General Overview

The evaluation committee for the Quebec #1 Missile Alert Facility (MAF) held a meeting to discuss issues concerning the MAF, tour the facility and evaluate the proposed acquisition of this property by Wyoming State Parks, Historic Sites and Trails (SPHST). The meeting started at 9:00 AM on September 11, 2013 at the Wyoming Historic Governors’ Mansion Carriage House. Participants included: Dan Barks, President, State Parks and Cultural Resources Commission, Brian Beadles, Historian, Christina Bird, Superintendent, Wyoming Historic Governors’ Mansion, Mary Hopkins, State Historic Preservation Officer, Jill Pope, Visit Cheyenne, Paula Taylor, Director, FE Warren ICBM and Heritage Museum, Todd Thibodeau, Planning and Grants Manager SPHST, Darrel Trembly, Regional Manager, SPSHT, Sue Wilson, State Representative House District 7. Lindi Kirkbride and a representative for Brian Jacobsen, the land owner adjacent to the MAF, attended the tour, but did not participate in the evaluation. Travis Beckwith, Cultural Resource Manager for F.E. Warren Air Force Base conducted the tour and answered committee questions. Invited but did not attend; Alliance for Historic Wyoming, Troy Thompson, Chairman, Laramie County Board of Commissioners, City of Cheyenne, State Senator Tony Ross, and the Warren Military Historical Association.

The meeting began with a discussion of the process for SPHST to acquire or dispose of land. SPHST will make a recommendation on what they would like to do, but the Wyoming state legislature will make the final decision on property acquisitions. The evaluation committee will evaluate the property and make a recommendation. This recommendation will be forwarded to the State Parks & Cultural Resources
Commission (commission), the director of the Wyoming Department of State Parks & Cultural Resources (director) and potentially to the Travel, Recreation, Wildlife & Cultural Resources joint interim committee of the Wyoming State Legislature (TRW&CR).

The committee then discussed how to manage the MAF and why the state should, or should not, acquire this property. The Missile-X (a.k.a. MX or Peacekeeper) Missile System (MX) is the most advanced and destructive InterContinental Ballistic Missile System ever built. The MX is credited with ending the Cold War. Upon completion of the MX, the Soviet Union decided they could no longer compete with the U.S. missile program. The MX is entirely within Wyoming and contains 5 MAF’s and 50 Launch Facilities. On February 5, 2011 a revised version of the START Treaty was finalized mandating the MX be dismantled. The United States Air Force (USAF) needs to have all of the launch facilities demolished by February 13, 2014. Four of the MAFs need to be demolished, but there is no deadline. One MAF must be disabled, but can be retained as an interpretative and educational facility. Once the terms of the START Treaty are completed, the Quebec #1 MAF will be the only facility of its kind remaining in the world.

Dismantling the MX requires compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act. Pursuant to NEPA, an Environmental Assessment has been prepared. A Finding Of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is recommended, but has not been signed at this time. Pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA the MAF is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and dismantling this system will result in an adverse effect. On March 4, 2013, the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office and the USAF entered into a programmatic agreement proposing one MAF be preserved, interpreted and made available for the public. On January 11, 2013, the Air Force has formally requested SPHST evaluate the MAF for inclusion in the state historic site system.

The committee then discussed other missile facilities the public is able to tour. There is an Atlas Missile silo owned by Weld County near Greeley, Colorado. This site is free and available by appointment only. We were not able to find information on visitation at this site. There is a Titan Missile Silo near Sahuarita, New Mexico at the Titan Missile Museum. This site charges $9.50 for adults and $6.00 for children. The site is open year round, 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM in the summer, with reduced hours in the winter. This site had approximately 55,000 visitors in 2012. The movie War Games was filmed at this site. The National Park Service manages a Minuteman II MAF near Badlands National Monument in South Dakota. This site is free. The site is open year round, 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM in the summer, with reduced hours in the winter. This site had over 70,000 visitors in 2012. The North Dakota Parks and Recreation
Department, manages another Minuteman II MAF in North Dakota. This site charges $10.00 for adults and $3.00 for children. The site is open 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM in the summer, with reduced hours in the spring and fall, and by appointment in the winter. This site is a considerable distance from any population center or highway and received less than 10,000 visitors in 2012.

Mary Hopkins passed out a copy of an article titled “On The Nuclear Trail” in the September, 2013 issue of Hemispheres Magazine. The article pointed out Atomic Tourism is one of the fastest growing niches in the tourism industry. A book came out in 2011 called “A Nuclear Family Vacation” that increased awareness of the Cold War and the public’s opportunity to visit these sites. The Pima Air & Space Museum, the New Mexico Museum of Nuclear Science & History, along with the aforementioned missile sites have had significant increases in visitation in the last few years.

The MAF is approximately 25 miles north of Cheyenne and within a half mile of exit 39 on Interstate 25. There is better public access to this MAF than any of the other public missile facilities. The City of Cheyenne owns an Atlas Missile site west of the City, F.E. Warren AFB has a missile museum, and the MAF is north of Cheyenne. The Atlas is the first of the ICBMs and the MX is the most advanced of the ICBMs. Cheyenne is the only place in the country with this kind of clustering of missile resources. This will give Wyoming an excellent opportunity to interpret the Cold War. Additionally, SPHST hopes to restore and interpret the World War II POW building in Douglas. There are three other facilities in the state that are interpreting the World War II experience in Wyoming. These are the F.E. Warren ICBM and Heritage Museum in Cheyenne. This museum depicts the rich heritage from 1867 to present including the development of the ICBM systems. The second building is the Wyoming Veterans Memorial Museum in Casper. This facility consists of the enlisted men’s club and focuses on the U.S. Army Air Corp during WWII. Finally, there is the Heart Mountain Japanese Internment Camp near Powell. This facility focuses on the experiences of the Japanese internees during WWII. Promotion of all of these five sites as a corridor and make a nice WWII and Cold War tour. Combined with all of the Frontier Era military sites, Wyoming has a unique opportunity to interpret and promote the western military experience, especially for those people traveling to Yellowstone National Park.

Next the Committee discussed potential partnerships with F.E. Warren, the City of Cheyenne, Laramie County, private groups and retired missilers.

Sue Wilson talked about ways to partner with the surrounding neighbors. The northern part of Laramie County is a pretty remote area and there are no public facilities. This area could use a community center. Sue wondered if the MAF could be used by the community for public meetings, voting booth, etc. Additionally, the volunteer fire department has to park their vehicles outside at a neighbor’s ranch. They were wondering if they could park the vehicles in the MAF shop building. Finally, the VA is looking for a 6 acre parcel near Cheyenne to create a veterans cemetery.
Facility Condition

The USAF prepared a Historic Structures Report for the MAF. The MAF is on approximately 5 acres of land. There are two buildings above ground; the Launch Control Support Building and the Shop building. There is also an air intake, exhaust ducts, antenna array, helipad, parking areas, recreation facilities, sewer lagoon and chain link fence topped by barbed wire. Below ground there is the access shaft with elevator, tunnel junction, launch control center and launch control equipment building. In 1962 the MAF was constructed as a Minuteman I site. Through the years the site was upgraded to a Minuteman III site. In 1986 it was converted to an MX site. In 2005, the MAF was placed in caretaker status. At that time all technical equipment was removed from the facility, the buildings were boarded up and the electrical, plumbing and mechanical systems were taken off line. Since that time vandals have removed much of the copper plumbing and wiring, they also broke windows and did some other minor damage. There is a sewer lagoon on-site and it is still permitted. The liner has been punctured, but otherwise the lagoon is functional. There is a water well on site that is still permitted. Structurally the buildings are in good shape. The elevator was functioning when it was taken offline and it is assumed it will work if it is reconnected and some general maintenance is performed. The cost estimate is a little over $1,000,000 to make all repairs, restore the facility to its 2005 appearance and convert to a museum. The committee agreed the state does not have the capacity to pay for the restoration and the USAF will need to do this work before the state can accept the property. The USAF has approximately $300,000 set aside to implement the terms of the START Treaty, but it is unclear where the rest of the funding will come from.

The committee discussed the importance of the equipment that was removed from the MAF. Apparently some of this equipment was scavenged for other MAFs. There is a potential to return some of this equipment to the Quebec #1 MAF. Additionally, some of this equipment is stored at FE Warren and there may be a possibility to return it to the MAF. There will also need to be money to address start-up costs, interpretation, staffing and operations and maintenance.
Tour
The evaluation committee went out and toured the MAF. The committee reconvened back at the HGM at 12:30 PM.

Options
Option 1. Make the MAF a fully staffed year round state historic site. This will require two full time staff, housing on-site and an O&M budget.

Option 2. Run the MAF as a seasonally operated satellite site of the HGM. This will require hiring three seasonal employees and supplementing these employees with volunteers. The MAF will be open seasonally in the summer. An administrative area will be provided on-site, but no housing. RV sites may be developed on the MAF.

Option 3. Have the state acquire the property and mothball it.

The committee discussed each option. There are pluses and minuses to each option. The committee decided Option 2 is probably the most viable option. The committee also agreed it makes sense to work with the surrounding land owners to see if the MAF can be used as a public
facility and to store the fire vehicles in the shop building. The committee felt if the community feels vested in the MAF they will be more likely to help monitor and maintain the facility. Additionally, if the fire vehicles are on-site the county may help maintain and plow the entrance road. Additionally, the fire equipment is already on-site if there is a fire. Following this the committee conducted the site evaluation criteria.
SITE CRITERIA

GEOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS

A. SIZE OF PARK/ BUFFER
There should be adequate park acreage to protect site or resource. The site should be large enough to accommodate multiple leisure uses and provide a buffer zone from potentially incompatible nearby land uses. Existing park acreage should be adequate to allow for all current and future planned uses and improvements, including allowing for adequate safe access, and provisions for providing utilities.

1-site has conflicting land uses; there are limited or no expansion possibilities; surrounding lands offer marginal site protection, are un-zoned, or contain threats to site integrity; least level of protection;

3- few conflicting land uses in view shed; little or no potential for site expansion; limited buffer zone around site; moderate level of protection;

5-little or no conflicting land use or structures in view shed; adjoining properties will remain in compatible uses for indefinite future; land available for future expansion; highest level of protection.

\[ \text{Total Points} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Barks</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Beadles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Bird</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hopkins</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Pope</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Taylor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrel Trembly</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Wilson</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. TRAVEL DISTANCE/ACCESSIBILITY TO SITE
Distance a visitor is required to travel to Park/Site:

1- driving distance greater than one hour from major population center (greater than 5,000 population) and/or highly traveled roadway (annual average daily traffic (AADT) of at least 2,000 vehicles per day);

3- driving distance is less than one hour but greater than one half hour drive from population center and/or highly traveled roadway;
5- less than one half hour drive from population center and/or highly traveled roadway.

4.75 Total Points

Dan Barks 5
Brian Beadles 5
Christina Bird 5
Mary Hopkins 5
Jill Pope 3
Paula Taylor 5
Darrel Trembly 5
Sue Wilson 5

C. DISTANCE FROM SIMILAR SITE/FACILITY
How far is this site from public or commercial facilities of similar or superior size and quality within the state?

1- other public or commercial sites of similar or superior size and quality are located within a one hour drive of this site;

3- other public or commercial sites of similar or superior size and quality are located within three hours of this site;

5- no other public or commercial sites of similar or superior size and quality are located within the state.

4.5 Total Points

Dan Barks 5
Brian Beadles 5
Christina Bird 5
Mary Hopkins 5
Jill Pope 5
Paula Taylor 5
Darrel Trembly 5
Sue Wilson 1

SIGNIFICANT FEATURES

D. UNIQUE FLORA, FAUNA & GEOLOGIC FEATURES
Site contains unique and/or significant geologic features or habitat for native flora and/or fauna.
1- no sensitive species or unique geologic features present, or if there are, they are common to other areas of the state; quality of features is diminished to such an extent that they no longer have the integrity to offer quality interpretation of the resource; presence of non-native plants or animals diminished property for park purposes; invasive species affecting property;

3- site has features that are of statewide or local significance, and in moderately good condition; may possess some intact natural assets: plants, animals, varied topography, vegetation, and/or water resources; some opportunities to interpret the natural setting; features have the capacity to be interpreted as part of a larger picture, but are unremarkable if interpreted in and of themselves; the features are an added attraction to the park, but do not serve as the primary draw for visitors;

5- largely natural setting possessing an uncommon abundance of natural assets, all of high quality: plants, animals, varied topography, vegetations, and/or water resources; property contains native species or geologic features of statewide or national significance; similar features are found in few other locations in the state, or are unique to that location; the geology of the park provides a defining characteristic such as fossil sites, waterfalls, overlooks, caves, thermal features or other geologic activity that is in excellent condition and offers high interpretive value to the public; outstanding example of habitat for native flora and/or fauna; sensitive species present; the feature more often than not is the reason visitors come to the park.

__1.63__ Total Points

Dan Barks ___3___
Brian Beadles ___1___
Christina Bird ___1___
Mary Hopkins ___3___
Jill Pope ___2___
Paula Taylor ___1___
Darrel Trembly ___1___
Sue Wilson ___1___

E. CULTURAL/ HISTORICAL SITE
The site offers unique heritage or cultural values. The site is listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or is enrolled as a National Historic Landmark. The site is in good condition and retains excellent historic integrity.

1- no unique cultural resources present at the site; the site or facility is in fair to poor condition and retains little historic integrity;
3- there are several other similar sites offering the same experience in the state; the site is referenced in state and local travel guides; the site or facility is in good condition and retains excellent historic integrity;

5- few or no other sites offer the same experience in the state; the site is listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or is enrolled as a National Historic Landmark; the site or facility is in excellent condition and retains excellent historic integrity; the site is one of a series within the state, all providing a interrelated experience.

__5__ Total Points

Dan Barks ___5__
Brian Beadles ___5__
Christina Bird ___5__
Mary Hopkins ___5__
Jill Pope ___5__
Paula Taylor ___5__
Darrel Trembly ___5__
Sue Wilson ___5__

F. RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

The site presents ample opportunities for multiple-use recreation and leisure activities as identified in the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) (Appendix A). To be suitable for inclusion in the system, the site must represent a recreational resource that is not already adequately represented in the SPHS system or is not comparably represented by another land-managing entity.

1- allows for less than 10 recreational activities as outlined in the 2003 SCORP; no opportunity to incorporate site into existing adjacent recreational facilities;

3- allows for between 10-20 recreational activities as outlined in the 2003 SCORP; allows for limited integration of recreational development with facilities outside of the park; site will assist in providing access to public land which has no or limited access;

5- allows for more than 20 recreational activities as outlined in the 2003 SCORP; allows for integration of recreational development with facilities outside of the park; site will assist in providing access to public land which has no or limited access and can be integrated into an existing trail system or staging area.

__1__ Total Points

Dan Barks ___1__
Brian Beadles ___1__
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

G. REVENUE GENERATION
The objective is to structure programming, potential retail sales, revenue flow, design, restoration, and control of access to the site, to offset operating and maintenance costs.

1- site expends more than three dollars ($3.00) for every one dollar ($1.00) revenue generated;

3- site expends more than two dollars ($2.00) but fewer than three dollars ($3.00) for every one dollar ($1.00) revenue generated;

5- site expends less than two dollars ($2.00) for every one dollar ($1.00) revenue generated.

Total Points

H. MANAGEMENT COSTS
Water use, escalating utility costs, higher law enforcement costs, shorter infrastructure life, and changes in recreation equipment technology combine to challenge the site manager. With escalating management costs, will it be feasible to control operation and maintenance costs at this site without discouraging park visitation?

1- projects, facilities, or mechanical systems that are complex, require technical expertise and training beyond reasonable expectation of park managers; utilization of materials and equipment that are labor intensive to an extraordinary level for operation and maintenance; sites with unusual natural, locational, or operational hazards (unstable soils,
flood zones, mine portals, incompatible uses of the park, high incidence of vandalism or criminal behavior);

3- projects and/or facilities that require occasional, but costly repairs and maintenance, some beyond the capabilities of a park manager or maintenance crews; there are few severe or locational problems; utility costs are reasonable for scope and use of park; some housing available within one-half hour of the park; facilities may require periodic replacement on an annual or biannual basis; no serious hazard areas;

5- a well-designed and constructed facility; project had timely operational input and quality materials to minimize problems; no serious site constraints or hazards; efficient trash collection and disposal; indigenous vegetation that can thrive on natural moisture; costly equipment that is not necessary; utility costs increase at close to regional average; adequate housing available within one-half hour of the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Barks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Beadles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrel Trembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Wilson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. DEVELOPMENT COSTS
Site suitability- adequate slope, soil stability, and developable resources must be taken into account when choosing an appropriate site. Appropriate design can limit vandalism and criminal activity through control of access points and features providing natural barriers.

1- availability and distances to utilities may be very costly; no developed water is available; fuel and water may have to be transported to site; some evidence of recent property loss due to erosion and/or land movement; land located in area of frequent flooding; limited by sensitive plant or animal species; limited access control may diminish ability to maximize entrance fee collections; limited water features; limited season site (less than 6 months); access to site is not convenient; road access considered extremely costly (greater than 20% of development cost estimates);

3- at minimum, water, power and telephone are within 1 mile; potable water is available (local or well, good quality and production); some evidence of recent property loss due to erosion; site located within flood zone; some limitations on development due to sensitive plant or animal species; site has adequate areas of minimal slope/aspect on which to
develop revenue-generating day-use or campgrounds; good water features available; access road development should be less than 20% of site development costs (stable, good grade and well drained un-surfaced road); development impacts (no hazardous waste, exposed mine portals, or unstable structures); well-developed stable soils, well drained; some mud and dust; greater than 6 month season; controllable access to expedite collections;

5- outstanding site with water, power and telephone less than 1 mile from development site; good quality water in adequate supply; granular soils, well drained, only limited problems with dust or mud; no evidence of erosion or land movement (slumping, etc.); is located outside of the 500 year flood plain or exhibits limited property loss due to erosion; insects controllable without inordinate cost; local employee pool available for seasonal assistance; low fire hazards; no extraordinary law enforcement or access control concerns; minimal costs for access (less than 20% of first phase development costs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Barks</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Beadles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Bird</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hopkins</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Pope</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Taylor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrel Trembly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Wilson</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

__4.75__ Total Points

J. **ENHANCES LOCAL ECONOMY**

Site will complement tourism and economic activity in the vicinity of the site and associated communities by aiding and marketing local services. Site is significant enough to promote overnight stay or use of local services, utilizing local labor, skills, and vendors in conjunction with local economic development plans. To provide a more comparable analysis, point criteria are separated into recreational and cultural.

1- no overnight camping (day-use only); located further than half hour drive from a community with grocery and other services utilized by park users; local vendors provide few services at the park; park open less than six months per year; no seasonal positions hired in the park;

- no staff on site; limited site interpretation; visitor hours are limited; site offers few conveniences or facilities for visitors; site discourages or limits extensive periods of visitation (typically 1 hour or less); site provides no employment or vendor opportunity for local community;
3- limited recreational opportunities to encourage multiple night camping (average stay one night); located within a half hour’s drive of a community with grocery and other services utilized by park users; park is referenced in local promotional information; local vendors provide many services at the park; park open more than six months per year; one or two seasonal positions for local employment;

- limited cultural or educational opportunities to encourage extended visitation (typically less than ½ day); good interpretive program and facilities such as water and sanitation for visitors; site open more than six months per year; one or two seasonal positions for local employment; some vendor opportunity;

5- extensive recreational/cultural opportunities to encourage extended stays (average stay multiple-nights), considered a destination site; located within a half hour’s drive of a community with grocery and other services needed by park users; local vendors provide many services at the park; park open all year; local entities host non-camping events that bring people to the park and community; active marketing and advertisement by local communities; at least three seasonal positions hired in the park;

- excellent cultural aspects and educational opportunities upon which to capitalize, whereby encouraging extended stays (typically longer than ½ a day); excellent folklore and local “flavor”; considered a destination site; outstanding opportunity to market local services and facilities; site open all year; museum on site; local entities host non-camping events that bring people to the site and community; active marketing and advertisement by local communities; at least three seasonal positions hired in the park.

__1.88__

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Barks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Beadles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Bird</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hopkins</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Pope</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Taylor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrel Trembly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Wilson</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORT**

K. **PARTNERSHIPS**

Expand operational partnership efforts with federal, state, local and private entities. Examples include federal grants, partnering with county law enforcement, and volunteer labor from friends groups.
1- no partnerships or support organization in place; local resentment to costs associated with establishing and maintaining the site (such as EMT, Fire, Police);

3- partner in place that has signed a formal agreement (memorandum of understanding) to provide volunteer labor, funding, or other resources required by the facility;

5- has two or more partners in place that have signed formal agreements (memorandum of understanding) to provide volunteer labor, funding, or other resources required by the facility.

2.25 Total Points

Dan Barks ___2___
Brian Beadles ___2___
Christina Bird ___2___
Mary Hopkins ___3___
Jill Pope ___2___
Paula Taylor ___3___
Darrel Trembly ___2___
Sue Wilson ___2___

L. PLANNING
Goal attainment is crucial to the success of the specific site and the overall SPHS system. To achieve minimum development and service standards a planning process should be implemented for the site; this can include Action Plan, Resource Management Plan (RMP), Master Plan, and/or Business Plan.

1- no formal plan developed for the site;

3- a strategy plan, system plan, RMP or site master plan has been developed, but no business plan has been prepared for the site. No cost estimates for development, maintenance, or restoration. No estimates of projected site visitation;

5- a master plan with associated business plan has been developed for the site by a professional consultant or firm.

4.13 Total Points

Dan Barks ___4___
Brian Beadles ___4___
Christina Bird ___4___
Mary Hopkins ___4___
Jill Pope ___4___
Paula Taylor ___4___
SUITABILITY

M. VISION, MISSION AND GOALS
The site relates to Wyoming State Park and Historic Sites Vision, Mission and Goals.

1- fails to meet a strategy from each of the objectives within the SPHS Systematic Guideline;

3- meets at least one strategy from each objective within the SPHS Systematic Guideline;

5- meets multiple strategies from each objective within the SPHS Systematic Guideline.

__5__ Total Points

Dan Barks ______5____
Brian Beadles ______5____
Christina Bird ______5____
Mary Hopkins ______5____
Jill Pope ______5____
Paula Taylor ______5____
Darrel Trembly ______5____
Sue Wilson ______5____

N. EXPANSION OF EXISTING SITE
Acreage should be adequate to allow for all current and future planned uses and improvements, and provide a buffer zone from potentially incompatible nearby land uses. An adjacent land that lends itself to the development of park facilities to provide or increase visitor services that would otherwise not be developed on existing site property will be given priority. Expansion supports increased capacity through renovation and expansion of existing site.

1- no significant expansion of capacity or quality of service; renovation projects only; inholdings diminish the integrity of the property; local zoning regulations limit current and future intended uses;

5- existing park acreage is adequate to allow for all current and future planned uses and improvements but provides no allowance for buffer from potentially incompatible nearby land uses, zoning considerations, and provisions for providing utilities;

10- existing park acreage is adequate to allow for all current and future planned uses and improvements, including allowing for adequate safe access, buffer from potentially
incompatible nearby land uses, incorporating zoning considerations and provisions for providing utilities; no incompatible inholdings; no in-park limitations on development.

__6.38__ Total Points

Dan Barks ___6__
Brian Beadles ___5__
Christina Bird ___5__
Mary Hopkins ___5__
Jill Pope ___10__
Paula Taylor ___5__
Darrel Trembly ___5__
Sue Wilson ___10__

O. LAND ACQUISITION

The acquisition of SPHS includes a variety of scenarios: transfer of federal lands under the Recreation and Public Purpose Act, cooperative projects with local governments, private donations, and joint ventures with Friend’s Groups or foundations. To the extent any of these, or others, relieves the State’s financial burden, the acquisition may be more attractive since it permits the State to leverage its resources.

1- the property is leased from another agency or entity; a cooperative agreement is required with the agency or entity that does not conform to the mission and/or goals of SPHS, or limits SPHS ability to manage the site;

3- the property is leased from another agency or entity; a cooperative agreement is required with the agency or entity that conforms to SPHS mission and/or goals and does not hinder SPHS’ ability to manage the site;

5- property is purchased by, transferred or donated to SPHS system; SPHS will have unilateral control of the site.

__5__ Total Points

Dan Barks ___5__
Brian Beadles ___5__
Christina Bird ___5__
Mary Hopkins ___5__
Jill Pope ___5__
Paula Taylor ___5__
Darrel Trembly ___5__
Sue Wilson ___5__
13.13 GEOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS
7.63 SIGNIFICANT FEATURES
14.76 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS
6.38 SUPPORT
16.38 SUITABILITY
58.28 TOTAL

PRIORITY SCALE
15-30 Not Considered
31-40 Low Priority
41-55 Moderate Priority
56-80 High Priority
Proposed budget for Quebec #1 Missile Alert Facility

1. Proposed Quebec #1 Missile Alert Facility Capital Outlay Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretative plans and exhibits</th>
<th>$100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(this includes professional services for developing an interpretative/exhibit plan, introductory video, an interactive computer kiosk, exhibits, signs and brochures)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site access and landscaping</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(this includes entrance signage, upgrading the entrance road and parking area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Capital Outlay Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>$100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Proposed Quebec #1 Missile Alert Facility One-Time Start Up Costs

Initial Equipment costs:
The site will require the following equipment to maintain and operate the site – Lawn mower and trimmer, various power and hand tools, ladder, vacuum cleaner, and general cleaning materials.

Total Cost   $5,000

3. Biennium Operations & Maintenance Budget

Conditions – SPHST used Fort Fetterman as the example of how to manage the MAF. SPHST has three seasonal employees to maintain and operate Fort Fetterman. This appears to be the level of staffing SPHST will need to maintain and operate the MAF. The site will be operational from May 1 to September 30 each year. The site will be open seven days a week from Memorial Day to Labor Day and 40 hours a week in the shoulder season. SPHST will require three additional seasonal employees to maintain and operate the MAF during this period.

Three Seasonal Employees: (100 series funds)
SPHST currently pays seasonal employees $9.75 per hour. When you include workman’s compensation this totals almost $11.00 per hour. Biennium cost is $45,000.

Operations and Maintenance Cost: (200 series)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>$9,600 per biennium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$400 per month (gas, water, phone, electrical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarm System</td>
<td>$2,200 per biennium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$500 call-back (annual), $500 maintenance (annual), $100 batteries (annual)
Maintenance                      $3,100 per biennium
(cleaning supplies, service supplies, lawn mower fuel/fertilizer/weed killer, maintenance costs)
Biennium cost is $15,000

**Summary of Biennium O&M Budget costs**
Seasonal Employees: (100 Series Funds) $45,000
Support Services: (200 Series) $15,000
**Total Cost** $60,000

**Summary of Total Project Costs**

**One-Time Interpretation and Start-Up Costs**
Capital Outlay Costs $165,000
One Time Start Up Costs $5,000
**Total** $170,000

**Ongoing Biennial Budget Expenses**
Biennium O&M Costs **Total** $60,000
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APPENDIX II

JANUARY 11, 2013 LETTER FROM UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
Colonel Christopher A. Coffelt  
Commander, 90th Missile Wing 
5305 Randall Avenue 
F. E. Warren AFB WY 82005-2266 

Mr. Milward Simpson  
Wyoming Director of State Parks and Cultural Resources 
2301 Central Ave 
Cheyenne WY 82003 

Dear Mr. Simpson 

My staff is currently consulting with you on the proposed demolition of the Peacekeeper Missile System. During this consultation it was determined that the proposed demolition constituted an "adverse effect" to historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR 800.5. We intend to mitigate these effects through the development of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Office. This MOA would stipulate that F. E. Warren Air Force Base shall transfer Missile Alert Facility Q-01 to the State of Wyoming for use as a museum and interpretive center. 

We are formally asking your office to consider this as a future State Historic Site. In order to facilitate a transfer, we are willing to retain ownership of Q-01 until these mitigation measures are feasible. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Travis Beckwith at (307) 773-3667. 

Sincerely 

[Signature]

CHRISTOPHER A. COFFELT, Colonel, USAF