes.

Weather in the McMurdo Sound region is dominated by the cold polar climate with a strong seasonal cycle. Storms, including major blizzards with blowing and drifting snow, may be more frequent and severe in autumn and spring. Most parts of the Ross Sea region experience surface temperatures that fall below -40°C (-40°F) in winter, with temperatures above 0°C (32°F) achieved only at the height of summer, usually in ice-free areas (Waterhouse 2001). Temperatures on the sea ice are characterized by lower mean and minimum temperatures resulting from frequent, surface-based inversions.

The relative humidity around the Ross Sea coast is typically 60%-70% which, at low temperatures, represents a very small amount of water in the atmosphere. Over the Ross Ice Shelf, annual precipitation is generally below 20 cm (7.8 in water equivalent), with slightly more falling over the mountains to the west (Waterhouse 2001).

The McMurdo Ice Shelf is a portion of ice shelf bounded by McMurdo Sound and Ross Island on the north and Minna Bluff (a rocky promontory) on the south. The floating glacier system that occupies the southern part of McMurdo Sound is an unusual and complex feature composed of different ice masses. The eastern part of the McMurdo Ice Shelf is formed from snow accumulating on ice flowing westward between Ross and White Islands from the Ross Ice Shelf and is contributed to by the Aurora and Terror Glaciers on Ross Island. Much of this ice is removed by melting (up to 3 m/year) at its base.

The southern McMurdo Ice Shelf is located between Black and White Islands, Minna Bluff, and Brown Peninsula. There, surface accumulation, ablation, and basal freezing are possible. There is little distributary flow from the Ross Ice Shelf between Black and White Islands. In the west, the Koettlitz Glacier flows down from the Royal Society Range and out to McMurdo Sound (Hatherton 1990).

The central portion of the McMurdo Ice Shelf, between the Dailey Islands and Black Island, is likely to be formed from frozen sea water. This central zone protrudes farthest into the sound because it is thickest and clearly marked by moraine patterns on the surface. Ice in the central zone is formed in tide cracks along the shores of Brown Peninsula, Mount Discovery, Bratina Island, and Black Island; in the water column; on the sea floor (known as "anchor ice") beneath the ice shelf; or directly on the bottom of the shelf. Fresh or brackish water drains off the ice shelf through holes or cracks and subsequently freezes, which may also contribute to ice in the area.

Prevailing southerly winds that are low in moisture and warmed slightly by descending Mount Discovery, likely accelerate ablation in this area and elongate meltwater features downwind. Ice velocity and thickness here are much less than on the Ross Ice Shelf. Along the 9-20 m (30-65 ft) thick ice front, speeds range from 100-1700 m (328-5577 ft) per year in the east to only 5-10 m (16-33 ft) per year in the west.

The Transantarctic Mountains turn prevailing easterly winds from open areas of the Ross Ice Shelf to the north and along the western side of the Ross Ice Shelf and Ross Sea so that the prevailing winds (barrier winds) are from the south (O'Connor et al. 1994). The predominant wind direction at Marble Point is from the southeast and south-southeast. There is little change in wind direction throughout the year.

Phoenix Airfield and Williams Field are located on the McMurdo Ice Shelf approximately 18 km (11 mi) and 11 km (7 mi) from McMurdo Station, respectively. Both are accessed by a snow roadway. The airfields experience thin but permanent and complete snow cover, underlain by a contiguous mass of glacial ice. Seasonal melting may occur. The ice shelf in this area is approximately 30 m (98 ft) thick.

4.5.2 Ecological Resources

4.5.2.1 *General*

The Ross Sea, including McMurdo Sound, is one of the most biologically productive regions of the Southern Ocean and includes a variety of benthic communities, marine mammals, penguins, fish, and invertebrates (Smith et al. 2014). Table B-2 (Appendix B) summarizes the fauna occurring in the vicinity of McMurdo Station. Pelagic zooplankton found in the Ross Sea region include protozoa, larval and

juvenile stages of copepods, herbivorous adult copepods, krill, mollusks, and larvae of benthic marine invertebrates (Hopkins 1987; Bhaud et al. 1999). Zooplankton in the Ross Sea region are also characterized by low biodiversity and diurnal and seasonal migrations (Mackintosh 1973).

4.5.2.2 *Marine Benthic Communities*

Rich and diverse communities of plants and animals, many of which are unique to Antarctica, live on the sea floor in the Ross Sea region (Thrush et al. 2006). Benthic species include sponges, sea stars, and nudibranchs (Brueggeman 1998). Many of these species are circumpolar and extremely long-lived (Arntz et al. 1994; Dayton 2013). Sponge species include *Mycale acerata*, *Rosella racovitzae*, *R. nuda*, and *Scolymastra joubini*. Sea star species include *Perknaster fuscus antarcticus*, *Acodontaster conspicuous*, and *Odontaster validus*. *Austrodoris mcmurdensis* is a species of nudibranch found in waters around Ross Island. Generally, sponges are a food source for some species of sea star and nudibranch, while some sea stars also feed on one another, in addition to organic material in sediments (Dayton et al. 1974). Abundant infaunal organisms include the amphipod *Heterophoxus videns*, and a tanaid crustacean, *Nototanais dimorphus* (Oliver and Slattery 1985). Organic matter inputs are a significant driver of benthic organism densities, with suspension feeders found in shallower water and the amount of detritus feeders increasing with depth (Barry et al. 2004).

Subtidal ecosystems in Antarctica have extremely high diversity and levels of endemism (i.e., organisms unique to a defined geographic location; Thrush et al. 2006). With the possible exception of decapod crustaceans (shrimps, crabs, and crayfish) and cirripeds (barnacles), species diversity in nearly all major groups of Antarctic marine invertebrates is at least 50%-100% higher than in the Arctic and is comparable to temperate or even tropical environments (White 1984; Arntz et al. 1997). Levels of endemism in the major groups of Antarctica's marine benthic fauna range from 50%-90% of all species present, indicating a long period of isolation and independent evolution. One unusual feature of such specialization is that only a few groups account for much of the diversity, as they have a high degree of dominance.

Soft sediments dominate the sea floor of the Ross Sea region (Gambi and Bussotti 1999). Sampling of the seabed throughout Granite Harbor and McMurdo Sound identified, with a few exceptions, muddy sand and relatively sparse macrofauna (Barrett et al. 1983). In shallower, soft-sediment areas of McMurdo Sound, total biomass is generally lower than in areas with hard substrates dominated by sponge communities, although the sponge spicule mat and its associated abundant macrofauna sometimes occurs on consolidated soft sediment as well as on rock. However, infaunal abundance in soft sediments may be extremely high, particularly in eastern McMurdo Sound, where densities of over 155,000 individuals/m² have been recorded (Dayton and Oliver 1977). In contrast, densities were much lower in the western portion of McMurdo Sound, with a total number of only 10,036 individuals/m² in New Harbor. This difference has been attributed to oligotrophic conditions in the western portion of McMurdo Sound, caused by nutrient-impooverished water flowing north from under the Ross Ice Shelf.

4.5.2.3 *Marine Mammals*

Marine mammals are the largest marine organisms present in McMurdo Sound. These include pinnipeds (seals) and cetaceans (whales).

Pinnipeds

Three pinniped species are known to occur in McMurdo Sound: Weddell, crabeater, and leopard seals. These species are discussed below.

Weddell Seal (*Leptonychotes weddellii*)

Weddell seals are the most common species of seal observed in McMurdo Sound, and they are generally associated with inshore fast ice throughout the summer (La Rue et al. 2011 and 2019). Weddell seals feed mainly on Antarctic silverfish (*Pleuragramma antarctica*) and *Trematomus* ice fish (Burns et al. 1998) and typically dive to depths of 100-600 m (328-1969 ft; Sterling 1969). Weddell seals are capable of diving beneath stable, contiguous sea ice, staying underwater for more than an hour, and swimming up to 300 m (984 ft) from an access hole. They actively maintain breathing and access holes by reaming the ice with their incisors. They may also maintain surface access by using perennial cracks in the ice. Weddell seals vocalize underwater and can produce a wide range of calls associated with a number of behaviors.

Weddell seals do not migrate, but most of the McMurdo Sound population disperse to the north during the austral winter. Some adult seals remain in the McMurdo Sound region during the winter, including an isolated colony at White Island (ASPA No. 137). Breeding season occurs in October, with a one-year gestation period. Pupping occurs on the sea ice and begins in mid-October. Nursing extends for approximately 45 days, at which time the pups are weaned. A second influx of the main population typically occurs in November along sea ice cracks from the Koettlitz Glacier northward. Concentrations of over 200 adults have been observed near the Strand Moraines, south of New Harbor, in November (Ross et al. 1982). A few Weddell seals breed at the Cape Bernacchi tide crack and Marble Point. The population breeding within Erebus Bay most recently numbered 917 females, and the population has stayed relatively stable, with annual variation due to temporary immigration (Cameron and Siniff 2004; Rotella et al. 2012).

Leopard Seal (*Hydrurga leptonyx*)

Leopard seals typically haul out on ice floes for breeding and pupping. Leopard seals feed only in the water, and their diet consists primarily of penguins and krill (Ainley et al. 2005). Leopard seals can swim long distances under ice and seek out breathing holes created by Weddell seals, which are often found in the fast ice of McMurdo Sound. Leopard seals generally prefer to remain in pack ice and areas of open water, such as at the sea ice edge.

Crabeater Seal (*Lobodon carcinophaga*)

Crabeater seals feed primarily on krill and move south into the Ross Sea and McMurdo Sound during the summer months. Crabeater seals are also found in pack ice (concentrated areas of drifting ice; Stirling and Kooyman 1971).

Cetaceans

The species of cetaceans known to occur in the McMurdo Sound area belong to two taxonomic groups: odontocetes (toothed cetaceans, such as the killer whale) and mysticetes (baleen whales, such as the minke; Ainley et al. 2017). These species are discussed below.

Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*)

Killer whales are cosmopolitan and globally abundant (de Bruyn et al. 2013). They can be seen from equatorial regions to polar pack ice. Killer whales are most common at high latitudes, especially in cooler areas where productivity is high, such as the Ross Sea and McMurdo Sound region.

In the McMurdo area, killer whales prowl the edge of fast ice for prey (Ainley and Ballard 2012). They can also be observed at pack ice edges and sometimes in dense pack ice. They will venture for short distances under fast ice while hunting at the ice edge.

Antarctic Minke Whale (*Balaenoptera bonaerensis*)

Minke whales have a cosmopolitan distribution that spans ice-free and polar latitudes (Stewart and Leatherwood 1985; Ainley et al. 2012). Minke whales find and exploit small and transient concentrations of prey (including fish and invertebrates), as well as more stable concentrations that attract multi-species assemblages of large predators. Minke whales are relatively solitary and are usually seen individually or in groups of two or three, although they can occur in large aggregations of up to 100 at high latitudes where food resources are concentrated (Perrin and Brownell 2002).

In Antarctica, the minke whale is usually sighted near the ice edge, either singly or in pairs. It feeds primarily on krill, may dive up to twenty minutes, and could be encountered in pack ice areas in McMurdo Sound.

4.5.2.4 Fish

Numerous fish occupy the waters of McMurdo Sound. The most abundant species belong to the notothenioid group, which have adapted to cold water temperatures (La Mesa et al. 2004). Generally, most of these species are found from near the surface to depths of up to 700 m (2,297 ft), although one species, the Antarctic toothfish (*Dissostichus mawsoni*), can be found at depths of up to 1600 m (5,249 ft). Most species, such as the DeVries's snailfish (*Paraliparis devriesi*) and the sharp-spined notothen (*Trematomus pennellii*), live on the seafloor.

4.5.2.5 Avifauna

Two species of penguin, the Adélie penguin and the emperor penguin, and one species of skua, the south polar skua, are found in McMurdo Sound.

Adélie Penguins

Adélie penguins are found throughout the Ross Sea region (Lynch and LaRue 2014). Breeding colonies are established in September to October, typically on ice-free coastal areas accessible from the ocean. The Adélie colony known to be the farthest south in the Ross Sea/McMurdo Sound region is at Cape Royds (ATS 2014a), though these penguins will frequent other areas in McMurdo Sound later in the summer as the sea ice edge retreats. The Adélie requires open water to feed and can dive down to a maximum depth of 170 m (558 ft).

Emperor Penguins

Emperor penguins are also found throughout the Ross Sea region and generally within the limits of pack ice (Fretwell et al. 2012). Emperors breed on stable fast ice near open water, and colonies are established in March and early April. The farthest south emperor penguin colony in the Southern Ross Sea is located at Cape Crozier (ATS 2014b). Emperor penguins may visit other areas in McMurdo Sound in the spring to late summer, as the sea ice edge retreats. Emperor penguins feed on fish, squid, and crustaceans and typically dive to depths of 100 m for a period of 5-6 minutes.

South Polar Skua

In the McMurdo region the south polar skua arrives in late October or early November and nests on high, rocky areas and in loose colonies associated with penguin colonies (Mund and Miller 1995). South polar skuas are opportunistic scavengers and predators, often nesting near other seabird colonies and foraging on the remains of adult Adélie penguins and chicks. South polar skuas are highly philopatric, returning to the same nest site each year, and are highly likely to retain mates in successive years (Ainley et al. 1990).

4.5.2.6 Sea Ice Communities

Sea ice in McMurdo Sound forms annually as early as late March. In most years, the sea ice breaks up naturally for a brief period in the austral summer and subsequently reforms the following winter. In other years, the sea ice may not break up and may accumulate.

The period of productivity in McMurdo Sound begins early in the austral summer and continues with the annual breakup of the sea ice (Ackley and Sullivan 1994). An important component of annual primary production is the microalgae that grow in association with the sea ice (Horner et al. 1992). The sea ice provides a growth substratum and refugium for a complex microbial community consisting primarily of microalgae, bacterium, protozoa, and small metazoa. Additionally, sea ice provides habitat for other animals, such as penguins and seals.

4.6 Protected Areas and Other Sites of International Significance

Numerous areas in the McMurdo region have been designated ASPAs or Historic Sites and Monuments (HSM) to safeguard outstanding environmental, scientific, historic, aesthetic, or wilderness values or to protect ongoing or planned scientific research. Similarly, an area in Antarctica where research, logistics, and/or tourism activities are being conducted (or may be conducted in the future) may be designated as an ASMA to assist in the planning and coordination of activities, avoid possible conflicts, improve cooperation between Antarctic Treaty parties, and/or minimize environmental impacts (ATS 2016b).

Five HSMs are present at or next to McMurdo Station: No. 18, Scott's Discovery Hut (also designated as ASPA No. 158); No. 19, George Vince's Cross; No. 20, Observation Hill Cross; No. 54, a bust of Richard E. Byrd; and No. 85, a plaque commemorating the PM-3A Nuclear Power Plant. Six other HSMs are located on Ross Island but are remote from USAP activities. In addition, one ASMA and 18 ASPAs are in the McMurdo area. As previously noted, ASMA No. 2 encompasses the MDV and represents the largest terrestrial protected area in Antarctica. In addition to containing the largest relatively ice-free area on the continent, ASMA No. 2 includes unusual microhabitats and biological communities and special geological features and minerals. The MDV represent a nearly pristine environment, largely undisturbed and uncontaminated by humans. Five ASPAs are located in ASMA No. 2, and 10 ASPAs are located on Ross Island.

There are 27 Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in the Ross Sea region, which represent 13% of all IBAs in Antarctica. Of these, 11 are located in Northern Victoria Land, four in the Wood Bay/Terra Nova Bay area, five in or close to the MDV in Southern Victoria Land, four on Ross Island, and the remaining three on islands in the southern Ross Sea. The IBAs of Southern Victoria Land all qualify on the basis of their populations of South Polar skuas, while those on Ross Island qualify on the basis of penguin and skua populations. IBA ANT187, Cape Crozier, in particular, has one of the largest populations of Adélie penguins in Antarctica, with approximately 272,000 breeding pairs present in 2012 (Lyver et al. 2014).

IBAs ANT173, Cape Wadworth and ANT176, Cape Washington host the two largest Emperor penguin colonies in Antarctica, with approximately 25,000 and 17,000 breeding pairs, respectively.

In October 2016, the Commission for the Conservation of Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) reached consensus on a New Zealand-United States proposal to establish a marine protected area (MPA) in the Ross Sea region (CCAMLR 2016). The Ross Sea region MPA encompasses 1.55 million km² (600,000 mi²). Currently, it is the world's largest MPA protecting habitats and foraging zones for marine mammals, birds, fish, and invertebrates. Roughly 72% of the MPA is fully protected, with no fishing permitted along the continental shelf and slope, around the Balleny Islands, and in representative habitats, such as seamount environments. The MPA includes a Special Research Zone which allows for limited research fishing for krill and toothfish. A research and monitoring plan has been developed to determine the effectiveness of the MPA over time.

Table 4-1. ASMA and ASPAs in the McMurdo Area

No.	Name	Area (km ² /mi ²)	Description
ASMA 2	McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land	17945 / 6928	Largest relatively ice-free region in Antarctica with important scientific and wilderness value. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=3&id=75&lang=e
105	Beaufort Island, McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea	22.4 / 8.6	The island contains substantial avifauna and it is one of the most important breeding areas in the region and a significant area of extensive vegetation. https://www.ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=10&lang=e
116	New College Valley, Caughley Beach, Cape Bird, Ross Island	0.34 / 0.13	The site of the most extensive and luxuriant stands of moss, algae, and lichens in southern Victoria Land. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=21&lang=e
121	Cape Royds	0.6 / 0.2	The area supports the most southerly established Adélie penguin colony known. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=26&lang=e
122	Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula, Ross Island	0.7 / 0.3	The ASPA was designated as a natural and electromagnetically quiet site, offering ideal conditions for the installation of sensitive instruments for recording data associated with upper atmosphere research programs. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=27&lang=e
123	Barwick and Balham Valleys, Southern Victoria Land	418 / 161	The site is one of the least disturbed and contaminated of the MDV of Victoria Land. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=28&lang=e

Table 4-1. ASMA and ASPAs in the McMurdo Area

No.	Name	Area (km ² /mi ²)	Description
124	Cape Crozier	72 / 28	The area supports rich bird and mammal fauna, as well as microfauna and microflora, and the ecosystem depends on a substantial mixing of marine and terrestrial elements of outstanding scientific interest. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=29&lang=e
131	Canada Glacier, Lake Fryxell, Taylor Valley, Victoria Land	1.5 / 0.6	The site contains some of the richest plant growth (bryophytes and algae) in the MDV. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=36&lang=e
137	North-West White Island, McMurdo Sound	142 / 54.8	This locality contains an unusual breeding population of Weddell seals that has been physically isolated from other populations. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=42&lang=e
138	Linnaeus Terrace, Asgard Range, Victoria Land	0.8 / 0.3	The site is one of the richest locations of unique cryptoendolithic communities that colonize the Beacon Sandstone. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=43&lang=e
154	Botany Bay, Cape Geology, Victoria Land	2.1 / 0.8	This site is an extremely rich botanical refuge for such a high latitude location. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=58&lang=e
155	Cape Evans, Ross Island	0.06 / 0.023	The site is one of the principal sites of the Heroic Age of Antarctic exploration; it contains historic structures and relics pertaining to this era. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=59&lang=e
156	Lewis Bay, Mount Erebus, Ross Island	14.4 / 5.56	Site of an Air New Zealand aircraft crash on 28 November 1979 into the northern slope of Mount Erebus. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=60&lang=e
157	Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island	0.04 / 0.015	The area is of significant historic value. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=61&lang=e
158	Hut Point, Ross Island	N/A	The hut was built during the National Antarctic (Discovery) Expedition in 1901-1904, and used again by other expeditions in 1907-1909, 1910-1913, and 1914-1917. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=62&lang=e

Table 4-1. ASMA and ASPAs in the McMurdo Area

No.	Name	Area (km ² /mi ²)	Description
165	Edmonson Point, Wood Bay, Ross Sea	5.5 / 2.1	The site contains one of the most outstanding terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems in northern Victoria Land. https://www.ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=69&lang=e
172	Lower Taylor Glacier and Blood Falls, Taylor Valley, McMurdo Dry Valleys, Victoria Land	436 / 168	The site is designated for its unique physical properties and unusual microbial ecology and geochemistry. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=165&lang=e
173	Cape Washington and Silverfish Bay, Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea	286 / 110	The site contains one of the largest emperor penguin colonies in Antarctica and has extensive volcanic rock exposures originating from the nearby active volcano, Mount Melbourne. https://www.ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=175&lang=e
175	High Altitude Geothermal sites of the Ross Sea region	0.265 / 0.102	High altitude geothermal sites with unique biological communities. https://ats.aq/devPH/apa/ep_protected_detail.aspx?type=2&id=177&lang=e

4.7 Prediction of Future Environmental Reference in the Absence of Proposed Activity

In the event the proposed activity is not implemented, USAP's operations and research would continue at their current level of activity, using existing resources and facilities, as represented by Alternative B (No Action). However, the risk of unintentional releases would increase over time due to degradation of facilities, maintenance activities, and inefficient operations. Therefore, the initial environmental state, as described above, would continue with limited changes, but an increased risk from unplanned releases due to equipment failures during operation would be likely.

5. Identification and Prediction of Impacts

5.1 Introduction

This section discusses impacts on the affected environment that would potentially result from the implementation of Alternative A, the proposed activity for continuation and modernization of McMurdo Station area activities. In addition, potential impacts associated with Alternative B, No Action – Maintain Current Level of Activity are also discussed. Alternatives Considered but not Carried Forward (e.g., location, size, configuration options of Alternative A) were evaluated and ultimately rejected by NSF for a variety of reasons, including cost, greater environmental impact, logistical challenges, and/or the potential to impact research, health and safety, and ongoing station operations. The discussion of impacts addresses

- methods and sources of data used to identify, quantify, and evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed activity (Section 5.2);
- aspects of the proposed activities that could impact the Antarctic environment (e.g., physical disturbances, hazardous materials, wastes, release to the environment, non-native species, noise; Section 5.3);
- continuation of existing McMurdo facility operations, research support, and area activities (Section 5.4);
- unavoidable and cumulative impacts (Sections 5.5 and 5.6); and
- proposed activity impacts summary (Section 5.7).

5.2 Methodology and Data Sources

Data used to project the nature and extent of impacts from the proposed activity were derived primarily from the AIMS Execution Plan and secondarily from the McMurdo Master Plan (NSF 2015a). Methods used to evaluate potential environmental and operational impacts are consistent with strategies used to evaluate program-wide and project-specific activities for EIAs (Table B-1, in Appendix B). Direct, indirect, unavoidable, and cumulative impacts (per ATS 2016a) resulting from the proposed activity were evaluated. For each impact the extent, duration, intensity, and probability (ATS 2016a) were estimated. Mitigations to reduce the impact were considered and described.

Initial environmental conditions described in Section 4 are the existing conditions at McMurdo Station (and at remote locations supported by McMurdo Station), including physical resources (e.g., facilities), environmental resources (e.g., geology, water), and ecological resources and ecosystems. The USAP conducts comprehensive monitoring routinely and uses a variety of data to assess impacts from land use, air quality, hazardous material use and storage, waste management, and releases that affect existing conditions.

The assessment of potential environmental impacts described below assumes that mitigation measures (i.e., measures to reduce or avoid impacts on the environment) described in Section 6 would be implemented as part of the proposed activity, when applicable. Impacts were estimated based on those identified for similar types of projects and activities assessed in previous IEE documents and other USAP evaluations (e.g., monitoring information, EIA audits, and site reviews). If feasible, additional measures may be developed that would further reduce environmental impacts.

The impact assessment assumes that AIMS construction would be completed in approximately eight years and McMurdo Master Plan construction would be completed approximately seven years after the completion of AIMS construction. However, it is possible that operational, logistical, funding, or weather-related factors may extend construction phases; thus, the entire construction phase of modernization projects would be approximately 15-20 years. Lengthening the duration of construction would change the duration of impacts but not the intensity of impacts. Therefore, impacts associated with an extended schedule would be consistent with the findings described in this CEE.

5.3 Impacts from McMurdo Station Modernization

Impacts from construction of modernization projects would temporarily increase relative to those experienced during ongoing operations (Section 2.2.3 for a summary of ongoing operations). However, all construction activities would be contained within the existing disturbed footprint of McMurdo Station. The Alternative A construction phase is fully discussed in Section 3 and Tables 3-1 through 3-5. Air emission calculations are provided in Appendix B (Tables B-3, B-4, B-5, and B-6).

5.3.1 Building Demolition and Construction

Building demolition would generate a number of impacts, including air emissions (from equipment and vehicle use), waste, fugitive dust, hazardous materials (e.g., lead paint, asbestos), physical disturbance of surrounding soils, and noise. The quantity of construction- and demolition-related debris generated each year during the construction phase of the proposed activity would range between 5670 kg (12,500 lb) and 243,500 kg (536,820 lb) and average 73,360 kg (161,730 lb), as shown in Table 3-1 and Table 3-3. For comparison, operating McMurdo Station and outlying facilities generates approximately 873,120 kg (1,924,895 lb) of solid waste annually. These waste estimates were based on a survey of the buildings (size, construction material, internal features) and experience in demolition of similar USAP buildings at McMurdo Station. The amount of geofoam, asbestos, and lead-based paints is anticipated to be very limited, based on the survey of existing building, building age, and experience in assessing and maintaining buildings. Demolished material would be inspected for potential reuse or recycling. However due to age, weathering, and degradation, most demolition waste is anticipated to not be suitable for reuse or recycling. Asbestos containing materials would be handled per United States regulations (29 C.F.R. 1926.1101) and immediately containerized upon removal from buildings. Waste created from demolition and construction activities would represent an expected annual increase between 0.6% and 28% (averaging 8%). Therefore, implementing the proposed activity would increase the amount of waste that would be handled annually at McMurdo Station, during the period that demolition activities are occurring. Demolition wastes that cannot be retrograded within same season would be securely packaged for shipment as soon as transport is available.

Once demolition is completed, sites would be visually inspected (e.g., for soil discoloration, petroleum odor, etc.) and samples from areas suspected of potential contamination would be tested in the laboratory for contamination. If contaminated, the material would be removed, contained, and handled as hazardous waste.

Dust would be generated during demolition and construction. Impacts to wildlife and vegetation would be limited since there are few animals in the area and vegetation is limited. Dust deposition may occur on the sea ice and, once the seasonal sea ice melts, would sink to the seabed in Winter Quarters Bay. This deposition may affect benthic and marine resources. However, as discussed in Section 4.2.2, there was no statistically significant change in community structure when compared to sites further away from Winter Quarters Bay (e.g., Cape Armitage). Mitigations to minimize dust would include compacting road

surfaces, spraying roads and construction sites with water, limiting vehicle speeds, and limiting the size of areas being actively disturbed.

Hazardous waste (e.g., lead paint, asbestos) may be generated during demolition activities and may also include petroleum contaminated debris or soils. All hazardous waste generated would be securely stored until removal from Antarctica for disposal within 15 months, per ACA requirements, and as part of existing hazardous waste handling processes (additional discussion in Section 6, Mitigation Measures). Current planning and investigations suggest that the amount of hazardous waste generated during demolition would represent a small percentage compared to current volumes generated from continuing operations.

Buried materials frozen in place or residues from past activities may be present at some demolition sites. In addition, as discussed above, sites would be inspected and chemically tested for contamination, as dictated by onsite observations. Depending on site conditions, removal may result in a greater impact than leaving the materials in place. In these instances, remedial actions would be determined following an environmental review. These decisions and related impacts would be documented using USAP's standard tracking processes.

Following completion of AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan project demolitions, disturbed areas would be regraded to the approximate original contour or prepared for new construction, reducing the potential for long-term impacts if residual contamination remains below the soil surface.

Ambient noise would increase during proposed demolition and construction activities during normal work hours. Noise would be periodic and concentrated at work sites and might be slightly more intense than typical station operations. Noise abatement procedures and personal protective equipment would be used to protect workers.

Construction noise may temporarily disturb wildlife. The only known occupied skua nests are two located on Hut Point Ridge approximately 430 m (1410 ft) from the nearest proposed construction location (Lodging #1) and 500 m (1640 ft) from the nearest fines collection area. The nearest haul-out seal location near the WWTP outfall is approximately 145 m (475 ft) from the nearest proposed construction location (fire protection water tank and pump house) and 790 m (2590 ft) from the nearest fines collection area.

Estimated potential noise levels generated from construction assume that five pieces of equipment, each generating a maximum of 90 dB, would operate simultaneously and continuously during the work day. Equipment sound levels were based on the Federal Highway Administration Construction Noise Handbook (2019a; 2019b). Equipment to be used (bulldozer, dump truck, excavator, grader, compressor) all generate sound levels between 80 and 85 dB. Using Equation 1, below, the combined noise level of five pieces of construction equipment at 15 m (50 ft) would be 97.0 dB. Noise levels generated during collection of fines assume that a rock crusher (generating 100 dB), a dump truck (85 dB), and a front-end loader (80 dB) would be operating simultaneously and generate a combined noise level of 100.2 dB at 15 m (50 ft).

$$P = 10 \log_{10} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n 10^{\frac{L_i}{10}} \right) \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

where:

P = Total sound pressure level from all sources (dB)

L_i = ith sound pressure level to be summed

n = number of sound sources

Using the concept that the sound level decreases approximately 6 dB with a doubling of distance, the rough estimate of the maximum sound level from construction [430 m (1410 ft) distant] or fines harvesting [500 m (1640 ft) distant] would be approximately 80-82 dB at the skua nests. Similarly, the rough estimate of the maximum sound level from construction at the nearest seal haul-out location [145 m (475 ft)] would be less than 77 dB.

Continuous noise levels below 93 dB would not result in a temporary threshold shift in bird hearing (Dooling and Popper 2007), and noise levels above 93 dB may result in masking effects. However, in-air noise levels above 100 dB may result in behavioral disruption (NOAA 2016).

Based on these thresholds, nesting birds may be affected (e.g., masking) by noise from construction and fines harvest; seals would likely not be affected.

Demolishing existing facilities and constructing new facilities at McMurdo Station would not further degrade the aesthetic and wilderness values of Ross Island, since construction would occur within the existing footprint of the station. The reduced number of structures and redesigned arrangement of the station would improve visual sightlines from McMurdo Sound (NSF 2015a) and improve station aesthetics. Noise from demolition and construction may be higher than normal operations. However, the sound sources and sound levels would be similar, and impacts to aesthetic and wilderness values likely would be minor, localized, and temporary.

5.3.2 Site Preparation, Fill, and Fines Harvesting and Use

An average of approximately 10,690 m³ (13,980 yd³) of fines, ranging from 1250 m³ (1635 yd³) to 35,935 m³ (47,000 yd³), would be harvested each year for nine years during the 15- to 20-year construction phase of modernization projects (Figure 5-1). This volume is approximately 3.5 times more than the 3060 m³ (4000 yd³) of fines used each year for existing operations. Numerous locations at McMurdo Station would be disturbed for soil (fines) excavation, grading, and/or filling due to building demolition and construction, utilidor installation, and roadway and drainage improvements. Additional fines excavated to support construction would be harvested in accordance with the IEE that assesses fines collection from existing locations within the current, previously disturbed footprint of the station, and types of impacts from fill harvesting would be similar to those described in the prior IEEs (NSF 2011b, 2014c).

As discussed in Section 5.3.1, impacts to wildlife and vegetation from dust would be limited since there are few animals and limited vegetation in the area. Similarly, impacts to the marine environment likely would not be substantive based on findings from previous monitoring work (GERG 2011). Dust reduction mitigations would include compacting roadways, spraying water on construction and roadways, and maintaining low vehicle speeds.




Figure 5-1. Fines Harvesting Areas at McMurdo Station

5.3.3 Drainage Improvements

Impacts associated with drainage improvements would include excavation of previously disturbed areas, resulting in dust and noise. In addition, some soil may be contaminated to a level that may require removal and replacement. These impacts and mitigations are similar to those associated with building construction discussed in Section 5.3.1. Generally, proposed drainage improvement projects would slow the runoff of melted snow and minimize or eliminate scouring and erosion of drainage channels. Some suspended, contaminated sediments would be collected in catchment basins, thus reducing contaminants entering Winter Quarters Bay. Implementing the proposed activities would be expected to have no adverse (and some beneficial) long-term impacts on earth surfaces at McMurdo Station and on meltwater runoff into McMurdo Sound.

5.3.4 Blasting and Explosives Use

Explosives would be used to quarry fill and fine materials, level construction sites, excavate foundation areas, and prepare road crossings for buried utility lines. Approximately 225 kg (500 lb) of explosives would be used annually to free up frozen areas as part of site work. Approximately 15,875 kg (35,000 lb) would be used to prepare the site for the new VEOC building. In addition, approximately 37,060 kg (81,700 lb) of explosives would be used annually in the fines collection areas. The maximum amount of explosives in a single charge for a detonation at the town site would be less than 4 kg (8.8 lb) and less than 19.5 kg (43 lb) in the fines collection areas.

Explosives use would generate air emissions, noise, and vibrations. The size and number of detonations would be kept to a minimum and planned to ensure that safety and environmental guidelines are followed. Explosive by-product emissions and dust would be minimized by limiting the number of detonations to one per day, using the least amount of explosives per shot, and having the detonations confined underground.

Ground vibrations from blasting could impact structures near the blast area. A blast plan would be reviewed and calculations made to ensure that the size of the detonation would not result in vibrations that would damage structures. The blast team has recent experience using explosives at the town site. Those detonations did not result in damage to buildings in close proximity to the blast site. As with prior detonations, the charges used in the town site would be small, less than 4 kg (8.8 lb) depending on the final blast plan and calculations. While charges used in the quarry would be larger (19.5 kg [43 lb]), the corresponding detonations would be several hundred meters from buildings. Therefore, the vibrations at building sites would be very small.

As discussed in Sections 4.2.2 and 5.3.1, the only two occupied skua nests located near the station are on Hut Point Ridge approximately 430 m (1410 ft) from the nearest proposed construction activity location (Lodging #1) and 500 m (1640 ft) from the nearest fines collection area. The seal haul-out location near the WWTP outfall is approximately 145 m (475 ft) from the nearest proposed construction activity location (fire protection water tank and pump house) and 790 m (2590 ft) from the nearest fines collection area.

The blasts would be planned, configured, and confined to ensure that sound levels would not exceed 120 dB. Assuming 120 dB sound level at 15 m (50 ft) from the detonation, and using the concept that the sound level decreases approximately 6 dB with a doubling of distance, the rough estimate of the maximum sound level, at 500 m (1640 ft) would be approximately 90 dB. This level would be below/at the 93-dB noise level that may result in a temporary threshold shift in bird hearing but would result in

masking (Dooling and Popper 2007). Similarly, the estimated 90 dB sound level would be 10 dB below the 100-dB level identified by NOAA (2016) that may result in behavior disruption.

Since a few seals occasionally haul out closer than 500 m (1640 ft) from the nearest planned detonation site, blasts in the town site would be delayed until no seals are hauled out within Winter Quarters Bay (Figure 4-1b) in order to maintain at least a 500 m (1640 ft) buffer. Therefore, impacts to wildlife would be limited.

Noise from blasting during construction and harvesting of fines may be more frequent compared to explosives use during continuing operations. However, sound levels would be similar and impacts to aesthetic and wilderness values, while more frequent, would likely remain minor, localized, and temporary.

5.3.5 Import of Material

During the construction phase, building material would be shipped to McMurdo Station, thus increasing the amount of cargo received annually. Antarctic Treaty Parties are concerned about the introduction of non-native species (e.g., insects, plant material, microbes) to Antarctica. The potential for introducing non-native species would increase during modernization activities because of the increase in material received at McMurdo Station. The USAP would continue to implement protective actions and educational programs to prevent the importation and transport of non-native species (Section 6.2.5). Mitigation measures would reduce the likelihood of non-native species impacts from the proposed activity.

5.3.6 Vehicle Use

Impacts from vehicle and heavy equipment use during the proposed activity would primarily involve exhaust emissions from fuel consumption (Table 3-1 and Table 3-3). During the construction phase, an average of approximately 66,560 L (17,590 gal) of fuel would be used by vehicles for construction (e.g., rock crusher, dump trucks, graders, and loaders). This represents an average 6.4% annual increase in fuel use (within a range of 1.3%-17.2%) compared to operations between 2014 and 2018. When construction is completed, the number of vehicles used is anticipated to be reduced by 20%, which would result in a comparable reduction in annual vehicle fuel use.

5.4 Impacts from Continuing Existing McMurdo Area Activities and Operating Existing Facilities During and After Modernization Projects

In general, impacts from continued operations of McMurdo Station during construction of modernization projects would be the same as current operations, as described in Section 3.4.1. Once modernization projects are completed, operational improvements and efficiencies are anticipated for the USAP. Centralization of station facilities would reduce fuel use, lower vehicle operation hours, reduce power and heat requirements, lower air emissions (Appendix B, Tables B-3, B-4, B-5, and B-6), and require fewer workers. These potential gains are highlighted below and in Section 3.4.2. Potential impact sources from continuing operations at McMurdo Station during construction and after completion of all modernization projects are enumerated in Table 3-5.

Under Alternative B (No Action), USAP's operations would continue at the current level of activity, using existing resources and facilities, and impacts would be equivalent to or greater than the impacts described below.

5.4.1 Building Use

Impacts from using existing buildings at McMurdo Station would primarily involve waste generation and the release of airborne emissions from the combustion of fuel for heating. Once modernization projects are completed, the support staff population would be reduced and 20% less building space would be used to support science. The number of support personnel (e.g., logistics, operations, science-support staff) would be 12% lower than current staff levels and 40% fewer personnel would be required to maintain facilities. Science and aviation personnel are expected to remain at current population levels. Therefore, the ratio of scientists to support staff likely would increase and the total maximum overnight population at McMurdo Station would likely be reduced.

5.4.2 Helicopter and Fixed Wing Operations

It is anticipated that aircraft flight operations during and after completion of modernization projects would continue at the same level as in the past five years (2013-2018). This would include approximately 6000 hours of flight time (Table 2-1) and the transfer and use of approximately 5,401,800 L (1,427,005 gal) of aviation fuel each year (Table 3-4). After modernization projects are completed, helicopter ground support would be improved by a new passenger terminal, pad, and hanger, with updated and expanded maintenance capabilities. Similarly, implementing the single-airfield concept, which would include replacing 27 airfield buildings totaling 1471 m² (15,834 ft²) with 14 airfield buildings totaling 1821 m² (19,600 ft²; Table 3-2), would reduce the cost of airfield ground operations.

5.4.3 Traverse Operations

Traverse operations would continue at current levels during construction and after modernization projects are completed. Therefore, no changes to existing physical disturbances and impacts from continuing traverses are expected. Each year, three to four traverses would continue to be conducted to Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station. In addition, refueling traverses to BITF and Marble Point and science traverses to deep-field science locations would continue. Approximately 536,640 L (141,765 gal) of fuel would be consumed each year for USAP's traverses. Traverses to Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station may result in multiple, small wastewater releases each year. However, incinerator toilets have reduced the number and volume of wastewater releases during traverses.

5.4.4 Vessel and Ice Pier Operations

Cargo supply vessel and ice pier operations are expected to continue at or near current support levels (Section 2.2.1). Each year, at least one resupply vessel and up to one fuel vessel would resupply McMurdo Station. In the event the ice pier becomes degraded and unsafe for continued use, all materials on the surface of the ice pier would be removed prior to release.

5.4.5 Support Facility Operations

Support facility operations at BITF and the Marble Point refueling facility are not expected to be affected by Modernization activities. These facilities would continue to house a small number of staff (two to eight) to support helicopter fueling (Marble Point) and communications connectivity (BITF). Use of the facilities would continue to generate small quantities of waste and consume fuel for power and heating. Impacts to aesthetic and wilderness values would remain the same as current impacts from the presence of structures, noise from activities (including fines harvesting and construction), helicopter operations, and occasional traverse vehicles.

5.4.6 Field Camp Operations

Field camp construction, operation, and closure would continue at current levels (Section 3.4.1 and Table 3-4) both during and after completion of modernization projects (Alternative A). This would include maintaining current practices to minimize the impacts of field camp activities, consistent with guidelines set forth in the IEE, *Construct and Operate New or Modified USAP Field Camps* (NSF 2008c). These practices include utilizing camp infrastructure appropriate to the level of support required and incorporating mitigation measures to minimize physical disturbances; preventing releases of fuel, waste, and other materials; and ensuring that wastewater discharged in snow- and ice-covered areas is isolated from the surrounding environment.

Each year, approximately 60 tent and minor camps plus two or three major deep-field camps would be constructed, operated, and closed. This would result in approximately 0.95 km² (0.37 mi²) of temporary surface disturbances. Most camps would be on ice- and snow-covered areas, which would recover in one to three years. Tent camps on rock areas would require more time to recover, but efforts to minimize the footprint of these camps would continue to be exercised.

Fixed facilities would continue to be used in the MDV to constrain and minimize the spread of impacts. The ASMA Management Plan and ASMA-specific environmental stewardship training provide additional guidance on minimizing impacts from fixed facilities.

Continued operations at field camps are not expected to change the types or quantities of hazardous waste (11,155 m³ [24,600 yd³]) or solid wastes (19,360 kg [42,680 lb]) generated. Similarly, wastewater releases would remain similar to current annual levels of 122,480 L (32,355 gal).

5.4.7 Water and Wastewater Operations

Wastewater generated and water use at McMurdo Station would increase from current annual levels (26,385,160 L [6,970,220 gal] of wastewater and 39,257,000 L [10,370,000 gal] of water) during the construction phase of Alternative A, but would decrease after construction is completed. Variations in volume are driven by population increases during construction and decreases after construction is completed (Table 3-5). The WWTP would continue to use primary and secondary treatment by extended aeration and effluent disinfection with ultraviolet light. The WWTP was designed based on the capabilities of the water plant (120,000 gallons per day), which would support 1200-1500 people. The maximum population of 1165 people (Table 3-5) during modernization construction would not exceed the WWTP or water plant capacity. As discussed in Section 4.2.2, while the marine environment was affected by past wastewater discharge, there was no statistically significant increase in contaminant concentrations, toxicity, and/or community structure. Since the WWTP was installed at the station and the sewage outfall relocated, the macrofaunal community near the former wastewater outfall has recovered and now resembles surrounding sites (GERG 2011).

AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan projects (Alternative A) would replace portions of the existing sanitary sewer system. Co-locating new sewer lines with other utilities in proposed utilidor would facilitate access and maintenance. In addition, replacing the current system with a gravity-based system would minimize or eliminate the need for sewer pumping stations, further minimizing maintenance requirements. Therefore, the proposed activity would have beneficial long-term impacts on wastewater conveyance and treatment at McMurdo Station.

5.4.8 Power Operations

The proposed activities at McMurdo Station would result in the removal of outdated structures, a smaller heated building area, construction of better insulated and more efficient buildings, installation of CHP units, and upgrades to the power grid (e.g., smart grid systems). At field camps, expansion of electrical generation from wind power, expanded use of solar technologies, and consolidation of functions into a more efficient layout and smaller developed footprint would further reduce reliance on fuel-powered generators. These actions would improve fuel and energy efficiency, resulting in an approximate 35% reduction in diesel fuel consumption compared to current conditions (Table 3-5). However, fuel use to provide power to field camps (Table 3-4) and McMurdo Station (Table 3-5) would continue, although at lower levels. Air emissions from these power operations at field camps and McMurdo Station would continue to have small to negligible impacts to the environment.

5.4.9 Solid Waste Operations

After completion of modernization projects, the types and quantities of non-hazardous solid waste (including food waste) generated annually at McMurdo Station and field camps by ongoing science and operations are expected to remain similar to or lower than current weights of 873,120 kg (1,924,900 lb; Table 3-4 and Table 3-5). Food waste is segregated and packaged separately from other solid waste to ensure it is immediately containerized and removed from the continent at the end of the season.

This is an upper estimate of waste generation because waste volume reduction, if any, cannot be accurately estimated at this time. Since the proposed activity would include a new, non-hazardous solid waste processing facility at McMurdo Station, waste management processes would improve due to modernized capabilities (e.g., greater efficiency and fewer releases to the environment). In addition, the new facility would improve operational safety for waste management personnel.

5.4.10 Hazardous Waste Operations

The new hazardous waste processing facility at McMurdo Station would have a positive impact on the future management of hazardous waste and for the safety of waste management personnel. Following completion of the construction phase of the proposed activity, the nature and intensity of operations that generate hazardous waste are expected to remain similar to those existing previously and produce amounts similar to or less than the current level of hazardous waste (e.g., fuel, lubricants, oils and contaminated rags, snow, and soil), at <233,920 kg (<515,710 lb) per year. This is an upper estimate of waste generation because hazardous waste volume reduction cannot be accurately estimated at this time.

5.4.11 Fuel Use and Storage

Once the construction phases of modernization projects are complete, continued operations would require approximately 10,408,625 L (2,749,670 gal) of fuel, which is approximately 16% less than is currently required, at 12,338,410 L (3,259,465 gal). Fuel use reduction is associated with reduced power and heat generation for buildings and fewer ground vehicles. No changes to fuel storage or fueling processes for buildings, aircraft, or ground-based vehicles are anticipated under the proposed activity, and secondary containment procedures would continue to be used to prevent unintended releases to the environment. There are no plans or a need to replace the bulk fuel tanks. A major multi-year effort to increase capacity and replace fuel storage tanks was completed in 2013 (NSF 1992b, 1997a, 2000a, 2004b, 2006a, 2007b, 2007c, 2008a, 2009a, 2011a, 2012). The current fuel capacity allows operational flexibility so that refueling does not need to occur each year. This reduces the risk of fuel spills during fuel off-load from the vessel to the storage tanks.

The USAP reviewed the carbon emission sources of all its buildings in Antarctica from 2005 through 2010. The analysis was based on fuel consumed to power and heat all buildings. The total greenhouse gas emissions from McMurdo area facilities and activities for the first three years were approximately 19,500 metric tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_{2-e}). Once modernization projects are completed, reduced fuel use would result in an emissions reduction of approximately 16,300 metric tons/year of CO_{2-e}.

5.4.12 Hazardous Material Storage and Use

Consistent with current operations, varying quantities and types of hazardous materials would be used and stored at McMurdo Station and at field camps. These materials include oils, lubricants, solvents, propane, compressed gases, and liquid fuels. The types and quantities of these hazardous materials would be consistent with the nature and extent of the current inventory of hazardous materials.

Following completion of modernization projects, a number of structures at McMurdo Station would be removed or consolidated, resulting in a corresponding consolidation and reduction of hazardous materials. Additionally, the vehicle and equipment fleet would be reduced, thereby decreasing the required quantities of vehicle-related fuel, oil, and other hazardous materials.

5.4.13 Explosives Use

The use of explosives to support maintenance projects and scientific research at field sites would continue to be similar to current levels. Explosives for scientific work are usually used for studies of glaciology and geology by setting small charges in a glacier or ice sheet. In these field environments, explosives would continue to not be used near sensitive habitats, animals, or protected areas. Therefore, impacts from the use of explosives for scientific research would be limited to temporary and minor release of emissions. Explosives use for operations outside of McMurdo Station would be primarily used to mitigate crevasse hazards along the South Pole traverse route in the transition zone between the Ross Ice Shelf and the continent. As with explosives use supporting research, explosives would not be used near sensitive habitats, animals, or protected areas. Explosives use, and associated impacts, for continuing operations at McMurdo Station would be similar to current levels following completion of modernization projects.

5.4.14 Fines and Fill

After completion of modernization projects, quarrying fines and fill materials would continue at McMurdo Station to support roadway and ice pier maintenance and similar projects. Approximately 3060 m³ (4000 yd³) of fines would continue to be harvested each year for continued station operations. Fines and fill would be harvested in accordance with IEEs that assess fines collection from existing locations within the current, previously disturbed footprint of the station. Types of impacts from fines and fill harvesting would be similar to those described in the prior IEEs (NSF 2011b, 2014c).

Fines would be collected from established harvest areas and follow environmental protection guidelines to minimize fugitive dust, fuel use, and area disturbed. Guidelines include minimizing the area disturbed at any one time, operating vehicles at low speeds, and spraying water over disturbed areas. Dust would be generated during the harvest and distribution of fines and fill. As discussed in Section 5.3.1, impacts to wildlife and vegetation would be limited since there are few animals in the area and vegetation is limited. Dust deposition may occur on the sea ice and would sink to the seabed in Winter Quarters Bay once the seasonal sea ice melts. This deposition may affect benthic and marine resources. However, as discussed in Section 4.2.2, there was no statistically significant change in community structure from dust when

compared to sites further away from Winter Quarters Bay (e.g., Cape Armitage). Mitigations to minimize dust would include compacting road surfaces, spraying roads and construction sites with water, limiting vehicle speeds, and limiting the size of areas being actively disturbed.

5.4.15 Materials Storage and Use

Consistent with current operations, varying quantities of materials would be used and stored at McMurdo Station and at field camps. At McMurdo Station, these materials are typically stored in outdoor cargo lines or inside warehouses, requiring transport to work sites when needed. Modernization projects would consolidate and modernize warehouses at McMurdo Station, reducing the need to transport these materials to their intended work sites and therefore reducing vehicle fuel consumption. Following modernization improvements, outdoor storage of materials and supplies would be reduced, minimizing the potential for releases to the environment.

5.4.16 Vehicle Use

Vehicles and equipment would continue to be used for cargo transport and overland traverses to support existing operations and scientific research. Once modernization projects are completed, the number of vehicles needed would be expected to decrease by 20% due to increased centralization and building integration. Similarly, spills from vehicle failures (e.g., hose breaks) likely would decline due to a modernization of the vehicle fleet and an overall reduction in use.

5.4.17 Science Support

The USAP would maintain the current level of scientific, operational, and logistical activities under Alternative A of the proposed activity. Once modernization projects are completed, the proposed activity at McMurdo Station would provide consolidated work centers dedicated to science support, thereby yielding increased efficiency. In addition, improvements to Crary Laboratory would enhance the laboratory, aquaria, and office spaces used by scientists.

5.5 Climate Change Implications

Due to the location and elevation of McMurdo Station, sea level rise and glacial melting as a result of climate change are not expected to affect the station. At McMurdo area supported locations, such as the MDV, lake level rise from glacial melt may inundate MDV facility zones. Should the lake level rise require a facility zone move, USAP's EIA process would be implemented and updated, or new EIA documentation would be prepared to meet the requirements of Annex I of the Protocol and in accordance with the ACA and its implementing regulations set forth in 45 C.F.R. § 641. Additionally, any updates to MDV facility zones would be coordinated with area stakeholders and reflected in MDV Management Plan updates.

5.6 Unavoidable Impacts

Unavoidable impacts are those that are inherent to the proposed activities and that cannot be fully mitigated or eliminated if the action is completed. The proposed modernization projects involve replacing or upgrading existing facilities. They do not involve expanding the resources used in Antarctica and would not result in impacts that are substantively new or different than those already occurring. The USAP is committed to making these modernization improvements to better serve new and continuing research and enhance stewardship of the Antarctic.

Unavoidable impacts directly resulting from implementing the proposed activity include physical disturbance of surfaces (fines) in the McMurdo Station facility zone, releases to the environment, releases of fuel-combustion by-products from equipment operation, and noise.

5.7 Cumulative Impacts

5.7.1 Introduction

Potential cumulative impacts of the proposed activity (Alternative A), in conjunction with other past, present, and (reasonably) foreseeable future actions, can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions expected to occur in a similar location during a similar time period. Reasonably foreseeable activities are activities that are separate from the proposed activity and likely to occur in the same area and time as the proposed activity. The analysis of cumulative impacts incorporates all actions that would occur during the lifespan of modernization activities in Alternative A, including the construction phase and continuing operations. In addition, past completed projects have contributed to existing conditions.

Activities at McMurdo Station prior to the adoption of the Protocol resulted in more than minor or transitory impacts. However, remediation of contaminated sites and closure and removal of former waste disposal areas at McMurdo Station have reduced historic impacts. Continued cleanup of contaminated areas would further reduce impacts from past activities.

Present and ongoing activities conducted by other organizations and individuals near McMurdo Station and areas supported by the station, and within the temporal scope of the proposed activities, include continuing operation of New Zealand's Scott Base, research performed by other national programs in the MDV and deep-field sites, and vessel and air operations by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and other national Antarctic programs. Reasonably foreseeable future projects likely to occur include the rebuilding of Scott Base. Additionally, construction for the IT&C Primary Operations Facility (POF) and the Ross Island Earth Station (RIES) has been initiated and will continue for several years. At T-Site, RIES would supplement the existing earth station at BITF. An approved IEE (NSF 2018b) for this project evaluated potential environmental impacts resulting from its construction and operation. The IT&C POF will support evolving program requirements and serve as the primary NSF data center. It will include control center offices, the network operations center, and relocated NASA and JPSS data centers. An approved IEE (NSF 2018c) evaluated the potential environmental impacts of renovating and expanding the existing SSC to create the IT&C POF.

5.7.2 Impacts of Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects

Cumulative impacts would be similar to impacts of the proposed activity. Modernizing and operating Scott Base would yield emissions of airborne pollutants from heating equipment and vehicles, while vessel and aircraft operations by NGOs and other national Antarctic programs would generate emissions, noise, and fuel-combustion by-products. Traverses to the South Pole would also generate noise, physical disturbances, and fuel-combustion by-products from vehicular use. However, these effects would be concentrated in the immediate environment and disturbances would occur within exiting footprints, traverse routes, and vessel/aircraft operating areas. As an example, Lugar (1994) monitored air quality at McMurdo Station (the largest single air emission source for the USAP) during the 1992-1993 and 1993-1994 austral summers. Data showed that station operations had a less than minor or transitory impact on local air quality. The USAP is expected to continue implementing mitigation measures to minimize any adverse impacts.

5.7.3 Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Activity

The proposed activity, as described in Section 3, plus the other projects described above would have potential cumulative impacts on

- fuel use, air emissions (including dust), and particulate deposition;
- fines and rock harvesting, resulting in a change to the existing land contour;
- waste generation; and
- wastewater releases.

Refer to Section 6 for the mitigation measures proposed for each of these activities.

Due to the temporary nature of construction activities and the fact that construction would be restricted to the previously disturbed footprint of McMurdo Station, Alternative A of the proposed action is unlikely to contribute significant adverse cumulative impacts to the environment. Typical construction- and demolition-related impacts (e.g., air and fugitive dust emissions, hazardous and solid waste generation, increased noise, physical disturbance) would be minimized to the extent practicable, as would impacts from future construction projects. The cumulative effects of physical disturbances from Alternative A and other actions would remain localized, and disturbances would mostly occur within the existing station footprint. In addition, mitigation measures (Section 6) would further minimize cumulative impacts.

Cumulative impacts from ongoing operations are likely to occur, but contributions from operations at McMurdo Station would decrease due to operational improvements (e.g., reduced fuel consumption and reduced greenhouse gas emissions, as discussed in Section 5.4.11). Continued USAP operations and the activities of other national Antarctic programs and NGOs are expected to be similar to current levels. Further, coordination with other projects and programs would minimize impacts. Cumulative impacts from Alternative A would not negatively affect the current and future scientific operations undertaken at and near McMurdo Station.

Under Alternative B, the current infrastructure and components of the USAP would continue, and existing conditions would remain the same. The impacts of continuing operations under Alternative B would be larger than those under Alternative A.

5.8 Summary of Impacts

Potential impacts from implementing the proposed activity have been identified and evaluated, consistent with the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (ATS 2016a). Table 5-1 summarizes the criteria used to evaluate the significance of the potential impacts relative to the extent, duration, and intensity of each activity, as well as the probability of their occurrence. Table 5-2 and Table 5-3 summarize potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed McMurdo Station area modernization activities and continuing operations, respectively. Because current USAP operations would continue during the construction phase of modernization projects, some impacts (e.g., waste generation, use of hazardous materials, accidental releases, noise) may be additive from both components of the proposed activity.

Implementing modernization improvements at McMurdo Station represents a significant commitment of resources over many years and could result in temporary but noticeable environmental impacts. However, the potential benefits of the proposed activity are substantial and long lasting. Overall, some of the

projected impacts from the proposed activity would be more than minor or transitory (e.g., cumulative impacts due to pre-Protocol activities). However, some impacts (e.g., waste generation, wastewater release, air emissions) would be localized, while other impacts (e.g., air emissions from aircraft) would be widely dispersed. Implementing mitigation measures would be expected to reduce impacts to no more than minor or transitory.

Table 5-1. Criteria for Assessment of Potential Impacts on the Environment

Type of Impact	Criteria		
	<i>Less than Minor or Transitory</i>	<i>Minor or Transitory</i>	<i>More than Minor or Transitory</i>
	Low	Medium	High
Extent	Local extent - Impact confined to the site of the activity.	Partial extent - Impact extends to a small area around the site of the activity.	Major extent - Impact extends well beyond the site of the activity.
Duration	Short term - Impact lasts several weeks up to several years; short compared to natural processes.	Medium term - Impact lasts more than several years; may or may not be reversible.	Long term - Impact extends many years beyond activity completion; impact may not be reversible.
Intensity	Minimal impact on natural functions and processes of the environment; impact may not be noticeable to an uninformed observer; reversible.	Impact on natural functions or processes of the environment, but these remain viable with no long-lasting changes; impact is noticeable to an uninformed observer; may or may not be reversible.	Natural functions or processes of the environment impacted or changed over long term; reversibility uncertain.
Probability	Impacts possible but unlikely.	Impacts likely.	Impacts certain.

Table 5-2. Impacts of McMurdo Station Modernization (AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan) Activities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts								Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact			
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management	Altered historic or aesthetic resources			Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
Building Demolition	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicle & equipment use, electrical power generation)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment in order.	L	L	L	H
	Generate fugitive dusts		X	X	X					Direct & Indirect	Implement fugitive dust control plan. Limit disturbance area size, spray water on area, limit vehicle speed.	L	L	L	L
	Emit by-products from use of explosives		X							Direct & Indirect	Limit explosive use to minimum amount necessary.	L	L	L	H
	Generate noise	X			X					Direct	Noise abatement would be performed to protect human safety and health. Demolition noise levels would be below thresholds disruptive to birds or marine mammal environments.	L	M	L	H
	Release fuel or hazardous materials				X	X				Direct & Indirect	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources.	L	L	M	L
	Generate waste							X		Direct & Cumulative	Establish waste staging areas and provide sufficient containment.	L	M	L	H
	Regrade land surface		X	X						Direct	Regrade surface to match surrounding contours.	L	L	L	H

Table 5-2. Impacts of McMurdo Station Modernization (AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan) Activities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts								Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact			
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management	Altered historic or aesthetic resources			Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
Building Demolition (continued)	Excavate/reveal previous contamination			X	X			X		Direct	Manage contaminated materials consistent with current procedures.	L	L	M	L
	Remove or relocate historic features								X	Direct	Implement management plan to preserve historical resources.	L	L	L	H
Site Preparation, Fill, and Fines Collection and Use	Physical disturbance (site preparation and site regrading)			X						Direct	Limit disturbance to the existing footprint of McMurdo Station.	L	L	M	H
	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicle & equipment use)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment in order.	L	L	L	H
	Generate fugitive dusts		X		X					Direct & Indirect	Implement fugitive dust control plan. Limit disturbance area size, spray water on area, limit vehicle speed.	L	L	L	H
	Generate noise	X								Direct	Noise abatement would be performed to protect human safety and health.	L	L	L	H
	Release fuel or hazardous materials				X	X				Direct & Indirect	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources.	L	L	M	L

Table 5-2. Impacts of McMurdo Station Modernization (AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan) Activities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts								Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact			
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management	Altered historic or aesthetic resources			Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
Blasting and Explosives Use	Physical disturbance	X		X					X	Direct	Limit explosives use to amount necessary.	L	M	L	H
	Emit by-products from use of explosives		X							Direct & Indirect	Limit explosive use to minimum amount necessary.	L	L	L	H
	Generate fugitive dusts		X		X					Direct & Indirect	Utilize blasting mats to reduce dust.	L	L	L	H
	Generate noise and vibrations	X								Direct	Explosives charges would be calculated to ensure minimal vibration. Noise abatement would be performed to protect human safety and health. Site activity would cease in the event birds entered the work site. Blasting and explosives would not be used in or near marine environments.	L	M	L	H
Import Material and Equipment	Transportation of non-native species	X						X		Indirect	Ship inspections and fumigations; inspect cargo and materials; remove and destroy discovered non-native species.	L	L	L	H
Transfer of Material and Equipment	Transfer of non-native species	X						X		Indirect	Inspection and cleaning of equipment, material, clothing and boots	L	L	L	H

Table 5-2. Impacts of McMurdo Station Modernization (AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan) Activities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts								Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact			
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management	Altered historic or aesthetic resources			Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
Building Construction	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicle & equipment use, electrical power generation)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	L	L	H
	Generate fugitive dusts		X		X					Direct & Indirect	Implement fugitive dust control plan. Limit disturbance area size, spray water on area, limit vehicle speed	L	L	L	H
	Generate noise	X								Direct	Noise abatement would be performed to protect human safety and health	L	M	L	H
	Release fuel or hazardous materials				X	X				Direct & Indirect	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources.	L	L	M	L
	Generate waste							X		Direct & Cumulative	Establish waste staging areas and provide sufficient containment.	L	M	L	H
	Alter visual landscape			X					X	Direct	Reduce the number of McMurdo Station structures.	L	L	L	H
Vehicle Use	Emit fuel combustion by-products		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	L	L	H
	Generate noise	X								Direct	Noise abatement would be performed to protect human safety and health	L	L	L	H

¹ Includes aesthetics and wilderness values.

Table 5-3. Impacts of Continued Operations of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts								Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact			
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management	Altered historic or aesthetic resources			Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
Building Use	Emit fuel combustion by-products (heating)		X							Direct, Indirect, Cumulative	Expand glycol heat recovery loop.	L	M	L	H
	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicles and equipment)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Locate warehouses or cargo lines closer to work centers.	L	M	L	H
	Release fuel or hazardous materials				X	X				Direct & Indirect	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources.	L	M	M	L
	Generate wastewater							X		Direct, Indirect, Cumulative	Improve wastewater conveyance systems to reduce maintenance.	L	M	L	H
Helicopter and Fixed Wing Operations	Emit fuel combustion by-products (aircraft)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Limit aircraft use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	L	M	H
	Generate noise	X								Direct	Adhere to ASPA or ASMA management plans.	L	L	L	H
	Release fuel or hazardous materials				X	X				Direct & Indirect	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources during refueling.	L	L	M	L

Table 5-3. Impacts of Continued Operations of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts								Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact			
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management	Altered historic or aesthetic resources			Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
Traverse Operations	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicle use)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	L	L	H
	Generate noise	X								Direct	Routes avoid ASPAs and animal concentrations.	L	L	M	L
	Regrade land surface (snow)			X						Direct	Regrade surface to facilitate safe transport of equipment through Shear Zone.	L	L	L	M
Vessel and Ice Pier Operations	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicle & equipment use)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	L	L	H
	Release fuel or hazardous materials				X	X				Direct & Indirect	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources.	M	L	M	L
Support Facility Operations	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicle & equipment use, electrical power generation)		X							Direct & Indirect	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	L	L	H
	Release fuel or hazardous materials				X	X				Direct & Indirect	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources.	L	L	M	L
Field Camp Operations	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicle & equipment use, heating, electrical power generation)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	L	L	H
	Disturbance of land surface (soil, snow)			X						Direct & Cumulative	Limited to skiways for major camps; natural snow drifting removes in one to two seasons.	L	L	L	M

Table 5-3. Impacts of Continued Operations of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts								Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact			
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management	Altered historic or aesthetic resources			Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
Field Camp Operations (continued)	Release fuel or hazardous materials				X	X				Direct	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources; buffer between camps and water.	L	L	L	M
	Generate waste							X		Direct & Cumulative	Establish waste staging areas and provide sufficient containment.	L	L	L	H
	Discharge wastewater (snow and ice areas)				X					Direct & Cumulative	Isolate discharges in deep ice pits.	L	L	L	H
Water and Wastewater Operations	Discharge wastewater (McMurdo Sound)					X				Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Use primary and secondary treatment and disinfection prior to discharge.	L	M	L	H
Power Operations	Emit fuel combustion by-products (electrical power generation)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	M	L	H
Solid Waste Operations	Release waste				X					Direct & Cumulative	Establish waste staging areas and provide sufficient containment.	L	L	L	H
	Generate noise	X								Direct	Limited to McMurdo Station area; perform packaging and compaction inside buildings.	L	L	L	H
Hazardous Waste Operations	Release waste				X					Direct & Cumulative	Establish waste staging areas and provide sufficient containment.	L	L	L	L
	Generate noise	X								Direct	Limited to McMurdo Station area; perform packaging and compaction inside buildings.	L	L	L	H

Table 5-3. Impacts of Continued Operations of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts								Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact			
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management	Altered historic or aesthetic resources			Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
Fuel Use and Storage	Accidental release of fuel				X	X				Direct & Indirect	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources.	L	M	L	H
Hazardous Material Storage and Use	Release hazardous materials				X	X				Direct	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources.	L	L	L	L
Explosives Use	Physical disturbance	X		X						Direct	Limit explosives use to amount necessary.	L	M	L	H
	Generate fugitive dusts		X		X					Direct & Indirect	Utilize blasting mats to reduce dust. Water surface areas.	L	L	L	H
	Emit by-products from use of explosives		X							Direct & Cumulative	Limit explosive use to minimum amount necessary.	L	L	L	H
	Generate noise and vibrations	X								Direct	Explosives charges would be calculated to ensure minimal vibration. Noise abatement would be performed to protect human safety and health. Site activity would cease in the event birds entered the work site. Blasting and explosives would not be used in or near marine environments.	L	L	L	H
Fines and Fill Collection and Use	Physical disturbance	X		X						Direct & Cumulative	Limit disturbance to designated collection areas within the existing footprint of McMurdo Station.	L	M	L	H

Table 5-3. Impacts of Continued Operations of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts							Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact				
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management			Altered historic or aesthetic resources	Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicle & equipment use)		X							Direct	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	L	L	H
Fines and Fill Collection and Use (continued)	Generate fugitive dusts		X	X	X					Direct & Indirect	Implement fugitive dust control plan. Limit disturbance area size, spray water on area, limit vehicle speed	L	L	L	H
	Alter visual landscape			X					X	Direct	Limit disturbance to designated collection areas within the existing footprint of McMurdo Station.	L	H	L	M
Materials Storage and Use	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicles and equipment)		X							Direct, Indirect, & Cumulative	Consolidate storage areas to reduce material transport.	L	L	L	H
	Release materials				X					Direct & Indirect	Utilize spill prevention procedures and resources.	L	L	L	M
Vehicle Use	Emit fuel combustion by-products (vehicles and equipment)		X							Direct & Cumulative	Limit equipment use to minimum amount necessary; maintain equipment.	L	M	L	H
Import Material and Equipment	Transportation of non-native species	X						X		Indirect	Ship inspections and fumigations; inspect cargo and materials; remove and destroy discovered non-native species.	L	L	L	H
Transfer of Material and Equipment	Transfer of non-native species	X						X		Indirect	Inspection and cleaning of equipment, material, clothing and boots	L	L	L	H

Table 5-3. Impacts of Continued Operations of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities

Activity	Environmental Aspect	Potential Environmental Impacts								Type	Preventive or Mitigating Measures	Impact			
		Wildlife disturbance	Decreased air quality	Altered land contours and drainage patterns ¹	Polluted terrestrial or marine environment	Polluted marine environment	Introduced non-native species	Increased waste management	Altered historic or aesthetic resources			Extent	Duration	Intensity	Probability
Science Support	None									Indirect	Minimize disruptions or delays to scientific research and support activities through advance planning.	L	L	L	L

¹ Includes aesthetics and wilderness values.

This page intentionally left blank.

6. Mitigation Measures

6.1 Introduction

All USAP projects are reviewed to determine their anticipated environmental impact, with the aim of avoiding, minimizing, and/or mitigating those impacts. Throughout USAP operations, a series of best management practices and mitigation measures have been developed and integrated into both unique and routine USAP activities, such as demolition, construction, remodeling, scientific drilling, fines recovery, explosives use, remotely deployed equipment recovery, field camp size management, non-native species prevention, spill prevention and response, and waste and wastewater management. Mitigation measures would continue to be integrated into USAP's actions throughout implementation of the proposed activity. All of USAP's actions performed in the MDV ASMA and/or area ASPAs would follow area-specific management plans. In addition, USAP personnel would receive environmental specific training on waste management (minimization, containerization, segregation, recycling); hazardous material spill prevention, management, and cleanup; expectations for activities undertaken in ASPAs, HSMs, and sensitive areas; protection of wildlife and vegetation; and preventing the introduction and spread of non-native species.

6.2 Mitigation during McMurdo Infrastructure Modernization Activities

6.2.1 Building Demolition and Construction

Demolition activities identified in the proposed AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan projects would be carried out in accordance with established, routine USAP procedures. Because demolition activities would only occur within the existing, previously disturbed footprint of McMurdo Station, there would be no impacts to undisturbed or environmentally sensitive areas. Demolition impacts would be further minimized by staggering the demolition schedule over many years so that waste and emissions do not occur in only one or two years (Table 3-1 and Table 3-3). If not redeveloped, demolition sites would be regraded to natural contours as much as feasible. Dust control measures (e.g., water spray) would be implemented at sites where soil disturbance has the potential to generate dust that would migrate in the environment.

At some locations, materials may have become frozen in place, or contamination from past activities may be present. Depending on site conditions, removal may cause greater impact than leaving the materials in place. At proposed project sites where hazardous materials are known or suspected to have been released during previous operations, potentially contaminated soil, snow, or ice would be tested to determine whether removal or on-site clean-up is required. As needed, subsurface contamination would be removed, containerized, and removed from the continent, and uncontaminated fill would be used to restore the area to the approximate original contour or a contour that would support activities planned for the location. At sites where subsurface contamination cannot be removed, the material would continue to be managed in place (e.g., encapsulated) in accordance with established USAP measures and procedures and following an environmental review and concurrence by NSF/OPP officials.

Personnel involved with removing facilities identified for demolition would review building plans or inspection reports to determine the potential for presence of hazardous substances (e.g., asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, petroleum or chemical-contaminated materials). Once NSF approves demolition, abatement of geofoam, asbestos-containing materials, and lead-based paint would be conducted beforehand, if necessary, using established protocols. Demolition work would be performed per United States regulations provided under 29 C.F.R. 1926.1101. Industry best practices and applicable

regulatory standards will be followed to ensure appropriate containment and management techniques are followed to reduce the potential for airborne exposures of hazardous materials, such as lead and asbestos. Required protocols are detailed in standardized procedures followed by all USAP personnel. Materials containing asbestos or lead-based paint would be removed following the regulatory standards (e.g., wetting areas before removing material to limit particulate suspension), contained, and packaged before building demolition would occur. The resources required to demolish the facility and remove debris from the continent, such as temporary storage areas and transportation containers, would also be identified.

During construction and demolition, ambient noise is expected to increase. Birds and marine mammals are not expected to be near work areas during the proposed activities. However, the USAP would continue implementing standard procedures to halt project activities when birds enter construction or demolition areas. If seals are hauled out along the shoreline, near the center of McMurdo Station (i.e., near the WWTP or Hut Point Peninsula), blasting activities would cease until the animals have re-entered the water. It is expected that noise-generating activities would be limited to work hours, when most of the local McMurdo Station population is awake. Personal protective equipment, such as earplugs or earmuffs, would continue to be used by workers on project sites, as needed.

High winds occur frequently in Antarctica and may be capable of lifting construction materials or debris if these are left unsecured. In addition to being unsightly, windblown materials can be hazardous to wildlife, personnel, and property. To eliminate the risk of windblown objects, materials awaiting installation or removal would be secured and/or contained. Additionally, work would be suspended by the on-site manager if winds become excessive or are forecast to increase rapidly. Any windblown debris would be cleaned up after each high-wind event.

6.2.2 Waste Management

Waste generated during construction, demolition, and operations would continue to be managed to prevent release to the environment and ensure that sufficient resources are available to package the waste for removal from the continent. Waste generated from demolition would be immediately segregated, containerized to prevent release to the environment, and stored in the existing waste storage area until shipped off-continent (Section 3.2.2). If delays in retrograding waste occur, the waste would be stored until transport is available to remove it from Antarctica through the current waste management process. Waste management has integrated mitigations that emphasize recycling, segregation, compaction, and prevention of release to the environment. In addition, the USAP procurement process incorporates a review of material to ensure banned substances are not purchased or shipped to McMurdo Station. During procurement, hazardous materials (e.g., chemicals, solvents, or other toxic substances) are reviewed and more environmentally friendly alternatives are substituted whenever possible. Implementing the McMurdo Master Plan projects to build a new hazardous waste facility and improve solid waste capabilities would further improve waste management and increase efficiency at McMurdo Station.

When not in use, hazardous materials would continue to be stored in containment areas, such as berms, sea containers, or lockers to prevent release into the environment. All personnel using or managing hazardous materials would be trained on proper methods of spill prevention. In the event a hazardous material is accidentally released to the environment, corrective action would be taken immediately to stop the release and prevent the material from migrating. To the maximum extent practical, all spilled material and contaminated media would be cleaned up as soon as possible and the resulting residues managed as hazardous waste.

6.2.3 Site Preparation, Fill, and Fines

Demolition and construction activities at McMurdo Station would involve site preparation and the collection and use of soil fines. Site preparation would include inspection to determine if there are any areas that appear discolored as evidence of potential contamination. If areas are suspected of being contaminated, samples would be tested to verify whether the material is indeed contaminated (i.e., needs to be removed, packaged, and handled as hazardous waste) or if it can be reused. Excavation of material for road maintenance and building foundations would be minimized by reusing previously excavated fines and limiting excavation areas. Fines would be collected using excavators, front-end loaders, and bulldozers and transported in dump trucks. During excavation, fines would be screened to segregate different sizes of material. USAP procedures would continue to be followed to limit fugitive dust (e.g., limit the area disturbed, spray water on disturbed areas, limit vehicle speed) and to harvest only from established and approved areas.

6.2.4 Explosives

During demolition, explosives would be used to dislodge buried or frozen building components and loosen soils for subsequent installation of underground infrastructure. Explosives would also be used during construction to prepare foundation areas or loosen frozen ground to install culverts and to assist in harvesting fines. A blast plan would be prepared for all detonation events. The blast plan would identify the minimum amount of explosives necessary and ensure that sound and vibrations would be below levels that would harm wildlife, structures, and people. If seals are hauled out along the shoreline near the center of McMurdo Station (i.e., near the WWTP or Hut Point Peninsula), blasting would cease until the animals have re-entered the water. In addition, blasting mats would be used for detonations in the town site and similar mitigations (blasting mats or additional fill over the blast site) would be used to ensure detonations in the fines area are fully confined in order to contain the blast and minimize the amount of noise, prevent flying rocks, and suppress dust.

6.2.5 Importation and Transfer of Materials, Equipment, and Personnel

Over the past 10 years, the USAP has enhanced training and prevention measures to mitigate the introduction of non-native species to USAP facilities and the Antarctic environment. Preventive measures include inspecting and cleaning cargo, equipment, and clothing before deployment to Antarctica and before deployment to field sites, in accordance with the *Non-native Species Manual* (ATS 2017). All cargo is inspected for non-native species before it leaves the United States, and it is further inspected upon arrival in New Zealand to ensure it meets bio-security standards. Any cargo that does not meet bio-security standards is fumigated at the inspection site. Additionally, an inspection of the wooden baggage boxes is conducted at the start of each season to ensure no contaminated or degraded wood is sent to the Antarctic. Further, the USAP requires the inspection and, if necessary, treatment of imported materials or equipment (e.g., wood, gravel, machinery) to eliminate the transfer of non-native species to the Antarctic. The USAP decontaminates or removes insects and seed materials that are discovered in raw foods or other materials imported to Antarctica. USAP participants regularly report observations of non-native insects, plants, and/or seeds, which are then isolated, destroyed, and removed from the Antarctic. Records of non-native species are used to identify areas or species of concern and to aid in determining if the species enters the continent through natural processes or as a result of USAP's operations. Similarly, when operating among multiple sites on the continent, both operational and scientific equipment and personnel clothing and boots would be inspected and cleaned to minimize the transfer of species between sites.

6.2.6 Vehicle Use

Vehicles and heavy equipment used for demolition and construction would release fuel-combustion by-products into the air. Since the proposed activity would occur over multiple years, vehicle emissions would not be concentrated and would be roughly equivalent to emissions during normal operations (emission estimates are presented in Tables B-4 and B-5 in Appendix B). Mitigation to minimize fuel consumption and related emissions would include limiting vehicle operating speeds, limiting equipment use to the minimum amount necessary to complete an activity, and maintaining equipment in good working order to ensure proper and efficient combustion.

6.2.7 Historic Sites and Monuments

Five HSMs are present at or next to McMurdo Station. All HSMs would be avoided, with the exception of HSM No. 54 (bust of Richard E. Byrd), which is adjacent to a building scheduled for demolition. The monument would be relocated to a new facility before demolition starts.

6.3 Mitigation Measures During Continuing Existing McMurdo Area Activities and Operating Existing Facilities

Best management practices and mitigation measures would continue to be implemented during continued USAP operations in the McMurdo area. Mitigation measures applicable to McMurdo Station activities are presented in Table 6-1. Personnel involved with the proposed activities would adhere to management practices, codes of conduct, and other requirements provided in management plans for ASMAs or ASPAs to avoid or minimize impacts on those areas.

6.4 Environmental Reporting and Review

The USAP has established a formal process to gather data in an efficient and consistent manner that addresses all activities at each permanent station and outlying facility in Antarctica. Since 1990, the USAP has engaged in a number of monitoring programs that have evolved, improved, and expanded along with the USAP. As detailed in Section 7, monitoring has included the annual measurement, monitoring, and tracking of population, fuel use, aircraft and traverse support, waste generation and disposition, wastewater discharge, wastewater characterization, planned releases to the environment, accidental releases (spills), and remotely deployed equipment. These data are used to evaluate trends and identify conditions that may require additional mitigation to limit or manage adverse environmental impacts.

The USAP has also implemented a program to document the extent of environmental disturbances resulting from past and current USAP facilities and the deployment of equipment and materials. Data collected includes the locations of airplane and helicopter landing sites, field camp sites, sampling activities, and fuel and waste storage facilities.

Table 6-1. Mitigation Measures Implemented during Continuing Operations and Modernization Activities

Environmental Aspect	Impact Goal	Mitigating Measure	Applicable USAP Operations and Resources																	
			Building Use	Aircraft (Helo and Fixed Wing)	Traverse	Vessel and Ice Pier	Support Facilities	Field Camps	Water and Wastewater	Power	Solid Waste	Hazardous Waste	Fuel Use and Storage	Hazardous Material Storage and Use	Explosives Use	Fines and Fill	Use of Materials	Vehicle Use	Science Support	
Emit fuel combustion byproducts (heating)	Reduce emissions	Expand glycol heat recovery loop.	X							X										
Emit fuel combustion byproducts (vehicles and equipment)	Reduce emissions	Locate warehouses or cargo lines closer to work centers.	X														X			
		Maintain equipment to operate efficiently.			X													X		
Emit byproducts from use of explosives	Reduce emissions	Prepare blasting plan; limit explosive use to amount necessary.													X	X				
Emit fugitive dust	Reduce emissions	Use blasting mats to reduce dust.													X					
		Implement fugitive dust control plan (compact surfaces, wet surfaces)	X														X			
Generate noise	Minimize wildlife disturbance	Adhere to ASPA or ASMA management plans.						X											X	
Accidental release of fuel	Prevent release	Utilize spill prevention measures during refueling.	X	X	X	X	X	X				X						X		
Accidental release of hazardous materials (non-fuel)	Prevent release	Utilize spill prevention features.	X					X					X						X	
		Consolidate material storage (indoor storage).											X							
		Procure only materials needed to adequately support activities.	X					X												X

Table 6-1. Mitigation Measures Implemented during Continuing Operations and Modernization Activities

Environmental Aspect	Impact Goal	Mitigating Measure	Applicable USAP Operations and Resources																
			Building Use	Aircraft (Helo and Fixed Wing)	Traverse	Vessel and Ice Pier	Support Facilities	Field Camps	Water and Wastewater	Power	Solid Waste	Hazardous Waste	Fuel Use and Storage	Hazardous Material Storage and Use	Explosives Use	Fines and Fill	Use of Materials	Vehicle Use	Science Support
Accidental release of waste	Prevent release	Establish waste staging areas and provide sufficient containment.	X				X	X				X	X						
Regrade land surfaces (soil, snow, ice)	Reduce disturbances	Limit operating/facility zone to only the area needed to support operations or research.					X	X								X			X
Regrade land surfaces (soil)	Reduce disturbances	Reuse recovered material generated during building demolitions, treat fuel-contaminated soil for reuse, and improve drainage around the station to reduce erosion resulting from snowmelt runoff.	X													X			
Release wastewater (marine, snow or ice areas only)	Reduce discharge; reduce maintenance	Containerize or treat wastewater where practical.			X			X											
		Improve conveyance systems.	X							X									
Introduce non-native species	Prevent distribution or cross-contamination	Inspect clothing, materials and equipment; remediate as needed	X	X	X	X	X	X									X		X
Transfer of non-native species	Prevent cross-contamination	Inspect and clean clothing, materials, and equipment between field sites.	X	X	X	X	X	X									X		X

7. Environmental Monitoring

In accordance with Article 5 of Annex I of the Protocol, the USAP conducts a comprehensive monitoring program of key environmental parameters to assess and verify the impacts of activities conducted in Antarctica. Since 2005, the USAP has used the guidance in the *Practical Guidelines for Developing and Designing Environmental Monitoring Programmes in Antarctica* (COMNAP 2005) to assist in developing robust environmental monitoring. The environmental monitoring program also verifies that projected impacts in EIAs are consistent with actual impacts. Environmental impacts and impact sources that are monitored include land use and disturbance, fuel use, hazardous material use and storage, waste management, and releases to the environment. The monitoring program also confirms that those impacts are localized and do not constitute a major adverse impact on the environment. The USAP regularly conducts on-site reviews of field camp operations and projects to assess the use and efficacy of best management practices (e.g., waste collection and management, spill prevention practices, and environmental impacts to the surrounding environment), as well as compliance with environmental protection requirements.

7.1 Overview of Past Monitoring Studies and Assessments

Historically, environmental monitoring has been performed at USAP facilities for the quality of water, air, soil, ice, and snow. Drinking water samples collected annually at McMurdo Station and select field camps are used to determine water safety and to protect the health of USAP's participants. Additionally, annual wastewater samples are collected from the McMurdo Station WWTP effluent to calculate pollutant loadings (e.g., biochemical oxygen demand [BOD], total suspended solids [TSS], ammonia-nitrogen) and determine if contaminants are being discharged to the receiving body.

A long-term, benthic monitoring program was conducted at McMurdo Station between 1988 and 1993 to study changes in benthic communities in response to chemical contaminants and the organic enrichment of sediments, as documented in the resulting Moss Landing Marine Laboratory report (Lenihan and Oliver 1995). An air monitoring program was conducted at McMurdo Station during the 1992-1993 and 1993-1994 austral summers. Those data showed that station operations had a less than minor or transitory impact on local air quality (Lugar 1994). Seasonal air emissions continue to be calculated from fuel use.

A drainage and erosion study was conducted at McMurdo Station in 2008, with the goal of providing recommendations for mitigating drainage-related erosion within the station footprint (Cold Regions Research and Engineering Lab [CRREL] 2014). The study identified areas where erosion was a concern and provided recommendations on soil compaction and drainage design to limit future erosion.

Environmental impacts caused by anthropogenic activities at McMurdo Station were monitored between 1999 and 2012 (Kennicutt et al. 2010; Klein et al. 2012). Researchers determined the extent of physical disturbance at the station (Klein et al. 2008) and analyzed soil to identify the contaminant footprint. A number of physical, chemical, and biological indicators were measured in soils and marine sediments, including contaminant dose (concentrations), toxicological properties, and *in situ* biological responses over short- and long-term time scales. The USAP also monitors and assesses previously disturbed locations at McMurdo Station and/or the McMurdo area through a system that tracks sites of past activity.

7.2 Monitoring Plan

7.2.1 USAP Environmental Monitoring Program

The USAP has a monitoring program which follows guidance in the *Antarctic Environmental Monitoring Handbook: Standard techniques for monitoring in Antarctica* (COMNAP and SCAR 2000) and the *Practical Guidelines for Developing and Designing Environmental Monitoring Programmes in Antarctica* (COMNAP 2005). Data is gathered on all science and operational activities at McMurdo Station, outlying facilities, and field camps in an efficient and consistent manner. The data collected through this process form the basis of the current monitoring program, which is summarized by season and collates key parameters, including:

- population (person-days by location);
- camp use;
- fuel use;
- field fuel caches;
- aircraft and traverse support;
- waste generation and disposition;
- wastewater discharge;
- annual wastewater characterization;
- planned releases to the environment (e.g., research balloons);
- sample sites;
- accidental releases (e.g., spills); and
- the recovery status of remotely deployed equipment.

In addition, the USAP inspects and reports non-native species found in food and cargo to assess and improve pre-shipping procurement and inspection processes.

The USAP has also implemented a program to document the extent of environmental disturbances resulting from past and current USAP facilities and the deployment of equipment and materials. Data are collected on field camp site locations, field sampling activities and locations, field population (person-days by location), and fuel and waste storage facilities. In recent years, the USAP has reviewed its monitoring program with the aim of improving the collection, maintenance, and quality of data. Future improvements to the monitoring program are aimed at developing a relational database to improve the ability of the USAP to identify the impact of all its activities on the Antarctic environment. Over the approximately 10 years of McMurdo Station recapitalization, USAP's monitoring program would need to progress to cover the full extent of the proposed modernization activities.

Key environmental parameters related to McMurdo Station area modernization activities would be monitored for the impacts identified in this CEE. This monitoring effort would be evolved from and integrated into the current USAP monitoring program. Monitored impacts include disturbance to wildlife, releases to the air (e.g., fugitive dust) and water, noise (disturbance to Antarctic animals), physical disturbance of terrestrial and marine environments, introduction of non-native species, increased waste production, and alteration of historic and aesthetic resources. Monitoring of material procurement

processes would include preventing the purchase and transport to Antarctica of banned materials. In addition, all material would be inspected before shipment to ensure no banned substances are included and to prevent importing non-native species.

Monitoring would occur throughout the extent of each modernization activity, including building demolition; site preparation, fill, and fines; blasting and explosives use; import of material; building construction; and vehicle use. Monitoring would continue to be conducted as part of the overall USAP monitoring program and would be expanded during modernization activities.

7.3 Verification of Predicted Impacts of the Proposed Activities

The USAP continues to implement a program of field audits to evaluate the environmental impacts of science, operations, and field camps to ensure that the impacts have been correctly identified. The results of these audits have been periodically reported to the CEP in Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) XL IP8 *Field Project Reviews: Fulfilling Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Monitoring Obligations, 2017* and in ATCM XXXVIII IP42 *EIA Field Reviews of Science, Operations, and Camps, 2015*. The USAP would continue to document and systematically evaluate impacts resulting from the proposed activities through a system of on-site audits undertaken during McMurdo Station modernization activities and throughout ongoing operations. The audits would ensure that the actions and mitigation measures detailed in this CEE are being performed as planned, that the impacts have been correctly evaluated, and that corrective actions are initiated as necessary to mitigate increased or unexpected impacts. Audits would focus on specific construction projects during McMurdo Station modernization activities, and reviews of modernization activity impacts would be completed following each construction season throughout the project. The audit program would continue for ongoing USAP activities and operations, focusing on specific science and operational activities to verify that impacts identified through the EIA process have been correctly identified and evaluated, mitigation measures and best management practices identified during the EIA process are implemented and effective, and that any necessary corrective actions to mitigate increased or unexpected impacts are initiated.

The USAP follows guidance for CEE reviews outlined in Resolution 2, *Procedures for Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation follow-up* (ATS 1997). In accordance with current USAP practices, the USAP would review modernization projects identified in this CEE every five years to determine if the EIA has adequately identified potential impacts and if mitigation measures are effective in reducing them. Examples of recent CEE reviews include two Information Papers submitted to the 2019 meeting of the ATCM: ATCM XLII IP 76 *The Environmental Impact Assessment Feedback Process: Review of Modernization of the Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station* (NSF 1998; ATS 2019a) and ATCM XLII IP 77 *Environmental Impact Assessment Feedback Process: Review of Project IceCube* (NSF 2004h; ATS 2019b).

This page intentionally left blank.

8. Decommissioning of United States Antarctic Program Facilities in the McMurdo Area

The *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (ATS 2016a) advises that decommissioning existing facilities to a pre-activity state should be considered, where such actions are appropriate. McMurdo Station is a major research and resupply resource for the USAP that is expected to continue operating for the foreseeable future. However, in the event that decommissioning were to occur, dismantling of each building would likely be in reverse of the construction sequence (i.e., it would start with removing building panels or other structural components, progress to removing utility connections and footers, and end with regrading the building site to restore its original condition to the greatest extent practical). Building demolition has been subject to an IEE and has always been a part of USAP upgrades and improvements. Therefore, the USAP has extensive experience in minimizing environmental disturbance during demolition.

The full removal of all material and components of McMurdo Station would require a minimum of 10 years, though the actual time would depend on the condition of facilities at the time of decommissioning. The resultant waste materials would be managed to prevent releases to the environment and would be contained and stored in the designated waste storage area and then shipped back to the United States via cargo vessel. Little or none of the demolition material would be suitable for reuse or recycling due to age and condition (e.g., heavily weathered or degraded). After decommissioning, land surfaces would be regraded to either resemble pre-disturbance conditions or blended into surrounding contours to the greatest extent possible.

Materials that have become frozen in place or contaminants from past activities may be present in some locations. Depending on conditions, removal may cause greater impact than leaving the materials in place. In these instances, appropriate actions would undergo USAP's EIA process and EIA documentation would be prepared to meet the requirements of Annex I of the Protocol and in accordance with the ACA and its implementing regulations set forth in 45 C.F.R. § 641.

This page intentionally left blank.

9. Gaps in Knowledge and Uncertainties

Uncertainty and unknowns are inherent in the environmental analysis of the proposed activity. The greatest uncertainties and gaps in knowledge relate to methodology, construction conditions, and future science. Impacts described in this CEE account for a range of conditions during facility modernization and the service life of the facility. Therefore, any variations or uncertainties that do not involve major changes are not expected to significantly affect the potential impact sources of activities or alter conclusions. Additionally, if project-specific plans are refined or changed, USAP's EIA process would be implemented and updated or new EIA documentation may be prepared to meet the requirements of Annex I of the Protocol and in accordance with the ACA and its implementing regulations set forth in 45 C.F.R. § 641.

9.1 Uncertainties in Methodology

While some uncertainty exists with respect to the methods used to estimate certain parameters, potential inaccuracies in the estimates did not affect the conclusions reached from the environmental reviews conducted or the impacts identified by those reviews. Technical information and data related to the proposed activity were derived from details of the action and its estimated impacts, such as waste generation, physical disturbances, fuel consumption, noise, and emissions to the air. Using these data, potential environmental impacts were evaluated relevant to the characteristics of the environmental settings that could be affected. USAP's project teams provided quantitative estimates developed using generic models based on preliminary design, area of the buildings, number of floors, construction materials, and other factors. Inaccuracies in these estimates are not expected to affect the conclusions derived from this environmental review.

9.2 Uncertainties in Construction and Demolition

Uncertainties may exist with respect to construction, demolition, operations, and impacts that could affect the surrounding environment, such as soil and rock conditions beneath structures to be demolished, including the potential presence of contaminants. Resources needed for temporary construction workers, work functions displaced by construction and demolition, and uncertainty in construction conditions (e.g., delays due to weather and/or material delivery) may require altering planned project schedules. Further, the adequacy of resources to handle, contain, and store demolition debris until it can be retrograded from Antarctica for disposal is unknown, particularly if there are changes to project schedules or to the estimated volume of material generated. However, consistent with current USAP practices, waste would be stored in a manner that prevents inadvertent release to the surrounding environment. In addition, the availability of sealift resources to remove demolition waste according to the estimated removal schedule is an uncertainty that may affect the final completion date of the proposed activity.

Although the general timing of modernization activities has been developed, specific demolition and construction sequences are uncertain at this time. Plans for the proposed activities would include AIMS, implemented over a period of approximately eight years, and remaining McMurdo Master Plan projects, implemented over the following approximately seven years. However, it is possible that operational, logistical, funding, or weather-related factors may extend construction phases; thus, the entire construction phase of modernization projects would be approximately 15-20 years. As a result, some environmental impacts would be spread over time at a lower intensity than those that would result from actions occurring simultaneously or with greater frequency. Additional EIAs, as required, would be

prepared for any modernization projects where uncertainties have limited the extent to which the associated impacts and mitigation measures have been assessed in this CEE.

9.3 Uncertainties in Future Science

Changes in future science projects, including the potential application of more advanced technologies, also contribute to uncertainty regarding the resources needed to support those projects. While the proposed changes to McMurdo Station science-support infrastructure are intended to be flexible and accommodate a number of changes in the types of research supported, the specific focus of future research projects is unknown. In addition, the nature and extent of future research projects involving international collaboration may affect the facilities or logistical resources that are needed and shared among the USAP and the programs of other Treaty Parties.

10. Conclusions

This CEE identifies impacts potentially resulting from Alternative A (the proposed activity) and Alternative B. The proposed activity would implement modernization projects at McMurdo Station and continue ongoing science and operations at McMurdo Station and the areas it supports. The proposed construction phase for modernization projects is anticipated to occur over a period of approximately 15-20 years.

The proposed activity (modernization and continuing operations) is not anticipated to expand the operating footprint of McMurdo Station or fixed facilities supported by McMurdo Station. Similarly, the proposed activity would not result in impacts that are substantively new or different from those that have already occurred. Impacts from the proposed activity are projected to be localized and either contained and removed from the continent (e.g., solid and hazardous waste) or at a level that the environment is able to absorb the impacts without change at the regional level (e.g., wastewater effluent and air emissions). However, some impacts would result in more than minor or transitory impacts, even with the proposed mitigations. Therefore, some long-term adverse impacts on the Antarctic environment are expected.

In accordance with current USAP practices, the USAP would review modernization projects identified in this CEE every five years to determine if the EIA has adequately identified potential impacts and if mitigations are effective in reducing them. These EIA reviews would fulfil the monitoring requirements identified in Article 5 of Annex I of the Protocol, Resolution 2 (ATS 1997), United States regulations, and are consistent with Section 3.6 (Monitoring) of the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment on Antarctica* (ATS 2016a).

The proposed activity would result in substantial improvements in environmental performance, and consistent use of mitigations and monitoring would further minimize impacts. Benefits would include continuing substantive scientific and logistic collaboration with other Antarctic programs and an increased potential for enhanced international collaboration as new science and logistical opportunities arise. The major benefits of modernization components of the proposed activity are

- improved capacity for USAP research in concert with continuing international collaborations in scientific and operational activities;
- enhanced safety performance in the USAP;
- increased operational efficiency (12% reduction in support staff and a 40% reduction in maintenance staff);
- increased logistical efficiency (20% reduction in building square footage);
- reduction in outdoor storage to reduce risk of material being released to the environment;
- reduced energy consumption (35% reduction in station fuel consumption and a 20% reduction in vehicle fuel use);
- reduced carbon emissions; and
- reduced long-term environmental impact.

This page intentionally left blank.

11. CEE Preparers and Reviewers

For further information regarding the CEE process, please contact Dr. Polly A. Penhale, Senior Advisor, Environment, National Science Foundation, Office of Polar Programs, 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22314. Email: CEE.comments@nsf.gov

This CEE has been prepared through the efforts of the Antarctic Support Contract (ASC), Leidos Corporation, which provides operations and logistics support for the USAP.

AECOM, Preparers

Mr. Art Jung, Program Manager / Senior Project Manager

Mr. John Maier, Project Scientist

Mr. Craig Carver, Environmental Planner

Mr. Michael Endicott, GIS Specialist

Ms. Charlene Wu, Environmental Planner

ASC, Leidos Contributors

Ms. Bettie K. Grant, Deputy Program Director

Mr. Gary Waggoner, Corporate Environmental, Health & Safety Director

Mr. Brandon Neahusan, AIMS Project Manager

Mr. Kevin Gibbons, Master Plan Project Manager

Mr. Jack Corbin, Facilities Estimating and Design Manager

Mr. JJ O'Brien, Facilities and Engineering Manager

Mr. Jeff Huffman, Operations Manager

Mr. Bob DeValentino, McMurdo Operations Manager

Mr. Matt Liffengren, Sr. Project Engineer

Mr. Jim Mastro, Sr. Communications Editor

Mr. Steve Dunbar, Senior Process Analyst

ASC, Leidos Reviewers

Dr. Kaneen Christensen, Manager, Environmental Engineering

Dr. Ted Doerr, Staff, Environmental Engineering

Dr. Andrew Titmus, Environmental Policy Analyst, Environmental Engineering

Mr. Nathan Williams, Sr. Environmental Engineer, Environmental Engineering

NSF, Office of Polar Programs Reviewers

Dr. Polly A. Penhale, Senior Advisor, Environment

Dr. Nature McGinn, Environmental Policy Program Manager

Mr. Michael Gencarelli, Facilities Construction and Maintenance Manager

Ms. Margaret Knuth, Operations Manager

Mr. Brian MacDonald, Capital Planning Manager

Mr. Ben Roth, Facilities Engineering Projects Manager

Mr. Patrick Smith, Technology Development Manager

12. Glossary

The glossary contains definitions of unusual words or words that are used in unusual ways in this document. The definitions are not necessarily dictionary based.

Ablation – Erosion of a glacier or ice sheet by sublimation (evaporation of ice to atmospheric water vapor) and wind erosion. Areas of ice ablation are those where the rate of ice removal by sublimation and wind erosion is high enough that a net loss occurs. Ice ablation results in blue ice formations consisting of exposed, blue glacial ice without a normal snow cover.

Antarctic Treaty – The Antarctic Treaty was signed in Washington, DC in 1959 and entered into force in 1961. The Treaty established a legal framework for the area of the earth south of 60°S (which includes all of Antarctica), reserves Antarctica for peaceful purposes, and provides for freedom of scientific investigation. The Treaty does not recognize, dispute, or establish territorial claims and prohibits the assertion of new claims.

Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) – Annual meeting of Treaty Parties and representatives of associated organizations to deliberate and adopt measures, decisions, and resolutions regarding the management and use of Antarctica. This term also refers generally to the body comprising the Treaty Parties and associated organizations that participate in the annual meeting.

Antarctic Treaty Secretariat (ATS) – Established on September 1, 2004, the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty is responsible for fulfilling the following tasks under the direction of the ATCM including:

- supporting the annual ATCM and the meeting of the CEP;
- facilitating the exchange of information between the Parties, as required in the Treaty and the Environment Protocol;
- collecting, storing, archiving, and making available documents of the ATCM; and
- providing and disseminating information about the Antarctic Treaty system and Antarctic activities.

Austral – Of or pertaining to southern latitudes. The austral summer is the period, approximately November to February, when temperatures in Antarctica are highest and when most USAP activities occur.

Baseline condition(s) – Current, present, or existing state of a resource or area.

Bladder (fuel) – Portable, flexible, synthetic-material fuel tank designed for use at temporary or remote sites. Bladders are shaped like pillows and are laid on the ground, snow, ice, or an impermeable liner, and then filled with fuel.

Bulk storage tank – Large fuel storage tank used to resupply smaller day tanks or to supply large fuel users, such as power plants and aircraft.

Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP) - The Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty established the CEP as an expert advisory body to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting.

Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) - As described in Annex I of the Protocol, a CEE is a document prepared to analyze an action that is likely to have more than a minor or transitory environmental impact.

Cumulative impacts – As defined in *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (CEP 2016) “a cumulative impact is the combined impact of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable activities.” Cumulative impacts may occur over time and space and can be additive or interactive and/or synergistic.

Day tank – Small tank that provides fuel for heating or other needs at an individual building. Day tanks are usually filled several times a week.

Decommissioning – Removal of a structure, vehicle, or piece of equipment from service or use. For the purposes of this CEE, decommissioning of a structure refers to its dismantling (i.e., demolition) and removal from any Antarctic location.

Fines – Rocks and soil extracted from geological materials in ice-free areas. Materials are typically screened and stockpiled for use in construction and maintenance applications.

Hazardous materials – Substances that exhibit hazardous characteristics, as defined in 45 C.F.R. § 671.

Ice sheet – Continental masses of glacial ice sometimes covered with surface snow. The Antarctic continent is almost entirely covered by ice sheets moving slowly from areas of snow accumulation to the sea or to areas of ice ablation.

Initial Environmental Evaluation (IEE) – As described in Annex I of the Protocol, unless it has been determined that an activity will have less than a minor or transitory impact, or unless a CEE is being prepared in accordance with Article 3, an Initial Environmental Evaluation shall be prepared. If the IEE indicates that the proposed activity is likely to have no more than a minor or transitory effect on the environment, the activity may proceed with the provision that appropriate monitoring of the actual impact should take place.

International Geophysical Year (IGY) – Cooperative endeavor conducted from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1958 by world scientists to improve the understanding of the Earth and its environment. Much field activity took place in Antarctica, where 12 nations established 60 research stations.

Intersessional Contact Group (ICG) – A web-based discussion forum established via the Members section of the Antarctic Treaty website.

Jamesway – A prefabricated, insulated canvas building, semicircular in cross-section, with a wooden frame and floor.

Loading (wastewater) – The rate (mass per time) at which a wastewater constituent is discharged. The loading of a constituent is determined by multiplying its concentration in the wastewater (mass per volume) times the wastewater discharge flow rate (volume per time).

Masking effects - When noise obscures or covers natural sounds or the sounds or calls made by marine mammals.

Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (Protocol) – The Protocol (ATS 1991) was adopted by the Antarctic Treaty Parties in 1991 to enhance protection of the Antarctic environment. The Protocol designated Antarctica as a natural reserve and set forth environmental protection principles to be applied to all human activities in Antarctica, including both governmental and non-governmental activities.

Remotely deployed equipment (RDE) – Equipment and instruments that are temporarily deployed in the field for research or operational purposes, for periods of a few weeks to multiple operating seasons.

Retrograde – As used by the USAP, the transport of any items (e.g., wastes, used equipment, research samples) from Antarctica to the United States or other countries for processing or disposition (e.g., disposal, recycling, analysis).

Sanitary wastewater – For the purposes of this EIA, sanitary wastewater includes all liquid wastes entering sewage collection systems, including those from living quarters, galleys, laboratories, and shops. It does not include hazardous waste streams or industrial chemicals, which are collected separately and either recycled or disposed of in permitted facilities in the United States.

Secondary containment – Facilities (e.g., berms, double walls) that contain the contents of a fuel tank, pipeline, or other container that holds hazardous materials in case of leaks or rupture.

Smart grid (SG) technology – Generally refers to computer-based, remote-control sensors, automation, and other systems in a utility distribution infrastructure to monitor its operation, efficiency, maintenance requirements, and other characteristics.

Traverse – In the context of operations in Antarctica, the process of transporting cargo or equipment over snow-covered terrain using tracked vehicles and sleds.

This page intentionally left blank.

13. References

- Ackley SF, Sullivan CW. 1994. Physical controls on the development and characteristics of Antarctic sea ice biological communities—a review and synthesis. *Deep-Sea Res Part I*. 41(10):1583-1604.
- Ainley DG. 1985. Biomass of birds and mammals in the Ross Sea. In: Siegfried WR, Condy PR, Laws RM, editors. *Antarctic nutrient cycles and food webs*. Berlin, Heidelberg (Germany). Springer. p. 498-515.
- Ainley DG, Lindke K, Ballard G, Lyver PO, Jennings S, Toniolo V, Pennycook J, Massaro M, Santora JA. 2017. Spatio-temporal occurrence patterns of cetaceans near Ross Island, Antarctica, 2002–2015: implications for food web dynamics. *Polar Biol*. 40(9):1761-1775.
- Ainley DG, Ballard G, Karl BJ, Dugger KM. 2005. Leopard seal predation rates at penguin colonies of different size. *Antarct Sci*. 17(3):335-340.
- Ainley DG, Ballard G. 2012. Trophic interactions and population trends of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in the Southern Ross Sea. *Aquat Mamm*. 38(2):153-160.
- Ainley DG, Clarke ED, Arrigo K, Fraser WR, Kato A, Barton KJ, Wilson PR. 2005. Decadal-scale changes in the climate and biota of the Pacific sector of the Southern Ocean, 1950s to the 1990s. *Antarct Sci*. 17(2), pp.171-182.
- Ainley DG, Jongsomjit D, Ballard G, Thiele D, Fraser WR, Tynan CT. 2012. Modeling the relationship of Antarctic minke whales to major ocean boundaries. *Polar Biol*. 35(2):281-290.
- Ainley DG, Ribic CA, Ballard G, Heath S, Gaffney I, Karl BJ, Barton KJ, Wilson PR, Webb S. 2004. Geographic structure of Adélie penguin populations: overlap in colony-specific foraging areas. *Ecol Monogr*. 74:159-178.
- Ainley DG, Ribic CA, Wood RC. 1990. A demographic study of the South Polar skua *Catharacta maccormicki* at Cape Crozier. *J Anim Ecol*. 59:1-20.
- Andriuzzi WS, Stanish LF, Simmons BL, Jaros C, Adams BJ, Wall DH, McKnight DM. 2018. Spatial and temporal patterns of microbial mats and associated invertebrates along an Antarctic stream. *Polar Biol*. 41(10):1911-1921.
- Archer SD, de los Ríos A, Lee KC, Niederberger TS, Cary SC, Coyne KJ, Douglas S, Lacap-Bugler DC, Pointing SB. 2017. Endolithic microbial diversity in sandstone and granite from the McMurdo Dry Valleys, Antarctica. *Polar Biol*. 40(5):997-1006.
- Arntz WE, Gutt J, Klages M. 1997. Antarctic marine biodiversity: an overview. In: Battaglia B, Valencia J, Walton DWH, editors. *Antarctic communities: species, structure and survival*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press. p. 3-13.
- Arntz W, Brey T, Gallardo VA. 1994. Antarctic zoobenthos. *Oceanogr Mar Biol*. 32:241-304.
- ATS. 1991. The protocol on environmental protection to the Antarctic Treaty [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.ats.aq/e/ep.htm>
- ATS. 1997. Procedures for Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation follow-up [Internet]. Available from: https://www.ats.aq/documents/cep/atcm21_res2_e.pdf

- ATS. 2014a. Management plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 121, Cape Royds, Ross Island [Internet]. Available from: https://www.ats.aq/documents/recatt/att542_e.pdf
- ATS. 2014b. Management plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 124, Cape Crozier, Ross Island [Internet]. Available from: https://www.ats.aq/documents/recatt/Att543_e.pdf
- ATS. 2016a. Guidelines for environmental impact assessment in Antarctica [Internet]. Available from: http://ats.aq/documents/recatt/Att605_e.pdf
- ATS. 2016b. Area protection and management / monuments [Internet]. Available from http://www.ats.aq/e/ep_protected.htm
- ATS. 2017. Non-native species manual [Internet]. Available from https://www.ats.aq/documents/ATCM40/att/atcm40_att056_e.pdf
- ATS. 2019a. The Environmental Impact Assessment Feedback Process: Review of Modernization of the Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station (1998 EIS). ATCM XLII IP76.
- ATS. 2019b. The Environmental Impact Assessment Feedback Process: Review of Project IceCube (2004 CEE). ATCM XLII IP77.
- Ball B, Virginia RA. 2014. The ecological role of moss in a polar desert: implications for aboveground-belowground and terrestrial-aquatic linkages. *Polar Biol.* 37:651-664.
- Barrett PJ, Pyne AR, Macpherson AJ. 1983. Observations on the sea floor of McMurdo Sound and Granite Harbour. *New Zealand Antarctic Record.* 5:16-22.
- Barry JP, Buck KR, Lovera CF, Kuhnz L, Whaling PJ, Peltzer ET, Walz P, Brewer PG. 2004. Effects of direct ocean CO₂ injection on deep-sea meiofauna. *J Oceanogr.* 60:759-766.
- Barry JP, Dayton PK. 1988. Current patterns in McMurdo Sound, Antarctica and their relationship to local biotic communities. *Polar Biol.* 8:367-376.
- Bhaud M, Koubbi P, Razouls S, Tachon O, Accornero A. 1999. Description of planktonic polychaete larvae from Terre Adélie and the Ross Sea (Antarctica). *Polar Biol.* 22:329-340.
- Block W. 1984. Terrestrial microbiology, invertebrates, and ecosystems. In: Laws, RM, editor. *Antarctic ecology*, Vol. 1. Cambridge (MA): Academic Press. p. 163-236.
- Broady PA. 1984. Taxonomic and ecological investigations of algae on steam-warmed soil on Mt Erebus, Ross Island, Antarctica. *Phycologia.* 23(3):257-271.
- Broady PA. 1989. Broadscale patterns in the distribution of aquatic and terrestrial vegetation at three ice-free regions on Ross Island, Antarctica. In: Vincent W, Ellis-Evans JC, editors. *High Latitude Limnology*. Dordrecht (Germany). Springer. p.77-95.
- BRP. 2012. More and better science in Antarctica through increased logistical effectiveness [Internet]. Available from: https://www.nsf.gov/geo/opp/usap_special_review/usap_brp/rpt/antarctica_07232012.pdf
- Brueggeman, P. 1998. Underwater field guide to Ross Island & McMurdo Sound, Antarctica [Internet]. Available from: <http://peterbrueggeman.com/nsf/fguide/index.html>

- Burns JM, Trumble SJ, Castellini MA, Testa JW. 1998. The diet of Weddell seals in McMurdo Sound, Antarctica as determined from scat collections and stable isotope analysis. *Polar Biol.* 19:272-282.
- Burns JM, Kooyman GL. 2001. Habitat use by Weddell seals and emperor penguins foraging in the Ross Sea, Antarctica. *Am Zool.* 41:90-98.
- Cameron MF, Siniff DB. 2004. Age-specific survival, abundance, and immigration rates of a Weddell seal (*Leptonychotes weddellii*) population in McMurdo Sound, Antarctica. *Can J Zool.* 82:601-615.
- Campbell IB, Claridge GGC. 1987. Antarctica: soils, weathering processes and environment, Vol. 16. New York (NY): Elsevier Sci. 367 p.
- CCAMLR. 2016. Conservation Measure 91-05: Ross Sea region marine protected area [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.ccamlr.org/en/measure-91-05-2016>
- Croxall JP, Trathan PN, Murphy EJ. 2002. Environmental change and Antarctic seabird populations. *Science.* 297(5586):1510-1514.
- CRREL. 2014. Runoff characterization and variations at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. Hanover (MD): Engineer Research and Development Center/CRREL. TR-14-6 [Internet]. Available from: <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a602401.pdf>
- COMNAP. 2005. Practical guidelines for developing and designing environmental monitoring programmes in Antarctica [Internet]. Available from: https://www.comnap.aq/Publications/Comnap%20Publications/comnap_guidelines_practicalmonitoring_2005.pdf
- COMNAP and SCAR. 2000. Antarctic environmental monitoring handbook: standard techniques for monitoring in Antarctica [Internet]. Available from: https://www.comnap.aq/Publications/Comnap%20Publications/comnap-scar_env_monitoring_handbook_jun2000.pdf
- Dayton PK. 2013. Polar benthos. In: Smith WO, editor. *Polar oceanography: chemistry, biology, and geology.* San Diego (CA): Academic Press. p. 631-679.
- Dayton PK, Oliver JS. 1977. Antarctic soft bottom benthos in oligotrophic and eutrophic environments. *Science.* 197:55-58.
- Dayton PK, Robilliard GA, Paine RT, Dayton LB. 1974. Biological accommodation in the benthic community at McMurdo Sound, Antarctica. *Ecol Monogr.* 44:105-128.
- de Bruyn PN, Tosh CA, Terauds A. 2013. Killer whale ecotypes: is there a global model? *Biol Rev.* 88(1):62-80.
- Dooling RJ, Popper AN. 2007. The effects of highway noise on birds. California Department of Transportation Division of Environmental Analysis. Rockville (MD). 74 p.
- Doran PT, McKay CP, Clow GD, Dana GL, Fountain AG, Nylen T, Lyons WB. 2002. Valley floor climate observations from the McMurdo Dry Valleys, Antarctica, 1986–2000. *J Geophys Res-Atmos.* 107:47-72.

- Doran PT, McKay CP, Fountain AG, Nylen T, McKnight DM, Jaros C, Barret JE. 2008. Hydrologic response to extreme warm and cold summers in the McMurdo Dry Valleys, East Antarctica. *Antarct Sci.* 20:499-509.
- Duncan SM, Farrell RL, Jordan N, Jurgens JA, Blanchette RA. 2010. Monitoring and identification of airborne fungi at historic locations on Ross Island, Antarctica. *Polar Sci.* 4(2):275-283.
- Federal Highways Administration. 2019a. Construction noise handbook: Chapter 9.0, equipment type noise levels and ranges [Internet]. Available from: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm
- Federal Highway Administration. 2019b. Roadway construction noise model Version 2.0 [Internet]. Available from: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm2/
- Fountain AG, Lyons WB, Burkins MB, Dana GL, Doran PT, Lewis KJ, McKnight DM, Moorhead DL, Parsons AN, Priscu JC, Wall DH. 1999. Physical controls on the Taylor Valley ecosystem, Antarctica. *Bioscience.* 49:961-971.
- Fountain AG, Nylen TH, Monaghan A, Basagic HJ, Bromwich D. 2010. Snow in the McMurdo Dry Valleys, Antarctica. *Int J Climatol.* 30:633-642.
- Fretwell PT, LaRue MA, Morin P, Kooyman GL, Wienecke R, Ratcliffe N, Fox AJ, Fleming AH, Porter C, Trathan PN. 2012. An Emperor penguin population estimate: The first global, synoptic survey of a species from space [Internet]. Available from: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0033751>
- Gambi MC, Bussotti S. 1999. Composition, abundance and stratification of soft-bottom macrobenthos from selected areas of the Ross Sea shelf (Antarctica). *Polar Biol.* 21(6):347-354.
- GERG. 2003. Spatial and temporal scales of human disturbance, McMurdo Station, Antarctica, final report. p. 1-203.
- GERG. 2011. Long-Term Monitoring at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. Final Report: Phase 7. p. 1-26.
- Gooseff MN, McKnight DM, Lyons WB, Blum AE. 2002. Weathering reactions and hyporheic exchange controls on stream water chemistry in a glacial meltwater stream in the McMurdo Dry Valleys. *Water Resour Res.* 38:15-17.
- Harris CM, Lorenz K, Fishpool LDC, Lascelles B, Cooper J, Croxall JP, Emmerson LM, Fijn R, Fraser WL, Jouventin P, LaRue MA, Le Maho Y, Lynch HJ, Naveen R, Patterson-Fraser DL, Peter H-U, Poncet S, Phillips RA, Southwell CJ, van Franeker JA, Weimerskirch H, Wienecke B, Woehler EJ. 2015. Important Bird Areas in Antarctica 2015 summary. Cambridge (MA): BirdLife Int and Env Research & Assessment Ltd. p. 45
- Harris CM, Lorenz K, Syposz M. 2017. Representation of Important Bird Areas in the series of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas. Cambridge (MA): Environmental Research & Assessment Ltd. 62 p.
- Hatherton T. 1990. Antarctica: The Ross Sea region. Wellington (New Zealand): DSIR Publishing 287 p.
- Hopkins TL. 1987. Midwater food web in McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea, Antarctica. *Mar Biol.* 96:93-106.
- Horner R, Ackley SF, Dieckmann GS, Gulliksen B, Hoshiai T, Legendre L, Melnikov IA, Reeburgh WS, Spindler M, Sullivan CW. 1992. Ecology of sea ice biota. *Polar Biol.* 12:417-427.

- Kennicutt MCII, Klein A, Montagna P, Sweet S, Wade T, Palmer T, Sericano J, Denoux G. 2010. Temporal and spatial patterns of anthropogenic disturbance at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. *Environ Res Lett.* 5:1-10.
- Klein AG, Sweet ST, Wade TL, Sericano JL, Kennicutt MC. 2012. Spatial patterns of total petroleum hydrocarbons in the terrestrial environment at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. *Antarct Sci.* 24:450-466.
- Klein AG, Kennicutt MCII, Wolff GA, Sweet ST, Bloxom T, Gielstra DA, Cleckley M. 2008. The historical development of McMurdo Station, Antarctica, an environmental perspective. *Polar Geography.* 3(4):119-144.
- La Mesa M, Eastman JT, Vacchi M. 2004. The role of notothenioid fish in the food web of the Ross Sea shelf waters: a review. *Polar Biol.* 27(6):321-338.
- LaRue MA, Rotella JJ, Garrott RA, Siniff DB, Ainley DG, Stauffer GE, Porter CC, Morin PJ. 2011. Satellite imagery can be used to detect variation in abundance of Weddell seals (*Leptonychotes weddellii*) in Erebus Bay, Antarctica. *Polar Biol.* 34(11):1727.
- LaRue MA, Salas L, Nur N, Ainley DG, Stammerjohn S, Barrington L, Stamatiou K, Pennycook J, Dozier M, Saints J, Nakamura H. 2019. Physical and ecological factors explain the distribution of Ross Sea Weddell seals during the breeding season. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser.* 612:193-208.
- Lenihan HS, Oliver JS. 1995. Anthropogenic and Natural Disturbances to Marine Benthic Communities in Antarctica. *Ecol Appl.* 5: 311-326.
- Longton RE. 1973. A classification of terrestrial vegetation near McMurdo Sound, continental Antarctica. *Can J Botany.* 51:2339-2346.
- Longton RE. 1985. Terrestrial habitats – vegetation. In: Bonner WN, Walton DWH, editors. *Key Environments: Antarctica.* London (UK): Pergamon Press. p. 73-105.
- Lugar RM. 1994. Fiscal year 1994 ambient air monitoring report for McMurdo Station, Antarctica Idaho Falls (ID): Idaho National Engineering Laboratory [Internet]. Available from https://inis.iaea.org/collection/NCLCollectionStore/_Public/26/049/26049914.pdf
- Lynch HJ and LaRue MA. 2014. First global census of the Adélie Penguin. *Auk.* 131(4):457-466.
- Lyver PO, Barron M, Barton KJ, Ainley DG, Pollard A, Gordon S, McNeill S, Ballard G, Wilson PR. 2014. Trends in the breeding population of Adélie penguins in the Ross Sea, 1981-2012: a coincidence of climate and resource extraction effects. *PLoS ONE.* 9(3): e91188.
- Mackintosh NA. 1973. Distribution of post-larval krill in the Antarctic. *Discovery Reports.* 36:95-156.
- Michaud AB, Šabacká M, Priscu JC. 2012. Cyanobacterial diversity across landscape units in a polar desert: Taylor Valley, Antarctica. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology.* 82:268-278.
- Monaghan AJ, Bromwich DH, Powers JG, Manning KW. 2005. The climate of the McMurdo, Antarctica, region as represented by one year of forecasts from the Antarctic mesoscale prediction system. *J Climate.* 18:1174-1189.
- Morgan F, Barker G, Briggs C, Price R, Keys H. 2007. Environmental domains of Antarctica, version 2.0, final report. Lincoln (New Zealand): Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd. p.89.

- Mund MJ, Miller GD. 1995. Diet of the south polar skua *Catharacta maccormicki* at Cape Bird, Ross Island, Antarctica. *Polar Biol.* 15:453-455.
- Murray JW. 2014. Ecology and paleoecology of benthic foraminifera. New York (NY): Routledge 408 p.
- NOAA. 2016. Marine mammal acoustic thresholds [Internet]. Available from: https://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/protected_species/marine_mammals/threshold_guidance.html
- Newman J, Poirot C, Roper-Gee R, Leihy RI, Chown SL. 2018. A decade of invertebrate colonization pressure on Scott Base in the Ross Sea region. *Biol Invasions.* 20(9):2623-2633.
- Nie Y, Sun L, Liu X, Emslie SD. 2015. From warm to cold: migration of Adélie penguins within Cape Bird, Ross Island. *Scientific reports,* 5:11530.
- NSF (National Science Foundation). 1988. IEE: construction of a replacement science facility. OPP93001.
- NSF. 1990. IEE: waste minimization, treatment and disposal program for McMurdo Station. OPP93012.
- NSF. 1991a. IEE: placement of steel fuel storage tanks at Marble Point. OPP93019.
- NSF. 1991b. IEE: black Island telecommunications facility upgrade. OPP93028.
- NSF. 1992a. IEE: demolition of building 56, Ecklund Biological Center, McMurdo Station. OPP93085.
- NSF. 1992b. IEE: construction of secondary containment around McMurdo Station's bulk fuel storage tanks. OPP93078.
- NSF. 1994a. IEE: management of long duration, heavy lift balloon flights in Antarctica. Unnumbered.
- NSF. 1994b. IEE: fuel storage upgrade at Marble Point, Antarctica. Unnumbered.
- NSF. 1994c. IEE: construction of a mobile runway facility to support air operations at Williams Field and the sea ice runway McMurdo Station, Antarctica. Unnumbered.
- NSF. 1995a. IEE: amendment 1: fuel storage upgrade at Marble Point, Antarctica. Unnumbered.
- NSF. 1995b. IEE: wastewater treatment plant, McMurdo Station, Antarctica. Unnumbered.
- NSF. 1995c. IEE: amendment 1: construction of a mobile runway facility to support air operations at Williams Field and the sea ice runway McMurdo Station, Antarctica. Unnumbered.
- NSF. 1995d. IEE: installation and maintenance procedures for the Antarctic automatic weather station program. PGAN9501.EAF.
- NSF. 1995e. IEE: continued use of explosives to support operations and scientific research in Antarctica. PGAN9601.
- NSF. 1996. IEE: placing a bulk used oil storage tank in the hazardous waste storage yard McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST9703.EAF.

- NSF. 1997a. IEE: improving the bulk fuel storage system at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST9801.EAF.
- NSF. 1997b. IEE: consolidation of facilities in the hazardous waste yard McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST9704.EAF.
- NSF. 1997c. IEE: adoption of standard operating procedures for the renovation or decommissioning of United States Antarctic Program facilities. PGAN9701.EAF
- NSF. 1997d. IEE: adoption of standard operating procedures for placement, management, and removal of materials cached at field locations for USAP. PGFC9801.EAF.
- NSF. 1997e. ROER: Black Island facility renovations. MCBI9800.R01.
- NSF. 1998. CEE/EIS: Final environmental impact statement for the modernization of the Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, Antarctica. SPSM.CEE.
- NSF. 1999. IEE: construction of a new science support center McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST0001.EAF.
- NSF. 2000a. IEE: helicopter fuel system upgrade. MCST0002.EAF.
- NSF. 2000b. IEE: MTRS-2 antenna installation at T-Site, McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST0107.EAF.
- NSF. 2000c. IEE: construction of a replacement telecommunications facility (T Site). MCST0108.EAF.
- NSF. 2000d. ROER: installation of sloping v antenna at T-Site. MCST0100.R03.
- NSF. 2000e. ROER: conical monopole antenna installation (T-Site). MCST0100.R04.
- NSF. 2001a. ROER: removal and reinstallation of automatic weather stations in Antarctica. MCAN0200.R03.
- NSF. 2001b. ROER: installation of satellite downlink at Black Island. MCBI0100.R01.
- NSF. 2003. ROER: gathering red fines from an area behind the ridgeline to the north east of McMurdo Station. MCST0400.R04.
- NSF. 2004a. IEE: LDB facility replacement. MCWF0500.R01.
- NSF. 2004b. IEE: construction of replacement gasoline bulk storage tanks at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST0402.IEE.
- NSF. 2004c. IEE: installation of a new modular fuel-pump building at Marble Point. MCMP0500.R01.
- NSF. 2004d. IEE: diesel engine generator set replacement for continued power generation and establishment of redundant power and water generation capacity at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST0401.IEE.
- NSF. 2004e. IEE: gathering fines adjacent to Fortress Rocks for maintenance and improvement to the former landfill and waste processing area, McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST0500.R02.

NSF. 2004f. CEE: development and implementation of surface traverse capabilities in Antarctica. SPST0502.CEE.

NSF. 2004g. IEE: continued use of explosives to support operations and scientific research in Antarctica. PGAN9601.AM1.

NSF. 2004h. CEE: project IceCube. SPST0501.FCEE.

NSF. 2005a. IEE: development and use of alternative overland traverse route system from McMurdo Station to Black Island, Antarctica. MCBI0601.IEE.

NSF. 2005b. IEE: bandwidth improvement project - installation of communications shelters, antennas, and temporary milvan. MCBI0500.R01.

NSF. 2006a. IEE: amendment no. 1: construction of replacement gasoline bulk storage tanks. MCST0402.AM1.

NSF. 2006b. IEE: adoption of contingency plan for fuel offload over sea ice at McMurdo Station. MCST0601.IEE.

NSF. 2006c. IEE: continued use of explosives to support operations and scientific research in Antarctica. PGAN9601.AM2.

NSF. 2007a. IEE: conduct long duration balloon (LDB) flights in Antarctica. PGAN0801.IEE.

NSF. 2007b. IEE: construction of five bulk fuel storage tanks. MCST0701.IEE.

NSF. 2007c. ROER: McMurdo Station helicopter fuel dispensing system upgrades. MCST0700.R04.

NSF. 2007d. IEE: Marble Point helicopter fuel dispensing system upgrades. MCMP0800.R01.

NSF. 2007e. ROER: continued gathering of fines by McMurdo Station operations. MCST0800.R01.

NSF. 2007f. IEE: construction and operation of earth station satellite receptors at McMurdo Station, Antarctica to support the NPOESS and EUMETSAT. MCST0702.IEE.

NSF. 2008a. IEE: amendment no. 1: construction of five bulk fuel storage tanks. MCST0701.IEE.AM1.

NSF. 2008b. IEE: development and implementation of surface traverse capabilities in Antarctica. SPST0502.CEE.AM1.

NSF. 2008c. IEE: construct and operate new or modified USAP field camps. PGAN0901.IEE.

NSF. 2008d. ROER: annual reporting of remotely deployed equipment. PGAN0900.R01.AM1.

NSF. 2008e. IEE: amendment no. 1: construction and operation of earth station satellite receptors at McMurdo Station, Antarctica to support the NPOESS and EUMETSAT. MCST0702.IEE.AM1.

NSF. 2009a. IEE: amendment no. 2: construction of replacement gasoline bulk storage tanks. MCST0402.AM2.

NSF. 2009b. IEE: operate a single airfield facility at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST1001.IEE.

- NSF. 2010. IEE: continued gathering of fines for McMurdo Station Operations. MCST0800 R01 AM1.
- NSF. 2011a. IEE: construction of five bulk fuel storage tanks at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST0701.IEE.AM2.
- NSF. 2011b. IEE: collection of rock fines at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST1201.IEE.
- NSF. 2011c. IEE: continuation of McMurdo Dry Valley LTER program (MCM4): increased connectivity in a polar desert resulting from climate warming. MCDV1201.IEE.
- NSF. 2012. IEE: construction of five bulk fuel storage tanks at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST0701.IEE.AM3.
- NSF. 2013a. ROER: reestablishing the Marble Point fuel line and fueling project. MCDV1400 R04.
- NSF. 2014a. IEE: relocation of the long duration balloon (LDB) facility in Antarctica. PGAN0801.IEE.AM1.
- NSF. 2014b. IEE: adoption of standard operating procedures for the renovation or decommissioning of United States Antarctic Program facilities. PGAN9701.IEE.AM1.
- NSF. 2014c. IEE: collection of rock fines (riprap) at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST1201.IEE.AM1.
- NSF. 2015a. McMurdo Station master plan 2.1, December 16, 2015. Prepared by Antarctic Support Contract, Prime contractor to NSF-OPP [Internet]. Available from https://www.usap.gov/news/documents/McMurdoMasterPlan_2.1.pdf
- NSF. 2015b. IEE: construct alpha airfield facility at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST1601.IEE.
- NSF. 2016. Notice of intent to prepare a comprehensive environmental evaluation under the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978, as amended. Federal Register. 81(164): 57,940-57,941.
- NSF. 2017. IEE: establishing Phoenix Airfield town site and closing Pegasus Airfield at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST1601.IEE.AM1.
- NSF. 2018a. IEE: construction, operation, and maintenance of a satellite communications antenna (Ross Island earth station) at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCST1801.IEE.
- NSF. 2018b. IEE: relocating Williams Field and cleaning up the current location at McMurdo Station, Antarctica. MCWF1801.IEE.
- NSF. 2018c. IEE: construction of a new science support center, McMurdo Station, Antarctica, amendment no.1, addition of information technology and communications primary operations facility and associated activities. MCST0001.EAF.AM1.
- NSF. 2019. Notice of Availability of Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities in Antarctica. Federal Register. 84(76): 16,547.
- O'Connor WP, Bromwich DH, Carrasco JF. 1994. Cyclonically forced barrier winds along the Transantarctic Mountains near Ross Island. Mon Weather Rev. 122:137-150.

- Oliver JS, Slattery PN. 1985. Effects of crustacean predators on species composition and population structure of the soft-bodied infauna from McMurdo Sound, Antarctica. *Ophelia*. 24:155-175.
- Perrin WF, Brownell RL Jr. (2002). Minke whales. In: Perrin WF, Wursig B, Thewissen JGM, editors. *Encyclopedia of marine mammals*. San Diego (CA): Academic Press. p. 750-754.
- Poage MA, Barrett JE, Virginia RA, Wall DH. 2008. The influence of soil geochemistry on nematode distribution, McMurdo Dry Valleys, Antarctica. *Arct Antarct Alp Res*. 40(1):119-128.
- Porazinska DL, Wall DH, Virginia RA. 2002. Invertebrates in ornithogenic soils on Ross Island, Antarctica. *Polar Biol*. 25:569-574.
- Robinson NJ, Williams MJM, Barrett PJ, Pyne AR. 2010. Observations of flow and ice-ocean interaction beneath the McMurdo Ice Shelf, Antarctica. *J Geophys Res*. 115:C03025.
- Ross J, Testa JW, Winter JD, Kuechle L, Reichle R. 1982. Weddell seal population dynamics and Antarctic cod movement patterns in McMurdo Sound. *Antarct J US*. 18:188-189.
- Rotella JJ, Link WA, Chambert T, Stauffer GE, Garrott RA. 2012. Evaluating the demographic buffering hypothesis with vital rates estimated for Weddell seals from 30 years of mark-recapture data. *J of Anim Ecol*. 81:162-173.
- Šabacká M, Priscu JC, Basagic HJ, Fountain AG, Wall DH, Virginia RA, Greenwood MC. 2012. Aeolian flux of biotic and abiotic material in Taylor Valley, Antarctica. *Geomorphology*. 155:102–111.
- SCAR. 2011. Code of conduct for the exploration and research of subglacial aquatic environments [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.scar.org/scar-library/search/policy/codes-of-conduct/3409-code-of-conduct-for-the-exploration-and-research-of-subglacial-aquatic-environments/>
- Siebert J, Hirsch P, Hoffmann B, Gliesche CG, Peissl K, Jendrach M. 1996. Cryptoendolithic microorganisms from Antarctic sandstone of Linnaeus Terrace (Asgard Range): diversity, properties and interactions. *Biodivers Conserv*. 5:1337-1363.
- Sinclair BJ. 2001. On the distribution of terrestrial invertebrates at Cape Bird, Ross Island, Antarctica. *Polar Biol*. 24:394-400.
- Skotnicki ML, Ninham JA, Selkirk PM. 1999. Genetic diversity and dispersal of the moss *Sarconeurum glaciale* on Ross Island, East Antarctica. *Mol Ecol*. 8:753-762.
- Smith Jr WO, Ainley DG, Arrigo KR, Dinniman MS. 2014. The oceanography and ecology of the Ross Sea. *Annu Rev Mar Sci*. 6:469-487.
- Somme L. 1985. Terrestrial habitats – invertebrates. In: Bonner WN, Walton DWH, editors. *Key environments: Antarctica*. London (United Kingdom): Pergamon Press. p. 106-117.
- Stirling I, Kooyman GL. 1971. The crabeater seal (*Lobodon carcinophagus*) in McMurdo Sound, Antarctica, and the origin of mummified seals. *J Mammal*. 52(1):175-180.
- Stewart BS, Leatherwood S. 1985. Minke whale *Balaenoptera acutorostrata*. In: Ridgway SH, Harrison RJ, editors. *Handbook of marine mammals*, Vol. 3. London (UK): Academic Press. p. 91-136.
- Sterling I. 1969. Ecology of the Weddell seal in McMurdo Sound, Antarctica. *Ecology*. 50:573-586.

- Terauds, A and Lee JR. 2016. Antarctic biogeography revisited: updating the Antarctic Conservation Biogeographic Regions, diversity and distributions, 1–5, DOI:10.4225/15/5729930925224.
- Thrush S, Dayton P, Cattaneo-Vietti R, Chiantore M, Cummings V, Andrew N, Hawes I, Kim S, Kvitek R, Schwarz AM. 2006. Broad-scale factors influencing the biodiversity of coastal benthic communities of the Ross Sea. *Deep-Sea Res Part II*. 53(8-10):959-971.
- Waterhouse EJ. 2001. Ross Sea Region 2001: a state of the environment report for the Ross Sea region of Antarctica. Christchurch (New Zealand): New Zealand Antarctic Institute p. 1-246.
- Wei ST, Lacap-Bugler DC, Lau MC, Caruso T, Rao S, de los Rios A, Archer SK, Chiu JM, Higgins C, Van Nostrand JD, Zhou J. 2016. Taxonomic and functional diversity of soil and hypolithic microbial communities in Miers Valley, McMurdo Dry Valleys, Antarctica. *Front Microbiol*. 7:1642.
- White MG. 1984. Marine benthos. In: Laws RM, editor. *Antarctic ecology*. London (United Kingdom): Academic Press. p. 850.
- Zhang L, Jungblut AD, Hawes I, Andersen DT, Sumner DY, Mackey TJ. 2015. Cyanobacterial diversity in benthic mats of the McMurdo Dry Valley lakes, Antarctica. *Polar Biol*. 38(8):1097-1110.

This page intentionally left blank.

14. Appendices

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A: Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Units of Measure

Units of Measure			
>	greater than	BITF	Black Island Telecommunications Facility
≥	greater than or equal to	BOD	biochemical oxygen demand
<	less than	BRP	Blue Ribbon Panel
≤	less than or equal to	CCAMLR	Commission for the Conservation of Marine Living Resources
%	percent	CEE	Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation
#	number	CEP	Committee for Environmental Protection
°C	degrees Celsius	C.F.R.	Code of Federal Regulations
°F	degrees Fahrenheit	CHP	combined heat power
cm	centimeter(s)	CO ₂	carbon dioxide
dB	decibel	CO _{2-e}	carbon dioxide equivalent(s)
ft	foot (feet)	COMNAP	Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs
ft ²	square foot (feet)	CRREL	Cold Regions Research and Engineering Lab
gal	gallon(s)	CTAM	Central Trans-Antarctic Mountains
gal/min	gallon(s) per minute	DVDP	Dry Valley Drilling Project
hr	hour	e.g.	for example
in	inch(es)	EIA	environmental impact assessment
kg	kilogram(s)	EUMETSAT	European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites
km	kilometer(s)	et al.	and others
km/hr	kilometers per hour	GERG	Geochemical and Environmental Research Group
km ²	square kilometer(s)	HF	high frequency
kW	kilowatt(s)	HSM	Historic Site and Monument
L	liter(s)	i.e.	that is
L _i	ith sound pressure level	IBA	Important Bird Area
L/min	liters per minute	IEE	Initial Environmental Evaluation
lb	pound(s)	ICG	Intersessional Contact Group
m	meter(s)	IGY	International Geophysical Year
m ²	square meter(s)	IT&C	Information Technology and Communications
m ³	cubic meter(s)	JPSS	Joint Polar Satellite System
mi	mile(s)	LDB	long-duration balloon
mi ²	square mile(s)	LTER	Long-Term Ecological Research
min	minute	MDV	McMurdo Dry Valleys
mph	miles per hour	MEC	Mechanical Equipment Center
n	number of sound sources	MPA	Marine Protected Area
P	Total sound pressure level	NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
yd ³	cubic yard(s)	NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
		NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
		NSC	National Security Council
		NSF	National Science Foundation
		OPP	Office of Polar Programs
		PEMB	pre-engineered metal buildings
General Abbreviations and Acronyms			
ACA	Antarctic Conservation Act		
AGAP	Antarctica Gamburstev Province		
AGE	aerospace ground equipment		
AIMS	Antarctic Infrastructure Modernization for Science		
ANDRILL	ANtArctic geological DRILLing Programme		
ANZ	Antarctica New Zealand		
ASC	Antarctic Support Contract		
ASMA	Antarctic Specially Managed Area		
ASPA	Antarctic Specially Protected Area		
ATCM	Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting		
ATS	Antarctic Treaty Secretariat		
ATV	all-terrain vehicle(s)		

POF	primary operations facility
Protocol	The Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty
RDE	remotely deployed equipment
RIES	Ross Island Earth Station
ROER	Record of Environmental Review
SATCOM	satellite communications
SCAR	Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research
SSC	Science Support Center
TPH	total petroleum hydrocarbons
T-Site	HF Transmit Site
TSS	total suspended solids
USAP	United States Antarctic Program
U.S.C.	United States Code
VEOC	Vehicle Equipment Operations Center
VHF	very high frequency
VMF	Vehicle Maintenance Facility
WAIS	Western Antarctic Ice Sheet
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant

Appendix B: Supplemental Information

This page intentionally left blank.

**Table B-1. EIAs for USAP Activities Representative of Programmatic Activities
and Facility Construction, General Operations, and Selected Long-Term Research Efforts**

Title	Year Prepared	Location(s)¹	Conclusion
Collection of Rock Fines at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	2011 2014 (Amendment)	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Construction and Operation of a Super Dual Auroral Radar Network (SuperDARN) Antenna Array at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	2009	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Construction of Five Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	2007 2008 (Amendment) 2009 (Amendment) 2012 (Amendment)	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Diesel Engine Generator Set Replacement for Continued Power Generation and Establishment of Redundant Power and Water Generation Capability at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	2004	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Construction of Replacement Gasoline Bulk Storage Tanks at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	2004	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
T-Site: Construction of a Replacement Telecommunications Facility	2000	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Maintenance of Wastewater Outfall	1998	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Less than minor or transitory
Improving the Bulk Fuel Storage System at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	1997	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Continuation of Food Waste Management at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	1996	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Wastewater Treatment Plant, McMurdo Station, Antarctica	1995	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Placement of a McMurdo Tracking and Data Relay Satellite (TDRS) Relay System (MTRS) in Antarctica	1995	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Installation of Reverse Osmosis Water Purification Unit at McMurdo Station	1992	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Proposed Replacement, Operation, and Decommissioning of Ice Wharves at McMurdo Station	1992	McMurdo Station facilities zone	Minor or transitory
Adoption of Contingency Plan for Fuel Offload Over Sea Ice at McMurdo Station	2006	McMurdo Station (McMurdo Sound)	Minor or transitory
Construct Alpha Airfield Facility at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	2015	McMurdo Station Area (Ross Ice Shelf)	Minor or transitory

Table B-1. EIAs for USAP Activities Representative of Programmatic Activities and Facility Construction, General Operations, and Selected Long-Term Research Efforts

Title	Year Prepared	Location(s) ¹	Conclusion
Installation and Use of Waste Water Outfalls at the Long Duration Balloon (LDB) Facility	2014	McMurdo Station Area (Ross Ice Shelf)	Less than minor or transitory
Operate a Single Airfield Facility at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	2009 2014 (Amendment)	McMurdo Station Area (Ross Ice Shelf)	Minor or transitory
Installation and Operation of an Infrasonic Array at Windless Bight near McMurdo Station, Antarctica	2000	McMurdo Station Area (Ross Ice Shelf)	Minor or transitory
Continuation of McMurdo Dry Valley LTER Program (MCM4): Increased Connectivity in a Polar Desert Resulting from Climate Warming	2011	Garwood, Miers, Taylor, and Wright Valley regions of the MDV	Minor or transitory
Conduct Typical Marine-based Research in Antarctica	2010	Waters surrounding Antarctica (south of 60°S)	Minor or transitory
Conduct Rock, Soil, Ice, or Sediment Drilling, Coring, and Select Excavation Activities to Support USAP Scientific Research and Logistical Operations	2009	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory
Construct and Operate New or Modified USAP Field Camps	2008	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory
Annual Reporting of Remotely Deployed Equipment (RDE)	2008	Continent-wide	Less than minor or transitory
Conduct Long Duration Balloon (LDB) Flights in Antarctica	2007 2014 (Amendment)	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory
Development and Implementation of Surface Traverse Capabilities in Antarctica	2004 2008 (Addendum)	Continent-wide	More than minor or transitory
Continued Use of Assisted Take Off (ATO) Units in Antarctica	2001	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory
Removal and Reinstallation of Automatic Weather Stations in Antarctica	2001	Continent-wide	Less than minor or transitory
Adoption of Standard Operating procedures for Placement, Management, and Removal of Materials Cached at Field Locations for the USAP	1997	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory
Adoption of Standard Operating Procedures for the Renovation or Decommissioning of United States Antarctic Program Facilities	1997 2014 (Amendment)	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory
Continued Use of Explosives to Support Operations and Scientific Research in Antarctica	1995 2004 (Amendment) 2006 (Amendment)	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory
Management of Unreliable and Unsafe Explosives in Antarctica	1995	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory

Table B-1. EIAs for USAP Activities Representative of Programmatic Activities and Facility Construction, General Operations, and Selected Long-Term Research Efforts

Title	Year Prepared	Location(s) ¹	Conclusion
Installation and Maintenance Procedures for the Antarctic Automatic Weather Station Program	1995	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory
Development of Blue-Ice and Compacted-Snow Runways in Support of The United States Antarctic Program	1993	Continent-wide	Minor or transitory
Subglacial Antarctic Lakes Scientific Access (SALSA): Integrated study of carbon cycling in hydrologically active subglacial environments in West Antarctica	2018	Deep Field	Minor or transitory
Whillans Ice Stream Subglacial Access Research Drilling (WISSARD) Project	2012	Deep Field	Minor or transitory
Recovery of a Deep Ice Core from the West Antarctic Ice Sheet Ice Flow Divide (WAIS Divide)	2005 2007 (Amendment) 2010 (Amendment) 2011 (Amendment) 2014 (Amendment)	Deep Field	Minor or transitory
Project IceCube Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation	2004	South Pole Station	More than minor or transitory
Final Environmental Impact Statement for Modernization of the Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, Antarctica	1998	South Pole Station	More than minor or transitory
Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the United States Antarctic Program	1991	Continent-wide	More than minor or transitory
Final Environmental Impact Statement for the United States Antarctic Program	1980	Continent-wide	More than minor or transitory

¹ Generally, activities evaluated in programmatic EIAs are subject to additional environmental review if the proposed activity would vary substantially from that evaluated in the EIA and/or if the activity is proposed to occur in an ASMA, ASPA, or other area with specialized management requirements.

Table B-2. Fauna Occurring in the Vicinity of McMurdo Station

Phylum	Type	Common Name (Scientific Name)	
Annelida	Polychaetes, bristle worms, featherduster worms, leeches	15 species	
Arthropoda	Amphipods, isopods, shrimp, ostracods, krill, sea spiders	50 species	
Brachiopoda	Brachiopods	Brachiopod (<i>Liothyrella uva antarctica</i>)	
Chordata	Fish	Emerald notothen or Emerald rockcod (<i>Trematomus bernacchii</i>)	
		Eelpout (<i>Lycodichthys dearborni</i>)	
		Deepwater notothen or Scaly rockcod (<i>Trematomus loennbergii</i>)	
		DeVries's snailfish (<i>Paraliparis devriesi</i>)	
		Eaton's skate (<i>Bathyraja eatonii</i>)	
		Naked dragonfish (<i>Gymnodraco acuticeps</i>)	
		Bald notothen or Bald rockcod (<i>Pagothenia borchgrevinki</i>)	
		Striped notothen, Striped rockcod, or Green rockcod (<i>Trematomus hansonii</i>)	
		Sharp-spined notothen (<i>Trematomus pennellii</i>)	
		Antarctic silverfish (<i>Pleuragramma antarcticum</i>)	
		Antarctic toothfish (<i>Dissostichus mawsoni</i>)	
		Penguins	Emperor penguin (<i>Aptenodytes forsteri</i>)
		Adélie penguin (<i>Pygoscelis adeliae</i>)	
	Seabirds	Antarctic petrel (<i>Thalassoica antarctica</i>)	
		Snow petrel (<i>Pagodroma nivea</i>)	
		South polar skua (<i>Stercorarius maccormicki</i>)	
		Southern giant petrel (<i>Macronectes giganteus</i>)	
		Southern fulmar (<i>Fulmaris glacialisoides</i>)	
	Seals	Crabeater seal (<i>Lobodon carcinophaga</i>)	
		Leopard seal (<i>Hydrurga leptonyx</i>)	
		Weddell seal (<i>Leptonychotes weddellii</i>)	
	Whales	Antarctic minke whale (<i>Balaenoptera bonaerensis</i>)	
Killer whale or Orca whale (<i>Orcinus orca</i>)			
Cnidaria	Sea anemones, soft coral, hydroids, jellyfish	26 species	
Ctenophora	Comb jellies, ctenophores	3 species	
Echinodermata	Seastars, urchins, brittle stars, sea cucumbers, crinoids	32 species	
Ectoprocta	Bryozoans	8 species	
Mollusca	Gastropods, bivalves, nudibranchs, octopus	22 species	
Nemertea	Proboscis worms	Proboscis worm (<i>Parborlasia corrugatus</i>)	
Porifera	Sponges	33 species	

Sources: *Underwater Field Guide to Ross Island & McMurdo Sound, Antarctica* (Brueggeman 1998); *The Marine Ecology of Birds in the Ross Sea, Antarctica* (Ainley et al. 1984)

Table B-3a. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Power-Generation Sources at McMurdo Station (Existing Conditions)

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	13,745
	Nitrogen oxides	461,963
	Carbon monoxide	85,737
	Particulate matter	10,720
	Carbon dioxide	9,672,000
	Aldehydes	3318
	Total organic carbon	17,062
Volatile Organic Compounds	Benzene	44
	Xylenes	14
	Toluene	19
	Propylene	122
	Formaldehyde	56
Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds	Acetaldehyde	36
	Naphthalene	4.0
	Anthracene	0.09
	Benz(a)anthracene	0.08
	Chrysene	0.02
	Fluoranthene	0.36
	Fluorene	1.4
	Phenanthrene	1.4
	Pyrene	0.23

¹ Annual air emissions from power generation sources are based on 3,246,400 L (857,608 gal) of fuel used for power generation at McMurdo Station.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuel.

Table B-3b. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Heating- and Water-Production Sources at McMurdo Station (Existing Conditions)

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹	Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants			Volatile Organic Compounds	Benzene	0.05
	Sulfur oxides ²	2701		Ethylbenzene	0.01
	Nitrogen oxides	4689		Xylenes	0.03
	Carbon monoxide	1172		Toluene	1.45
	Particulate matter	469		1,1,1-trichloroethane	0.06
	Carbon dioxide	5,192,075		Formaldehyde	7.74
	Total organic carbon	130	Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds	Naphthalene	0.2649
	Non-methane total organic carbon	80		Acenaphthene	0.0049
	Methane	51		Acenaphthylene	0.0001
	Nitrous oxide	26		Anthracene	0.0003
	Polycyclic organic matter	0.8		Benz(a)anthracene	0.0009
Metals	Arsenic	0.12		Benzo(b,k)fluoranthene	0.0003
	Antimony	0.00		Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	0.0005
	Beryllium	0.07		Chrysene	0.0006
	Cadmium	0.31		Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	0.0004
	Chromium	1.64		Dibutylphthalate	0.0000
	Cobalt	0.00		Fluoranthene	0.001
	Mercury	0.09		Fluorene	0.001
	Manganese	0.40		Indo(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.0005
	Nickel	0.51	Octochloro-dibenzo-dioxin	<0.00001	
	Lead	0.25	Phenanthrene	0.0025	
		Phenol	0.0000		
		Pyrene	0.0010		

¹ Annual air emissions from heating and water production sources are based on 1,955,000 L (516,456 gal) of fuel used for heating and water production at McMurdo Station.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuels.

Table B-3c. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Fuel-Powered Equipment at McMurdo Station and Outlying Facilities (Existing Conditions)

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	5441
	Nitrogen oxides	65,681
	Carbon monoxide	176,950
	Exhaust hydrocarbons	10,638
	Particulate matter	5303
	Carbon dioxide	18,398
	Aldehydes	1312
	Total organic carbon	0.7
	Methane	0.29
	Nitrous oxide	1.3

¹ 1,735,310 L (458,420 gal) of fuel used in equipment, including diesel-powered, gasoline-powered, and propane-powered equipment.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuels.

Table B-3d. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Aircraft (Existing Conditions)

Type of Aircraft	Projected Flight Hours (per year)	Fuel Combustion By-products from Normal Operations (kg)				
		Carbon Monoxide	Exhaust Hydrocarbons	Nitrogen Oxides	Particulates	Sulfur Oxides
LC-130/ C-130	2,613	43,040	18,335	69,449	18,893	8,751
C-17	250	4,282	355	120,105	5,806	3,168
B-757	15	218	18	7,146	348	190
A-319	50	856	71	24,021	1,161	634
Twin Otter/Basler	1,632	8,487	3,884	4,209	8,314	578
Helicopters (all)	1,500	8,660	2,775	8,500	1,250	1,200
Totals		65,543	25,438	233,430	35,772	14,521

**Table B-4a. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Power-Generation Sources at McMurdo Station
(Maximum during Modernization Activity)**

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	15,747
	Nitrogen oxides	529,275
	Carbon monoxide	98,230
	Particulate matter	12,282
	Carbon dioxide	11,081,298
	Aldehydes	3,801
	Total organic carbon	19,549
Volatile Organic Compounds	Benzene	51
	Xylenes	15
	Toluene	22
	Propylene	140
	Formaldehyde	64
Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds	Acetaldehyde	42
	Naphthalene	4.6
	Anthracene	0.10
	Benz(a)anthracene	0.09
	Chrysene	0.02
	Fluoranthene	0.41
	Fluorene	1.6
	Phenanthrene	1.6
	Pyrene	0.26

¹ Annual air emissions from power generation sources are based on 3,719,430 L (982,569 gal) of fuel used for power generation at McMurdo Station.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuel.

**Table B-4b. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Heating- and Water-Production Sources at McMurdo Station
(Maximum during Modernization Activity)**

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹	Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	3426	Volatile Organic Compounds	Benzene	0.06
	Nitrogen oxides	5948		Ethylbenzene	0.02
	Carbon monoxide	1487		Xylenes	0.03
	Particulate matter	595		Toluene	1.84
	Carbon dioxide	6,585,357		1,1,1-trichloroethane	0.07
	Total organic carbon	165		Formaldehyde	9.81
	Non-methane total organic carbon	101		Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds	Naphthalene
	Methane	64	Acenaphthene		0.0063
	Nitrous oxide	33	Acenaphthylene		0.0001
	Polycyclic organic matter	1.0	Anthracene		0.0004
	Metals	Arsenic	0.15		Benz(a)anthracene
Antimony		0.00	Benzo(b,k)fluoranthene		0.0004
Beryllium		0.09	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene		0.0007
Cadmium		0.40	Chrysene		0.0007
Chromium		2.08	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene		0.0005
Cobalt		0.00	Dibutylphthalate		0.0000
Mercury		0.11	Fluoranthene		0.0014
Manganese		0.51	Fluorene		0.0013
Nickel		0.65	Indo(1,2,3-cd)pyrene		0.0006
Lead		0.32	Octochloro-dibenzo-dioxin		<0.0001
			Phenanthrene	0.0031	
		Phenol	0.0000		
		Pyrene	0.0013		

¹ Annual air emissions from heating and water production sources are based on 2,479,620 L (655,046 gal) of fuel used for heating and water production at McMurdo Station.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuels.

Table B-4c. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Fuel-Powered Equipment at McMurdo Station and Outlying Facilities (Maximum during Modernization Activity)

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	6112
	Nitrogen oxides	73,620
	Carbon monoxide	180,261
	Exhaust hydrocarbons	11,365
	Particulate matter	5953
	Carbon dioxide	18,398
	Aldehydes	1458
	Total organic carbon	0.7
	Methane	0.29
	Nitrous oxide	1.3

¹ 1,915,090 L (505,913 gal) of fuel used in equipment, including diesel-powered, gasoline-powered, and propane-powered equipment.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuels.

Table B-4d. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Aircraft (Maximum during Modernization Activity)

Type of Aircraft	Projected Flight Hours (per year)	Fuel Combustion By-products from Normal Operations (kg)				
		Carbon Monoxide	Exhaust Hydrocarbons	Nitrogen Oxides	Particulates	Sulfur Oxides
LC-130/ C-130	2,613	43,040	18,335	69,449	18,893	8,751
C-17	250	4,282	355	120,105	5,806	3,168
B-757	15	218	18	7,146	348	190
A-319	50	856	71	24,021	1,161	634
Twin Otter/Basler	1,632	8,487	3,884	4,209	8,314	578
Helicopters (all)	1,500	8,660	2,775	8,500	1,250	1,200
Totals		65,543	25,438	233,430	35,772	14,521

**Table B-5a. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Power-Generation Sources at McMurdo Station
(Average during Modernization Activity)**

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	12,426
	Nitrogen oxides	417,655
	Carbon monoxide	77,514
	Particulate matter	9691
	Carbon dioxide	8,744,347
	Aldehydes	2999
	Total organic carbon	15,426
Volatile Organic Compounds	Benzene	40
	Xylenes	12
	Toluene	18
	Propylene	111
	Formaldehyde	51
Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds	Acetaldehyde	33
	Naphthalene	3.6
	Anthracene	0.08
	Benz(a)anthracene	0.07
	Chrysene	0.02
	Fluoranthene	0.33
	Fluorene	1.3
	Phenanthrene	1.3
	Pyrene	0.20

¹ Annual air emissions from power generation sources are based on 2,935,034 L (775,353 gal) of fuel used for power generation at McMurdo Station.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuel.

**Table B-5b. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Heating- and Water-Production Sources at McMurdo Station
(Average during Modernization Activity)**

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹	Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	2703	Volatile Organic Compounds	Benzene	0.05
	Nitrogen oxides	4693		Ethylbenzene	0.01
	Carbon monoxide	1173		Xylenes	0.03
	Particulate matter	469		Toluene	1.45
	Carbon dioxide	5,196,560		1,1,1-trichloroethane	0.06
	Total organic carbon	130		Formaldehyde	7.74
	Non-methane total organic carbon	80		Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds	Naphthalene
	Methane	51	Acenaphthene		0.0050
	Nitrous oxide	26	Acenaphthylene		0.0001
	Polycyclic organic matter	0.8	Anthracene		0.0003
	Metals	Arsenic	0.12		Benz(a)anthracene
Antimony		0.00	Benzo(b,k)fluoranthene		0.0003
Beryllium		0.07	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene		0.0005
Cadmium		0.31	Chrysene		0.0006
Chromium		1.64	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene		0.0004
Cobalt		0.00	Dibutylphthalate		0.0000
Mercury		0.09	Fluoranthene		0.0011
Manganese		0.40	Fluorene		0.0010
Nickel		0.51	Indo(1,2,3-cd)pyrene		0.0005
Lead		0.25	Octochloro-dibenzo-dioxin		0.000001
			Phenanthrene	0.0025	
		Phenol	0.0000		
		Pyrene	0.0010		

¹ Annual air emissions from heating and water production sources are based on 1,956,689 L (516,902 gal) of fuel used for heating and water production at McMurdo Station.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuels.

Table B-5c. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Fuel-Powered Equipment at McMurdo Station and Outlying Facilities (Average during Modernization Activity)

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	5663
	Nitrogen oxides	68,304
	Carbon monoxide	178,044
	Exhaust hydrocarbons	10,878
	Particulate matter	5518
	Carbon dioxide	18,398
	Aldehydes	1360
	Total organic carbon	0.7
	Methane	0.29
	Nitrous oxide	1.3

¹ 1,896,404 L (500,976 gal) of fuel used in equipment including diesel-powered, gasoline-powered, and propane-powered equipment.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuels.

Table B-5d. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Aircraft (Average during Modernization Activity)

Type of Aircraft	Projected Flight Hours (per year)	Fuel Combustion By-products from Normal Operations (kg)				
		Carbon Monoxide	Exhaust Hydrocarbons	Nitrogen Oxides	Particulates	Sulfur Oxides
LC-130/ C-130	2,613	43,040	18,335	69,449	18,893	8,751
C-17	250	4,282	355	120,105	5,806	3,168
B-757	15	218	18	7,146	348	190
A-319	50	856	71	24,021	1,161	634
Twin Otter/Basler	1,632	8,487	3,884	4,209	8,314	578
Helicopters (all)	1,500	8,660	2,775	8,500	1,250	1,200
Totals		65,543	25,438	233,430	35,772	14,521

Table B-6a. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Power-Generation Sources at McMurdo Station (Post-Modernization)

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	8721
	Nitrogen oxides	293,103
	Carbon monoxide	54,398
	Particulate matter	6801
	Carbon dioxide	6,136,628
	Aldehydes	2105
	Total organic carbon	10,826
Volatile Organic Compounds	Benzene	28
	Xylenes	9
	Toluene	12
	Propylene	78
	Formaldehyde	35
Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds	Acetaldehyde	23
	Naphthalene	2.6
	Anthracene	0.06
	Benz(a)anthracene	0.05
	Chrysene	0.01
	Fluoranthene	0.23
	Fluorene	0.09
	Phenanthrene	0.09
	Pyrene	0.14

¹ Annual air emissions from power generation sources are based on 2,059,755 L (544,129 gal) of fuel used for power generation at McMurdo Station.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuel.

Table B-6b. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Heating- and Water-Production Sources at McMurdo Station (Post-Modernization)

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	1,897
	Nitrogen oxides	3,294
	Carbon monoxide	823
	Particulate matter	329
	Carbon dioxide	3,646,855
	Total organic carbon	92
	Non-methane total organic carbon	56
	Methane	36
	Nitrous oxide	18
	Polycyclic organic matter	0.5
Metals	Arsenic	0.08
	Antimony	0.000
	Beryllium	0.05
	Cadmium	0.22
	Chromium	1.15
	Cobalt	0.00
	Mercury	0.06
	Manganese	0.28
	Nickel	0.36
	Lead	0.18

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Volatile Organic Compounds	Benzene	0.03
	Ethylbenzene	0.01
	Xylenes	0.02
	Toluene	1.02
	1,1,1-trichloroethane	0.04
	Formaldehyde	5.43
	Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds	Naphthalene
Acenaphthene		0.0035
Acenaphthylene		0.0000
Anthracene		0.0002
Benz(a)anthracene		0.0007
Benzo(b,k)fluoranthene		0.0002
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene		0.0004
Chrysene		0.0004
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene		0.0003
Dibutylphthalate		0.0000
Fluoranthene		0.0008
Fluorene		0.0007
Indo(1,2,3-cd)pyrene		0.0004
Octochloro-dibenzo-dioxin		<0.0001
Phenanthrene		0.0017
Phenol		0.0000
Pyrene		0.0007

¹ Annual air emissions from heating and water production sources are based on 1,373,170 L (362,753 gal) of fuel used for heating and water production at McMurdo Station.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuels.

Table B-6c. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Fuel-Powered Equipment at McMurdo Station and Outlying Facilities (Post-Modernization)

Category	Substance	Amount (kg) ¹
Characteristic Air Pollutants	Sulfur oxides ²	4,663
	Nitrogen oxides	56,469
	Carbon monoxide	173,107
	Exhaust hydrocarbons	9,794
	Particulate matter	4,550
	Carbon dioxide	18,398
	Aldehydes	1,142
	Total organic carbon	0.7
	Methane	0.29
	Nitrous oxide	1.3

¹ 1,526,490 L (403,255 gal) of fuel used in equipment including diesel-powered, gasoline-powered, and propane-powered equipment.

² Sulfur content of fuel may vary each year by fuel type ($\leq 0.2\%$); emission factors and related estimates may not account for the use of lower sulfur fuels.

Table B-6d. Projected Annual Air Emissions from Aircraft (Post-Modernization)

Type of Aircraft	Projected Flight Hours (per year)	Fuel Combustion By-products from Normal Operations (kg)				
		Carbon Monoxide	Exhaust Hydrocarbons	Nitrogen Oxides	Particulates	Sulfur Oxides
LC-130/ C-130	2,613	43,040	18,335	69,449	18,893	8,751
C-17	250	4,282	355	120,105	5,806	3,168
B-757	15	218	18	7,146	348	190
A-319	50	856	71	24,021	1,161	634
Twin Otter/Basler	1,632	8,487	3,884	4,209	8,314	578
Helicopters (all)	1,500	8,660	2,775	8,500	1,250	1,200
Totals		65,543	25,438	233,430	35,772	14,521

Appendix C: Comments Solicited and Responses to Comments

Notice of Intent to prepare a Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation of the Continuation of USAP Activities in Antarctica

A Notice of Intent was published in the *Federal Register* on August 24, 2016 to announce the beginning of the scoping process to solicit public comments and identify issues to be analyzed in the CEE (NSF 2016). Public comments were accepted until October 15, 2016. One comment was received via email from a member of the public during the scoping period; issues raised in this comment were outside the scope of the CEE.

Notice of Availability of the Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) to be prepared by the United States Antarctic Program

A Notice of Availability of the Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for Continuation of the United States Antarctic Program was published in the *Federal Register* on April 19, 2019 (NSF 2019). Public comments were accepted until July 11, 2019. One comment was received via email from a member of the public during the comment period; issues raised in this comment were outside the scope of the CEE.

Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities: Committee for Environmental Protection Comments

In accordance with Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, the United States notified Parties (through ATCM Circular 5/2019, dated February 19, 2019) of the availability of the draft CEE for Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities. An Intersessional Contact Group (ICG) was established to review the draft CEE. ICG correspondence was available to CEP Members and Observers via the CEP Discussion Forum, which also provided the Non-Technical Summary, translated into the official Treaty languages. The Republic of Korea convened the ICG and compiled the comments as ATCM XLII WP15, below:



**XLII Antarctic Treaty
Consultative Meeting**
Prague • Czech Republic • 2019

WP 15

ENG

Agenda Item:	CEP 8a
Presented by:	Korea (ROK)
Original:	English
Submitted:	14/5/2019

**Report of the intersessional open-ended
contact group established to consider the
draft CEE for the “Continuation and
Modernization of McMurdo Station Area
Activities”**

Report of the intersessional open-ended contact group established to consider the draft CEE for the “Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities”

Working Paper submitted by the Republic of Korea

Summary

An intersessional open-ended contact group (ICG) was established in accordance with the *Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs* to consider United States’ draft comprehensive environmental evaluation (CEE) for “Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities”. On the basis of comments provided by participants, the ICG advises the CEP that the draft CEE is generally clear, well structured, and well presented, but noted a few inconsistencies between sections of the draft CEE. Participants agreed that the draft CEE generally and broadly conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection, however, some participants recommended reconsideration of the scope of the proposed activity and expressed the view that additional information would be required on a number of aspects for the final CEE to fully conform to the requirements of Article 3 of the Protocol. The draft CEE identifies the majority of the impacts that are likely to be associated with the activity, but ICG participants have suggested including some additional potential impacts including cumulative impacts and on mitigation measures. The ICG further advises that the conclusion that impacts of some activities within the project will have a more than minor or transitory impact is broadly supported by the information contained within the draft CEE. The ICG suggests that if the United States decides to proceed with the proposed activity, there are some aspects for which the inclusion of additional information could strengthen the final CEE.

1. Background

On 14 February 2019 the United States notified the CEP Chair of the availability of the draft CEE for “Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities”. The draft CEE has been prepared by National Science Foundation (NSF). The full document can be downloaded from the CEP Workspace on the website of the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty⁴ as described in CEP Circular 4/CEP XXII. The contact point for the draft CEE is Dr. Polly A. Penhale (CEE.comments@nsf.gov).

In accordance with the *Procedures for intersessional consideration of Draft CEEs* (Appendix 3 to the CEP XX Final Report) the CEP Chair issued:

- CEP Circular 4/CEP XXII (14 February 2019), which;
 - advised contact points of the availability of the draft CEE;
 - advised of the need to establish an open-ended intersessional contact group (ICG) to review the draft CEE;
 - proposed that Dr. Ji Hee Kim (Republic of Korea) convene the ICG;
 - proposed terms of reference for the ICG; and
 - invited CEP members to comment on the proposed convener and/or terms of reference.
- CEP Circular 5/CEP XXII (04 March 2019), which noted that no comments had been received on the proposed convener or terms of reference.

⁴ www.ats.aq/e/cep_workspace/cep_draftcee.htm

Terms of reference

The ICG addressed the following four generic terms of reference, drawn from the *Procedures for intersessional consideration of draft CEEs* as adopted by CEP XX⁵:

- the extent to which the CEE conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I of the Environmental Protocol;
- whether the CEE: i) has identified all the environmental impacts of the proposed activity; and ii) suggests appropriate methods of mitigating (reducing or avoiding) those impacts;
- whether the conclusions of the draft CEE are adequately supported by the information contained within the document; and
- the clarity, format and presentation of the draft CEE.

The *Revised Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (Annex of Resolution 1, 2016), provide relevant guidance to reviewers as well as authors on the presentation of CEEs.

Method of operation

All ICG correspondence has been made available to CEP members and observers via the CEP Discussion Forum. The English language version of the full draft CEE was posted on the Forum, together with four official language versions of the Non-Technical Summary and the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (Resolution 1, 2016).

ICG participants were reminded by the CEP Chair and the ICG convener of the CEP's agreement that the Procedures for intersessional consideration of draft CEEs do not detract from the right of any Party to the Protocol to raise an issue on a draft CEE at meetings of the CEP or at an Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM).

The ICG commenced with an initial comment period from 04 March to 15 April 2019. The convener circulated a draft ICG report for comment on 22 April. In this Working Paper the final comments submitted by CEP members and Observers have been addressed to the convener's best ability.

2. Summary of comments received from ICG participants

Comments were submitted to the ICG by nine CEP Members (Australia, China, France, Germany, Italy, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Romania, and the United Kingdom) and one Observer (ASOC).

The following sections summarizes overarching comments and observations, as well as matters of principles, raised by one or more ICG members during the review period.

The detailed comments submitted by ICG members using tabular comment sheet provide important information and should be considered of interest to the proponent in their effort to finalize the CEE. No effort has been made to compile these comments into a single document on the following basis:

- Substantive (non-technical) issues that members have raised have been included in the summary of the Working Paper;
- Compiling similar comments, may lead to loss of nuances; and
- Proponents are more likely to find use in the individual comments rather than the compiled comments in their further work.

The complete set of comments from ICG participants are available in full from the CEP Discussion Forum.

⁵ Appendix 3 CEP XX Report: Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs

1. ToR 1: The extent to which the CEE conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I of the Environmental Protocol

ICG participants considered that the draft CEE generally and broadly conforms to the formal requirements of Article 3 of Annex I of the Environmental Protocol. However, some participants recommended reconsidering the scope of the proposed activity and expressed the view that additional information would be required on a number of aspects for the final CEE to fully conform to the requirements of Article 3 of the Protocol.

Participants commented favourably on the proposal to continue the long-standing and significant USAP research activities in the McMurdo station area, and the anticipated scientific operation, safety and environmental benefits of the proposed activity. Nevertheless, the following points provide a useful summary of the participants' suggestions regarding matters that could be addressed in a final CEE:

- Further defined and expanded statement of the scope of the CEE and interdependencies between the Antarctic Infrastructure Modernization for Science (AIMS) projects and McMurdo Master Plan projects;
- Detailed information on the proposed activity and description of the initial environmental reference state and possible alternatives;
- Further information on the proposed construction projects including layout, design, materials, prefabricated elements, and schedule for the AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan projects;
- Further details regarding the predicted direct, indirect and cumulative environmental impacts;
- Consideration of the effects of the proposed activity on not only the scientific operations but also other existing uses and values;
- Summaries of key provisions of separate or complementary referred USAP procedures and EIAs with accessible links as methods and source of data used in the draft CEE;
- The present uncertainties in the designs and locations of McMurdo Master Plan projects.

Participants did identify some aspects for which additional information or clarification could usefully be provided in the final CEE to enhance its robustness, if the proponent decides to proceed with the proposed activity. A summary of these comments are provided in the following, as per the requirement of Annex I, Art. 3.2. For comments related to Annex I, Art. 3.2 (c-e and g-h), see discussion under ToR 2.

Description of the proposed activity (Annex I, Article 3.2 (a)): The ICG participants presented similar questions and comments in nature and noted that the proponent could consider *inter alia*:

- Explanation of how the AIMS project and the McMurdo Master Plan fit together and will influence or include the support toward ongoing USAP science and operational activities;
- Separation of EIA or EIAs for implementing McMurdo Master plan;
- Clarification of the extent of the area and inclusion of a clear statement of scope for the proposed activity;
- A proposed timeline of the activities;
- Further details of the reasons why the current facilities are not considered satisfying and more information regarding the way life expectancy of the current facilities and energy efficiency standards;
- How the Lodging # 1 building would increase energy efficiency and reduce maintenance requirements compared to the existing housing it would replace;
- Including the improvement of grey water management to the modernization projects to allow a diminution of the energy cost of the station, and improve its environmental performance;

- Providing details of locations of laydown area and new buildings planned in proposed activity;
- Details of construction materials, building form and foundations, prefabricated facilities outside Antarctica;
- Further information on the planned alternative energy technology system, including an estimate of the extent to which alternative energy sources may offset power generation by diesel generators;
- Bringing forward the schedule for the construction of the new waste processing facility to assist with the handling of wastes generated during the proposed modernization activities;

Possible alternatives to the activity (Annex 1, Article 3.2 (a)): Some participants commented on this aspect. They noted that a number of other alternatives were considered but not carried forward, and only a limited information regarding these other alternatives were provided in the draft CEE. They recommended providing a more detailed summary of the alternatives considered (e.g. locations, layouts, designs, materials, construction techniques, technologies, timing and scale) and relative environmental impacts.

Description of the initial environment (Annex 1, Article 3.2 (b)): ICG participants noted that the CEE would benefit from:

- Providing the reference to the maximum and minimum latitude and longitude, and images and diagrams of the key areas of operations to understand the description of the environment and potential impacts from the proposed activity;
- Focusing the affected areas by the construction activity and reducing or deleting some of the initial environmental state descriptions for those areas in Chapter 4 described as not affected. (e.g. section 4.3 to 4.6);
- Further detailed description of the McMurdo Station area (including Winter Quarters Bay) that covers the identified station footprint of 2.5 km² including some information and/or maps showing the measured levels of contamination;
- Including the human-built environment (section 2.2.3 could possibly be relocated);
- Inclusion of plans and figures, maps showing the location of the ecological resources (e.g. distribution maps for vegetation, ice-free ground, seal haul out areas, nesting skuas, ASPAs, HSMs, and IBA) with the area of construction activities;
- Providing a summary of the description of the environment in the McMurdo Dry Valley region, with a drawing on the cited IEE for the continuation of the LTER program including a description of current impacts;
- Incorporating results from monitoring programme undertaken at the McMurdo Station area between 1999 and 2012 to better describe the area;
- Including new studies to allow a more accurate documentation of changes in organism communities over time;

Consideration of cumulative impacts (Annex 1, Article 3.2 (f)): Some participants recommended proponent to provide details regarding cumulative environmental impacts and identify the cumulative impacts in Table 5-2 and 5-3 summarizing the “Impacts of McMurdo Station Modernization (AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan) Activities” and the “Impacts of Continued Operations of McMurdo Area Activities and Facilities”.

Consideration of the effects of the proposed activity on the conduct of scientific research and on other existing uses and values (Annex 1, Article 3.2 (i)): Some participants suggested expanding consideration of the potential impacts to include not only current and future scientific operations undertaken at and near McMurdo Station but also its existing uses and values on other aspects.

Identification of gap of knowledge (Annex 1, Article 3.2 (j)): A few comments were made by the participants with regard to this aspect, some participants suggested highlighting the present uncertainties in the designs and locations of McMurdo Master Plan project in Chapter 9. Others recommended preparing another EIA after completion of the AIMS projects to reduce the uncertainty and gaps in knowledge regarding the implementation and potential environmental impacts from the projects under McMurdo Master Plan.

A non-technical summary of the information provided (Annex I, Article 3.2 (k)): Most participants were satisfied with the non-technical summary provided by the proponent, however some participants suggested redrafting a more general summary or overview of the draft CEE to help clarify the scope of the activities, and highlighting the most significant environmental impacts in the non-technical summary.

2. ToR 2: Whether the CEE i) has identified all the environmental impacts of the proposed activity and ii) suggests appropriate methods of mitigating (reducing or avoiding) those impacts

(i) Impacts: The ICG participants noted that the draft CEE identifies the key environmental impacts of the proposed activity and provides broad description. However, the CEE provides limited information regarding the associated environmental impacts with the environmental aspects of the proposed McMurdo Station modernization activities and continuing McMurdo area activities. Some participants were concerned with how the scope of the CEE could be potentially confusing to understand, and suggested clarifying and reducing the scope of the CEE even further to identify all the impacts of the proposed activity. Besides, participants raised some issues which would benefit from additional attention when preparing the final CEE:

Methodology and structure

- The methods and data used to evaluate the potential environmental and operational impacts refer to the existing USAP procedures and EIAs relevant to the proposed activity, however, only limited information is provided. Further details with links to and summaries of key provisions of the procedures and EIAs could strengthen the CEE.

Impacts

- Table 5-2 contains a well-presented and comprehensive overview of both the environmental aspects and impacts of the proposed activity, but the absence of supporting written descriptions of these potential impacts limits the ability to objectively consider and verify the impact ratings;
- The environmental impacts of activities at locations supported by the station are not very clear. If they are to remain in scope, then it is suggested that Chapter 5 should directly refer to and include within the impact tables the fixed facilities, mode of logistics and the sensitivity of the different environments where those operations occur away from the station;
- Some activities planned in the McMurdo Master Plan (2027-2033) may require some future evaluation. Participants acknowledged that it is difficult to assess their impacts due to the time scale and uncertainties, nevertheless further information on their potential impacts is required to discuss the master plan in this CEE;
- Participants have highlighted a few issues relating to impact of explosives use and excavation during site preparation and drainage improvement, and suggested further consideration could be given to:
 - Providing information on background noise level and the calculation of the ambient noise level at the nearest nesting sites and seal haul out areas with a map. In addition, population size of birds and number of seals hauling-out which should be required to monitor possible negative effect on their populations (e.g. breeding success rate decreasing and displacement) during the construction periods;

- Providing references to support the statement that 93 decibel is sound noise level at temporary threshold shift (TTS) and threshold level for pinnipeds;
- Identifying potential impacts associated with the generation of vibration and dust during construction activities;
- Considering the impact of not only blasting activities but also drilling, excavation or material handling activities to assess overall noise-related disturbance of wildlife comprehensively;
- Further information should be provided on the location and the schedule of the activity to better plan the different phases of the construction and demolition work, taking into account critical seasonal periods for wildlife;
- Providing further detailed description including the packing of waste, and precise amount of hazardous waste generated during the current operation and the construction period;
- The ICG participants noted the increases and changes in quarrying are presented as volumes in the CEE, however, the location(s) and areal extent of the extraction(s) and rock types(s) are not described. Further details should include the fines harvesting locations in a form of a map, as well as related environmental features such as wildlife locations, drainage and snow banks;
- Considering the option of sourcing fines from already disturbed location within the station area rather than harvesting from intact rock outcrops;
- Including an assessment of the impacts on the marine environment associated with the use, and periodic construction and release, of the ice pier, and associated mitigation measures;
- Addressing the risk of introduction of non-native species, and transfer of species between location, and related mitigations in Table 5-3;
- Some participants noted that the indirect impacts (e.g. dust on the sea ice, sediment runoff to the marine environment) are not discussed in the impact section and cumulative impacts are not identified in Table 5-2;

Mitigation: The ICG participants noted that the CEE suggests appropriate methods of mitigation, reduction or to avoid the impacts of the proposed activity in general. However, the CEE frequently refers to the “established USAP measures and procedures” or a similar regulation that would be implemented to mitigate predicted environmental impacts without a description of the procedure or inclusion of it. The ICG recommended that the proponent includes links to the relevant external measures and procedures, or present sufficient information (e.g. a summary of key provisions) to allow an assessment of the likely effectiveness of the planned arrangements, consistent with the approach recommended in the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (Section 3.5). The ICG participants also noted that clarification of some mitigation measures and further information on some topics could be helpful *inter alia* with regards to:

- Providing the environmental protection guidelines referred to the CEE as an appendix in the final CEE;
- Noting that blasting has a number of potential impacts associated with it, there is need to consider:
 - Clarification of the “standard procedures to halt project activities” to avoid noise impacts to wildlife;
 - Consideration of explosions to be carried out as much as possible at a time when the animals are not yet on site or not in critical periods (e.g. incubating period);
 - Whether fresh or salt water would be used for dust control;
 - Further investigation of mitigation measures for blasting and dust control
- Setting criteria for wind speed and direction, for ceasing dust generating operations could minimize dust generation and impacts on sensitive sites;
- Further details of prevention and mitigation measures for hazardous wastes release (e.g. asbestos, lead based paint) to the environment;

- Whether existing sewage treatment capacity is satisfied the amount of sewage increased by more than 30 % during construction phase;
- Providing a more comprehensive description of planned prevention, monitoring and response measures for non-native species;
- Considering recycling and reuse of the treated water, which would reduce the requirements for reverse osmosis; and
- Providing further detail regarding plans for the removal, management, and presumably replacement of HSM 54.
- Providing further details regarding the environmental monitoring to be undertaken during and after the proposed activity

3. Tor 3: Whether the conclusions of the draft CEE are adequately supported by the information contained within the document

ICG participants felt that the conclusion that “some impacts would result in more than a minor or transitory impact”, is broadly supported by the information contained within the draft CEE, and that this level of EIA therefore seems to appropriate for this project. While noting, some suggestions regarding the provision of additional information, participants also considered that the following conclusions presented in the draft CEE were likely to be correct:

- the potential benefits of the proposed activity are substantial and long lasting (Section 5.7);
- the proposed activity would result in substantial improvements in the environmental performance of USAP McMurdo Station area activities (Section 10).

4. Tor 4: The clarity, format and presentation of the draft CEE

The ICG participants agreed that the draft CEE is generally clear, well written and well presented. They felt that the draft CEE is quite concise which may be due to the nature and location of the proposal, involving ongoing activities and/or new activities in already disturbed locations, and are largely subject to applicable existing environmental management procedures. However, to a certain extent, it is also a consequence of the draft CEE relying on information contained in other documents. Participants felt that this approach makes it challenging to gain a clear understanding of the draft CEE. A number of participants recommended the followings for the final CEE:

- To find a way to illustrate the relationship between the proposed activities that are within the scope of the draft CEE and the associated activities that are addressed under separate or complementary EIAs;
- To summarise the key points from separate documents cited in the draft CEE that contain information relevant to describing the proposed activities and their environmental management.
- To support enhanced understanding of the spatial context for proposed activities, a final CEE could contain additional and higher quality maps, figures or aerial photos, for example including:
 - planned/anticipated locations for McMurdo Master Plan project activities and topography (Section 3.3);
 - locations of environmental features relative to proposed activities (Sections 4.3 to 4.6);
 - location of known contaminated sites; and
 - harvest areas for fill and fines generation and harvesting (page 3-6)
- To note the sensitivities of the sites within the locations supported by the station, particularly ice-free areas and location of wildlife, including more details regarding this activity would be useful to include within the CEE.

Note that further valuable comments relating to the format and the structure of the document provided by the ICG participants are available on the CEP Discussion forum. The proponent is encouraged to use these detailed comments when finalizing the CEE.

3. Conclusions

The ICG established to review the draft CEE prepared by the United States for the “Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities”, in accordance with the *Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs*, advises the CEP that:

- 1) The draft CEE generally and broadly conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. However, some participants recommended reconsideration of the scope of the proposed activity and expressed the view that additional information would be required on a number of aspects for the final CEE to fully conform to the requirements of Article 3 of the Protocol.
- 2) If the United States decides to proceed with the proposed activity, there are some aspects for which additional information or clarification could be provided in the final CEE to enhance its comprehensiveness, as outlined in this ICG report. In particular, the Committee’s attention is drawn to the suggestions that some further consideration could be provided regarding:
 - To clarify the scope of the CEE to identify all the impacts of the proposed activity;
 - The relationship between the proposed activities that are within the scope of the draft CEE and the associated activities that are addressed under separate/complementary EIAs;
 - To summarise the key points from separate documents cited in the draft CEE that contain information relevant to describing the proposed activities and their environmental management plan;
 - Full range of description, impacts, and mitigation measures of the proposed McMurdo Station modernization activities (AIMS and McMurdo Master Plan) and continuing McMurdo area activities.

The United States is furthermore encouraged to consider the detailed comments provided by ICG participants as well as the summary of the main issues as put forward in the ICG report.

- 3) The information provided in the draft CEE broadly supports the conclusion that the impacts of some activities within the project will have a more than minor or transitory impact”, and that this level of EIA is appropriate for this project.

The draft CEE is generally clear, well written and well presented, although suggestions were made to clarify and further strengthen the document.

**Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for
Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area
Activities: United States Response to the Comments presented in
ATCM XLII WP15**

The United States' response to the comments received through the CEP ICG process was presented as ATCM XLII IP82 below:



**XLII Antarctic Treaty
Consultative Meeting**
Prague • Czech Republic • 2019

IP 82

ENG

Agenda Item:	CEP 8a
Presented by:	United States
Original:	English
Submitted:	30/5/2019

Initial Responses to Comments on the Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities

Initial Responses to Comments on the Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities

An information paper submitted by the United States

Background

A draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) was prepared by the National Science Foundation (NSF) for the modernization of McMurdo Station while continuing the United States Antarctic Program (USAP) science and operational activities at the station, field sites, and facilities that the station supports. The draft CEE was prepared in accordance with applicable provisions of Annex I, Article 3 of the *Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (1991) and the *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* (2016).

Notification of the availability of the CEE was circulated by the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat to all Parties via Circular 5 (February 19, 2019) and to the CEP via CEP Circular 5 (March 4, 2019). The draft CEE was made available on the CEP Workspace on the website of the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty: https://www.ats.aq/e/cep_workspace/cep_draftcee.htm and on the National Science Foundation's Office of Polar Programs: https://www.nsf.gov/geo/opp/antarct/treaty/modernization_cee.jsp

In accordance with the *Procedures for intersessional consideration of Draft CEEs* (Appendix 4 to the CEP X Final Report), an Intersessional Contact Group (ICG) was established, convened by the Republic of Korea, to review the draft CEE. ICG correspondence was available to CEP Members and Observers via the CEP discussion forum, which also provided the Non-Technical Summary (NTS) translated into the official Treaty languages

The United States appreciates the efforts of ICG participants who provided valuable comments on the CEE and, in particular, thanks the Republic of Korea for convening the ICG and providing an excellent summary of the responses (ATCM XLII WP15 *Report of the intersessional open-ended contact group established to consider the draft CEE for the "Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities"*). We plan to revise the CEE and address the comments received from the ICG, from discussion during the CEP meeting, and from the general public in the Final CEE.

With regard to the conclusions of the ICG, we note that the participants considered that the draft CEE generally and broadly conforms to the formal requirements of Article 3 of Annex I of the Environmental Protocol. We also note that some participants recommended reconsidering the scope of the proposed activity and expressed the view that additional information would be required on a number of aspects for the Final CEE to fully conform to the requirements of Article 3 of the Protocol. Recommendations to provide additional information or clarification in several areas of the CEE, both in the text and in the figures and tables, were made. The ICG concluded that the draft CEE broadly supports the conclusion that the impacts of some activities within the project will have a "more than minor or transitory impact", and that this level of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is appropriate for this project.

Initial Responses to the comments from ICG participants

Purpose and Scope of the CEE

The United States recognizes that this CEE is unlike any CEE to date. The scope of the CEE is broad, and the period of work is 15-20 years. We believe that our approach, although novel, fully conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of the Protocol. Because ICG participants noted that further explanation of the scope of the CEE would be beneficial, we have expanded our statement of the purpose and scope of the CEE as detailed below.

The purpose of the proposed activity is to ensure that USAP resources at McMurdo Station continue to serve as a viable and flexible platform to support evolving scientific research efficiently and effectively. The proposed activity consists of two interrelated and interdependent parts: the modernization of McMurdo Station through the McMurdo Master Plan and the continuation of science and associated operational activities in areas supported from the McMurdo Station area hub.

The McMurdo Master Plan consists of a phased set of projects that would be conducted over a period of 15- 20 years. The McMurdo Master Plan replaces or substantially upgrades assets at McMurdo Station that are nearing or have exceeded their life expectancy. Proposed modernization activities would provide facilities and equipment that meet energy efficiency standards, logistical requirements, and environmental stewardship goals. A subset of the McMurdo Master Plan is the Antarctic Infrastructure Modernization for Science (AIMS) project. Site preparation and initial demolition work is planned to begin in the 2019-2020 season. The AIMS project construction phase is planned to continue through 2025-2026. Other McMurdo Master Plan projects following AIMS (implemented primarily from 2026 through 2033) have been identified but are not yet fully developed nor funded and thus are not at a stage for detailed environmental analysis.

Science and operational activities supported from the McMurdo Station area hub have been conducted since the construction of the station in 1955. Research sites supported from the McMurdo Station area hub include locations on Ross Island, in McMurdo Sound, on the Ross Ice Shelf, in the McMurdo Dry Valleys, and at deep field sites on the polar plateau and in West Antarctica.

The USAP considers the McMurdo Station modernization (both AIMS projects and other Master Plan projects that are in the conceptual planning phase) and science activities supported from the McMurdo Station area hub are interlinked to the degree where a holistic approach is required to fully understand potential environmental impacts. The USAP has a track record of assessing its activities, including operations, logistics, construction/demolition, and science projects, in an integrated manner. CEE-level assessments that covered program-wide activities were conducted in 1980 and 1991, prior to the adoption of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. Since that time, several CEEs and numerous IEEs assessed individual projects in the areas of both operations/logistics and science.

This CEE continues the integrated assessment approach with regard to McMurdo Station and activities supported from the McMurdo Station area hub. The CEE incorporates by reference prior EIAs that are appropriate for the assessment of activities to be conducted over the next 15-20 years. The CEE provides an assessment of activities for which there is currently a sufficient level of detail. The USAP commits to further EIAs, as appropriate, for activities listed or planned that are not known in sufficient detail to assess at this time, have not been previously assessed, or which are to be conducted in sensitive areas. Additionally, the USAP is committed to an EIA feedback process as described in 2016 *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica*. Examples of the USAP feedback process are discussed

in ATCM XXXVIII IP42 *EIA Field Reviews of Science, Operations and Camps*; ATCM XL IP8 *Field Project Reviews: Fulfilling the environmental impact assessment (EIA) monitoring obligations*; ATCM XLII IP77 *The Environmental Impact Assessment Feedback Process: Review of Project IceCube (2004 CEE)* and ATCM XLII IP76 *The Environmental Impact Assessment Feedback Process: Review of Modernization of the Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, Antarctica (1998 CEE)*.

Overall comments on supporting material

ICG participants recommended improvements to the figures and tables in order to more fully understand the scope, timeline, and footprint of the activities; locations of new construction and demolition of extant buildings, laydown areas, and fines collection areas; and locations of ecological resources (fauna and flora), ASPAs, and HSMs within the area. To address these comments, four new figures were prepared, and the current figures were substantially improved. Several tables in Chapter 3 (Proposed activity and alternatives), Chapter 5 (Identification and Prediction of Impacts), Chapter 6 (Mitigation Measures), and Appendix Table B-1 were amended. The list of references was also updated as recommended by several participants.

Alternatives

Some participants noted that several alternatives considered but not carried forward were not described in detail. These alternatives, which considered the function, location, size, design, configuration of specific buildings, were severely constrained by existing site conditions at McMurdo Station. These alternatives were identified early in the process as non-viable due to higher cost, lower efficiency gain, and impact to construction schedule. Given the heavily disturbed nature of the McMurdo Station footprint, these alternatives in building design and location were considered to have essentially the same environmental impact as Alternative A and thus were not further developed.

Description of the initial environment.

Several commenters recommended specific improvements to the description of the initial environment, particularly as related to the footprint of McMurdo Station. The improved figures provide clarity with regard to location of the new and to-be-demolished buildings. Results of prior environmental monitoring which show the disturbed nature of McMurdo Station's footprint have been incorporated into the CEE. The areas of fines collection, which are within the McMurdo Station footprint, are also included in the new figures. There were questions raised about the location of ecological resources within the potentially impacted area, in order to allow for an understanding of potential impacts to fauna and flora. This information, along with the location of ASPAs and HSMs, is incorporated into the new figures. The text of the CEE will be amended accordingly.

Impact Assessment Methods

ICG participants suggested that expansion of the impact assessment methods would be appropriate. The methods and data used have been more fully described to provide a more complete understanding of how USAP implemented the 2016 *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* related to impact assessment methodology description. The Final CEE will include a discussion of applying extent, duration, intensity, and probability to predicting the impact level. In addition, a short overview has been added that summarizes data sources and application of the extensive experience USAP has in understanding the impacts of those proposed activities that are similar to prior construction and demolition on operation activities.

Impacts

ICG participants noted that additional detail on impacts and clearer linkage between the text and summary tables (Tables 5-2 and 5-3) would enhance the CEE. In addition, ICG participants recommended that additional impacts should be identified and that additional EIA documents may need to be prepared as project plans and designs mature.

The Final CEE will provide additional detail on sources and types of impacts, resources potentially affected, and scale of impacts. A Gantt chart of the construction schedule of each of the seven AIMS construction projects has been provided for inclusion in the Final CEE. This schedule compiles more detail of the basic construction steps that supports the existing text. Chapter 5 (Identification and Prediction of Impacts) will be expanded to include more detail on waste management during demolition and construction plus figures showing fines harvest locations. The revised impact chapter will include a broader discussion on the potential impacts to wildlife, vegetation, and marine resources from dust, noise, and vibrations. The Final CEE will separate potential impacts at McMurdo Station from potential impacts at supported locations (e.g. field camps, Black Island Transmission Facility, Marble Point, traverse operations). The discussion of indirect impacts (e.g., to marine resources) and cumulative impacts is being expanded. In addition, as previously discussed in this paper, USAP commits to further EIAs, as appropriate, for activities listed or planned that are not known in sufficient detail at this time, have not been previously assessed, or which are to be conducted in sensitive areas.

Mitigation

The ICG participants noted that the CEE suggests appropriate methods of mitigation aimed to reduce or to avoid the impacts of the proposed activity in general. However, they suggested that more specific detail of mitigations should be included in the Final CEE. In addition, participants noted that additional detail would allow an assessment of the likely effectiveness of the planned arrangements, consistent with the approach recommended in the 2016 *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica*.

The Final CEE will include additional information throughout the Chapter 5 (Identification and Prediction of Impacts) and Chapter 6 (Mitigation Measures) related to specific mitigations. Examples of additional information provided includes specific mitigations for dust suppression, reduction of impacts from explosives use, handling of waste to minimize/prevent release to the environment, testing and management of material containing asbestos and lead-based paint, and prevention of transfer of non-native species among sites on the continent. Figures have been improved to facilitate an understanding of the location of activities, particularly construction and demolition, and the location of sensitive receptors (e.g., wildlife, vegetation, and HSMs), maps and figures).

Monitoring currently on-going by USAP would continue during construction and post-construction of the McMurdo Modernization projects. In the Final CEE, Chapter 7 (Environmental Monitoring) will be expanded to explicitly identify the types of measurements that would be made to monitor specific resources.

Summary

In summary, the United States appreciates the efforts of ICG participants who provided valuable comments on the CEE and in particular, thanks the Republic of Korea for convening the ICG and providing an excellent summary of the responses. We are in the process of revising the CEE based on comments received to date and will address the comments received from the ICG, from discussion during the CEP meeting, and from the general public in the Final CEE. We look forward to circulating the Final CEE in due time.

For further comments or information, please contact Dr. Polly Penhale, Senior Advisor, Environment, National Science Foundation, Office of Polar Programs, 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22314. E-mail: CEE.comments@nsf.gov

Comments received during CEP XXII

Following the presentation of ATCM XLII WP 2 *Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities*, ATCM XLII WP15 *Report of the intersessional open-ended contact group established to consider the draft CEE for the “Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities”* and ATCM XLII IP82 *Initial Responses to Comments on the Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities*, CEP Members and observers discussed the draft CEE.

The Committee thanked the United States for presenting a solid and well-structured draft CEE. The CEP concluded that the draft CEE generally conformed to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol, and that the information provided in the CEE supported the conclusion that the impacts of some activities within the project would have a greater than minor or transitory impact and that this level of EIA was appropriate for the project. The draft CEE was considered thorough, systematic, clear, well-structured and well presented, although some minor adjustments could be considered to strengthen the document further. The CEP noted that there were some aspects for which additional information or clarification would be provided in the final CEE. The United States was encouraged to consider the comments that arose during the ICG as the final CEE is being prepared.

The United States reiterated its commitment to consider all comments in its final CEE and to provide additional detailed information on several issues that were raised, including: mitigation of environmental impacts; impact assessment methods; scale of impacts; alternatives; and description of the initial environment. With respect to those activities that had not been detailed sufficiently in the draft CEE, the United States assured members that it would provide a future EIA for those activities to the CEP. In addition, the United States noted that it would provide periodic feedback per the EIA Guidelines.

Comments received from the United States Environmental Protection Agency

The U.S. Environmental Protection agency reviewed the draft CEE and transmitted the following comments. The USAP is committed to following best management practices. Mitigation of potential environment impacts is key to the conduct of the USAP and its McMurdo modernization program.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
POLICY

JUL 10 2019

Dr. Polly A. Penhale
Senior Advisor, Environment
National Science Foundation, Office of Polar Programs
2415 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dear Dr. Penhale:

In accordance with our responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the National Science Foundation's Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for Continuation and Modernization of McMurdo Station Area Activities (CEQ No. 20190054). We understand that this document was prepared as a CEE in accordance with Annex I, Article 3 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty and the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica.

The proposed activity (Alternative A) would implement modernization projects under the McMurdo Master Plan that would provide facilities and equipment that meet energy efficiency standards, logistical requirements, and environmental stewardship goals; while continuing the United States Antarctic Program's science and operations at or near current levels. The construction phase of the modernization project would occur over 15-20 years and includes demolishing, constructing, renovating, and operating buildings and structures at McMurdo Station.

The EPA supports the use of best management practices and implementation of the proposed mitigation measures throughout the demolition, construction, and operation of the proposed modernization activities at McMurdo Station. We also support the early evaluation of mitigation opportunities that may be needed to correct any increased or unexpected impacts from the proposed activity.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this Draft CEE and look forward to reviewing the Final CEE related to this project¹. The staff contact for the review is Megan Barnhart and she can be reached at (202) 564-5936 or barnhart.megan@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert Tomiak".

Robert Tomiak
Director
Office of Federal Activities

¹ Please note that effective October 22, 2018, the EPA no longer includes ratings in our draft EIS comment letters. Information about this change and EPA's continued roles and responsibilities in the review of federal actions can be found on our website at <https://www.epa.gov/nepa/epa-review-process-under-section-309-clean-air-act>.