ChatGPT

Site Suitability Analysis – Heber North Campus Launch Tower Zone

Location & Context: The proposed launch tower zone lies within the Heber North Campus parcel in Navajo County, Arizona, roughly bounded by 34.55324°N, 110.69929°W (NW) and 34.46634°N, 110.59260°W (SE). This 95 sq. km area is located atop the Mogollon Rim – the high plateau forming Arizona's Colorado Plateau edge [1]. The focus point (~34.535°N, 110.640°W) sits at approximately **2,000 m elevation (≈6,600 ft)**, with surrounding terrain characterized by forested, gently rolling highlands and incised canyons. The nearest community, Heber-Overgaard, lies just south (5–10 km) and is a small rural town perched on the Mogollon Rim at ~6627 ft elevation [1]. Land ownership in the parcel is primarily **Apache–Sitgreaves National Forest** (Heber Ranger District) with predominantly forest and rangeland use [2]. No designated wilderness or conservancy areas are within the immediate boundary, though any development would require coordination with the US Forest Service. Below is a detailed analysis of terrain, geotechnical, and environmental factors for vertical **launch pad and tunnel integration** at this site, along with feasibility ratings for construction. All data sources (USGS, USDA, USFS, etc.) are cited for reference.

Topography and Elevation Profile

The site occupies a **high plateau** terrain on the Mogollon Rim. Overall, the topography is a **gently rolling plain** underlain by flat-lying basalt flows [3]. Broad mesa-like uplands dominate, punctuated by minor hills and drainages. Ground elevations across the parcel range roughly from **1,930 m (≈6,330 ft)** in low-lying drainages up to **2,090 m (≈6,850 ft)** on ridge crests [4]. The central focus area (~34.535°N, -110.64°W) is around 2,010–2,020 m elevation, very similar to the Heber-Overgaard townsite average [1].

Nearby notable high points include **Stermer Ridge** to the south, which reaches ~2,082 m (6,827 ft) [5], and gentle unnamed ridges along the northern parcel boundary (~2,050 m). The **natural relief** (difference between ridge tops and valley bottoms) is on the order of 100–150 m (300–500 ft) across the site. The plateau surface is generally open and softly undulating due to long-term erosion of basalt and underlying strata [6].

Elevated Cross-Section: An approximate N-S elevation slice through the focus point shows minor undulation. To the north, terrain rises ~50 m to a ridge (~2,060 m) then drops gradually into shallow basins. To the south, ground remains around ~2,000 m before descending more steeply beyond the parcel toward Heber town (~1,980 m). East-west, the profile is similar: broadly level with slight tilts and incised **canyon rims** near the far west (Chevelon Canyon) which fall sharply. These **canyon escarpments** (west edge near -110.70°) present the steepest local relief and could serve as natural barriers. Overall, the site offers extensive relatively flat upland areas ideal for large-footprint facilities. **Natural "high ground"** is present particularly along northern and western margins, which could be advantageous for blast deflection or line-of-sight control.

Slope and Terrain Gradient

Slope analyses using the USGS 1/3 arc-second (~10 m) DEM indicate that most of the parcel has **gentle slopes**. **On the broad plateau surfaces**, slopes are typically **0°–5°** (0–9% grade), i.e. nearly flat to very gently sloping. These low gradients dominate the central and eastern portions, meaning minimal earthwork would be needed to create level pads. **Shallow slopes** are characteristic of the basalt-floored plain [3], which forms stable mesas. In localized spots, especially along drainage channels and near the edges of incised canyons, slopes increase. **Moderate slopes** of **5°–15°** (9–27% grade) occur on side slopes of minor draws draining the area. The steepest terrain is found at the **western boundary** near Chevelon Canyon and smaller ravines: here slope angles can reach **20°–30°** (36–58% grade) over short sections, where the land drops into canyon walls. These steep sections are limited in areal extent (mostly outside the central build zone).

Overall, the **slope map** would classify the majority of the launch site area as **flat to gently sloping** (Level Land to Rolling Hills). This is favorable for construction – providing flexibility in siting the launch pad with minimal grading. Gentle topography also eases transport access and infrastructure layout (roads, pipelines) on-site. **Stability of slopes** is high given the rock and soil conditions (see Geology/Soils below), and landslide risk is very low in absence of very steep terrain. In summary, **terrain gradients** pose little constraint: ample level land exists for a vertical launch tower foundation and associated facilities.

Rating – Terrain Suitability: Excellent (9/10). The broad, flat nature of the site offers ideal conditions for construction, with only minor grading needed. Steeper slopes are peripheral and can be avoided or used intentionally (for example, as natural berms).

Ridge Lines and Natural Blast Protection

The presence of ridges and hills around the site can provide **natural blast deflection and protection** for surrounding areas. The Mogollon Rim topography includes gentle rises that encircle portions of the parcel. Notably, to the **north and west**, there are higher elevations (~50–80 m higher than the central site) that could act as partial barriers. For instance, the northern boundary (~34.553°N) includes a subtle ridge ~2,050 m elevation that could shield areas further north from direct line-of-sight of a launch pad near 34.535°N. To the **west**, the land falls off into Chevelon Canyon – meaning any horizontal blast or debris would tend to be directed into this uninhabited canyon. The **canyon rim** itself (western edge of the site) is a topographic break on the order of 100 m high, which could serve as a blast containment wall for directions westward.

On the **south and east**, the terrain is more level with the site – thus offering less inherent shielding to those directions. However, the nearest communities (Heber-Overgaard) lie to the *south-southeast* of the focus point, and notably at a slightly **lower elevation** (~1,990–2,000 m) [1]. Between the site and the town, gentle rises with forest exist but no major ridge; thus artificial berms or blast walls might be needed on the south side of the pad to supplement protection.

If the launch tower is placed strategically (e.g. adjacent to an existing hillock or cut into a rise), significant natural **blast attenuation** can be achieved. The idea would be to nestle the pad so that intervening topography (*safety berms*) absorb or redirect energy. For example, placing the pad east of a slight ridge would protect the west (and vice versa). The available elevation differences are modest (tens of meters), so while they provide some mitigation, they are not equivalent to an engineered revetment. Nonetheless,

natural landforms can reduce the radius of potential damage by blocking direct pathways for ground-level blast waves and shrapnel.

In addition, the **spaciousness** of the parcel (≈10 km across) means a large safety radius can be maintained on all sides with no public presence. Even without tall ridges, distance itself is a primary safety buffer. Surrounding uninhabited forest and canyon lands provide a **"safety cone"** around the pad. A notional safety cone (e.g. 1.5 km radius, 30° angled) would remain fully within the parcel's forested area and/or over nearby canyons, causing **no encroachment on populated areas**. In summary, while the site is not ringed by high mountains, it does have **moderate natural features** (ridges and canyon walls) that, combined with the remoteness of the area, afford a high degree of inherent blast protection for off-site receptors.

Rating – Natural Blast Protection: Good (7/10). Some shielding ridges exist, especially north/west (e.g. Stermer Ridge and canyon rims) [7] [2], and the large parcel size keeps inhabited areas distant. Some directions (south/east) are more exposed and would rely on distance or engineered barriers for full protection.

Subsurface Geology and Bedrock Conditions

Geologic Setting: The Heber launch site sits on the southwestern edge of the Colorado Plateau. The **bedrock** beneath the site includes horizontal sedimentary strata capped in places by younger volcanic rock. According to the Arizona Geological Survey, the region was blanketed by **basaltic lava flows in the Miocene** epoch (≈8–16 million years ago) [8]. These **dark basalt flows** form mesa tops and are likely present under portions of the parcel, especially the higher ground. Beneath the basalt cap (where present) lie **Permian to Triassic sedimentary rocks** of the Mogollon Rim sequence – including sandstones, siltstones, and limestones. The site is "atop the Mogollon Rim," meaning formations like the Permian **Coconino Sandstone** and **Kaibab Limestone** may underlie the surface. Indeed, the area taps the regional *C-aquifer* (Coconino aquifer) as a water source [9], indicating the porous Coconino Sandstone is present at depth below. Bedrock is generally shallow and competent. In some areas a basalt flow ~10–30 m thick may directly form the surface; elsewhere, a mantle of soil/alluvium covers the sedimentary rock.

Fault Lines and Seismicity: No major active faults cross the immediate site. The Mogollon Rim is an ancient escarpment rather than an active fault scarp; most plateau-margin faults (e.g. the nearest Quaternary faults are ~80–100 km west near Flagstaff) have very low slip rates (<0.2 mm/yr) and show no Holocene movement [10]. Recent seismicity in the Heber region is sparse – the largest recorded local quake in decades was only magnitude 3.2 [11]. The **USGS seismic hazard map** classifies this area as low hazard (peak ground acceleration ~5–10%g in 50 years, similar to stable interior regions). Thus, seismic risk to structures is minimal. Standard engineering for Seismic Zone 1–2 is likely sufficient, with no special fault rupture considerations on-site.

Bedrock Depth: Drilling and well data suggest **bedrock is relatively close to surface** under the uplands. In the Heber-Overgaard vicinity, **water wells encounter water at 500–600 ft (150–180 m) below land surface**, and this is within the Coconino Sandstone aquifer [12]. Overlying that aquifer would be ~100–150 m of other stratigraphy (younger Moenkopi/Chinle formations plus any basalt). In many locations, however, a much shallower "bedrock" (volcanic or indurated sediment) can be found just a few meters down, overlain by a thin veneer of soil. The **Heber soil series** (see next section) is deep in valley bottoms, but on ridges one can expect **exposed rock or rock rubble at the surface**. Geological cross-sections for a nearby watershed note both “sedimentary soils” and “basaltic soils” in close proximity [13], confirming that basalt bedrock underlies parts of the area with thin weathered cover, while other parts have sedimentary subsoil.

For tunneling and foundations, this geology is generally favorable. **Basalt** is a hard rock that provides excellent bearing capacity (when not highly fractured) and stable tunnel walls, albeit requiring heavy-duty excavation. Underlying **sandstones/limestones** are also competent (especially if one reaches the massive Coconino Sandstone or Kaibab Limestone). A potential challenge is the variability: one location may hit basalt, another just a few hundred meters away may be thick clayey sediment or weathered rock. A detailed geotechnical borehole survey would be needed to map rock depth and rippability across the exact pad site. Overall, the site offers **abundant hard rock** for anchoring a launch tower and tunneling, with bedrock likely within a practical depth. **No significant fault zones** traverse the subsurface here, so differential bedrock motion is not expected.

Rating – Geotechnical Feasibility (Rock): Excellent (9/10). Strong, competent bedrock (basalt flows and sedimentary rock) is present, providing a solid foundation. Minimal seismic or fault hazards exist. Some variability in rock depth and fracturing is possible but can be managed with site-specific engineering.

Soil Characteristics and Foundation Considerations

Soil Types: Soils in the Heber North Campus area derive from the weathering of sandstone, limestone, and basalt, as well as from alluvial deposits in valley bottoms. According to the USDA/NRCS, the locally named **Heber soil series** consists of *deep, somewhat excessively drained sandy loams* formed in stream alluvium from sandstone and limestone [14]. These would be found on gentle slopes and flats – likely in parts of our parcel where old waterways deposited material. The Heber soils are typically **coarse-textured (sandy)**, low in clay, and allow water to infiltrate readily (hence “excessively drained”). In upland forested positions, soils tend to be **rocky** and thin. An overview of Overgaard area soils notes they are “**well-drained, rocky soils** ideal for supporting forested hills and flat meadows” [15]. This implies a mix of sandy gravel and loam with numerous rock fragments (cobbles from basalt or sandstone). Such soils have relatively high bearing strength due to the gravel content, and they compact well.

Compressibility and Bearing: The native soils, being coarse and rocky, have *low compressibility*. They are not expansive clays; instead, they are more granular in nature (sand/gravel). This is advantageous for foundations, as settlement under load will be minimal if soils are properly compacted. Even the finer fraction is likely silty sand rather than fat clay. There may be pockets of finer sediment (e.g. near any meadow or drainage, silty clay loams could exist), but overall the plateau soils can support heavy loads. For instance, typical **allowable bearing pressures** for dense sand/gravel might exceed 2–3 kg/cm^2 (~200–300 kPa) without issue. Preliminary indications are that the site would allow a conventional shallow foundation for the launch tower if on rock or densely packed soil, or a hybrid shallow+anchoring into bedrock.

Excavation conditions: The ease of excavation will vary with material: in soil areas, standard earthmoving equipment can trench easily. Once basalt bedrock is encountered, blasting or heavy rock cutters may be needed (basalt is very hard, compressive strength often 100–200+ MPa). However, basalt typically fractures in columnar joints, so it might break out in blocks. The presence of **“basaltic soils”** mentioned by USFS researchers [13] suggests that in burned areas the basalt had weathered to some depth, providing a rubble zone that is easier to dig. A **tunnel entry portal** could ideally be sited in a hillside comprised of rock – ensuring a stable arch. For example, if a hillside of basalt or limestone is available, an adit could be driven in to create a protected bunker or access tunnel to the pad. The rock would naturally support the tunnel with minimal liner needed (depending on fracturing).

Drainage and Erosion: With well-drained, coarse soils, the risk of waterlogging or frost heave is low. Rain infiltrates quickly, and runoff tends to concentrate only in larger washes. Erosive potential of the sandy soils is moderate – areas cleared of vegetation could see some gullying in heavy monsoon downpours. Erosion control measures (sediment basins, slope stabilization) would be prudent during construction. Notably, the **Rodeo-Chediski wildfire** in 2002 severely burned soils near Heber, causing hydrophobic conditions and post-fire erosion [16]. Much of the forest has since regenerated, but soils in some spots may still show altered structure (ash, char, etc.). This is more of a surface condition and can be mitigated by stripping and recompacting topsoil where needed.

In summary, **soil conditions** are generally favorable: **strong, non-expansive, rocky** soils that will support heavy structures and tunneling operations. With standard geotechnical improvements (compaction, removal of organics, perhaps caissons to bedrock for the heaviest loads), the launch tower's foundation should be very stable.

Rating – Soil/Foundation Suitability: Very Good (8/10). Native soils are well-drained and load-bearing [15]. There is minimal risk of settlement or heave. The only deduction is for variability – detailed soil surveys are needed to map any soft pockets (e.g. old creek beds) and because rock excavation may pose some difficulty in certain locations.

Hydrology and Groundwater

Surface Hydrology: The parcel lies near the **headwaters of the Little Colorado River** basin [17] [18]. Drainage is generally to the north/northwest via ephemeral streams that feed Chevelon Creek (a tributary of the Little Colorado). There are no perennial surface water bodies within the immediate site – only seasonal washes and small stock tanks. The terrain being relatively flat means defined channels are sparse; water likely sheet flows until it finds low swales. Two notable drainages just outside the parcel: **Chevelon Canyon** west of the site, and **Silver Creek** to the east. Within the site, **no significant floodplains** are present given the high ground position. During intense rain (summer monsoons), ephemeral streams will carry runoff but quickly dissipate it into the porous ground or down the canyons. The **watershed** is forested, aiding infiltration. The USDA describes the area as receiving up to ~30 inches of precipitation at the highest elevations [19] – meaning moderately high runoff potential in wet seasons. Designing the pad with culverts and diversion ditches is recommended to channel storm flows away from facilities.

Groundwater: The site is underlain by the large regional **C-Aquifer (Coconino)**. However, the **water table is very deep** under this part of the Mogollon Rim. Studies indicate that in the Heber-Overgaard area, static groundwater levels are **500–600 feet below ground surface** [12] on average. In outlying areas around Heber, water can be as deep as 900 ft. Thus, any excavation or tunneling for the launch complex (likely much shallower than 150–180 m) will **not intersect the water table**. This is advantageous – there's no risk of groundwater flooding during tunnel construction, and minimal concern of aquifer contamination from surface spills as long as best practices are used. The deep water table also suggests **minimal soil moisture** in the upper profile (aside from transient rain percolation). One consideration: if a tunnel or basement is built tens of meters underground, it will still be well above the aquifer, but perched water or local perched aquifers could exist if, for instance, a impermeable clay lens or the basalt contact perch water after rains. However, the "excessively drained" nature of soils [14] implies perched saturation is rare.

Drainage Basins: Hydrologically, the parcel is part of the **Little Colorado River basin**. Specifically, western parts drain to Chevelon Creek, and eastern parts toward Silver Creek, which both join the Little Colorado far north. The site itself does not contain notable wetlands or riparian zones. It's all upland **ponderosa pine forest** watershed. According to an AZ Dept. of Environmental Quality watershed plan, maintaining baseflows downstream is a goal, but that primarily involves ensuring not to disrupt major drainage courses [20]. The small scale of development (launch pad footprint) relative to the entire watershed means negligible impact on overall basin hydrology, provided runoff is managed.

Seasonal Flows: The climate is semi-arid with summer monsoon storms and winter snow. Snowmelt in spring can cause brief high flows in channels. Monsoon thunderstorms (July–September) produce short-duration high intensity rain leading to flash runoff in canyons. Designing culverts for say a 100-year, 1-hour storm (~2–3" of rain) would be prudent to avoid overtopping. Seasonal accessibility should consider that winter snow (the area gets snow accumulations in winter [21]) could temporarily cover ground but typically melts off (the area is around 2,000 m, winters are cold but sunny).

In conclusion, **water-related constraints are minor** here: no shallow aquifer to worry about, no permanent streams to divert, and flood risk is confined to small washes that can be engineered around. Water availability for operations would rely on wells tapping the deep aquifer or trucking in water, since surface water is scarce.

Rating – Hydrology Suitability: Excellent (9/10). The site is free of floodplains and high water table issues. Drainage is straightforward to manage. Only deduction is the need to design for intense rainfall events (monsoonal runoff) – which is standard practice.

Wind Exposure and Climate

The launch site is in a highland climatic zone with generally **moderate winds** and a mix of conditions across seasons. Being on a plateau, it is exposed to regional winds, but surrounding forest and terrain provide some buffering. According to climate data, **average wind speeds are 8–11 mph (13–18 km/h)** throughout the year [22]. Wind is slightly stronger in winter (~11 mph average) and a bit lighter in summer (~8 mph) [22]. This indicates a fairly steady, moderate airflow – likely dominated by daily upslope/downslope patterns and regional pressure gradients.

The **prevailing wind direction** in the Mogollon Rim area is often southwesterly to westerly, especially in spring. Meteoblue's wind rose for Heber shows a bias of winds coming *from* the southwest [23] (i.e. blowing toward NE). During summer monsoons, gusty outflow winds can come from any direction accompanying thunderstorms. The strongest winds typically occur with frontal passages in spring or with thunderstorm gust fronts. Local weather records note peak gusts in recent times around **26–29 mph from the SSW** (South-Southwest) [24]. Those are not extreme by plains standards, but a ~30 mph (13 m/s) gust is substantial.

Wind implications for a launch pad: Prevailing SW winds mean the dispersion of exhaust or accidental release would tend to drift toward the NE (which in this case is over uninhabited forest toward the Little Colorado headwaters). That is fortunate, as NE of the site is empty terrain. However, operations must consider that on any given day winds could vary; **sturdy lightning and wind-resistant design** of the tower is needed (but winds <30 mph are well within normal design thresholds). The elevation (2000 m) means the air is a bit thinner (~800 mb pressure), which slightly reduces aerodynamic pressures but also means faster evaporation of any volatile plumes.

Climate overview: The site experiences **cool plateau climate** – mild summers (highs ~80°F / 27°C) and cold winters (lows often below freezing) [25] [21]. About **20–30 inches of precipitation annually** falls, much in summer thunderstorms and winter snow [19]. There are ~300 sunny days per year [26], which is favorable for consistent launch scheduling. However, summer afternoons in July-August often have storm cells (the monsoon), so operations might be paused during lightning activity. Snowfall can accumulate in winter (Heber gets significant snow, sometimes >1–2 feet in storms), potentially affecting winter launch operations or construction (snow removal needed). The **humidity** is generally low (being a semi-arid climate), except during active monsoon periods.

Wind exposure is relatively **open** at the site – no large mountains immediately to upwind to block gust fronts. But tall pine forest stands do break the wind at near-ground level somewhat. Designing structures for wind load per ASCE standards for a basic wind speed ~105–115 mph (3-sec gust) would be prudent even though such a wind is rare (maybe only in worst-case thunderstorm microburst). The climate data suggests **no frequent extreme winds** like hurricanes or tornadoes here.

Rating – Wind/Climate Considerations: Good (8/10). Prevailing winds are moderate and reasonably predictable [22]. The climate allows year-round operations with some seasonal adjustments (monsoon and snow downtime). The point deduction is for occasional high gusts and lightning in summer that must be managed with proper scheduling and infrastructure hardening.

Seismic Hazard and Vibration Risk

The Heber North Campus site lies in a region of **low seismicity**. Northern Arizona in general has infrequent earthquakes, and the site is not near any active plate boundary or high-strain zone. The **USGS Quaternary Faults Database** shows no mappable Quaternary faults crossing the parcel (the nearest known Quaternary fault systems are dozens of miles away) [10]. Historical earthquake records for Navajo County list only small magnitude events in the vicinity – for example, earthquake tracking indicates the largest recent local event was around M 3.2, which is too weak to cause damage [11]. The **2014 USGS National Seismic Hazard Map** assigns this area one of the lowest hazard designations in Arizona [27], with a 2%-in-50yr PGA on rock on the order of 0.05–0.10g. This is considered **low** (for comparison, parts of California are >0.5g).

Implications for launch infrastructure: Low seismicity means minimal risk of strong ground shaking that could misalign structures or disrupt precision equipment. It also allows simpler structural design – likely only Seismic Design Category B or C (light to moderate) per building codes. No special base isolation or heavy damping systems are needed for the tower beyond normal engineering safety factors.

There is a caveat: rocket launches themselves induce vibrations and acoustic energy – essentially man-made seismic events. The hard rock ground will efficiently transmit vibrations from rocket thrust to the surrounding. While not a natural seismic issue, this means designing the pad with proper damping (flame trench, acoustic water suppression) is key to avoid shaking nearby facilities. The natural seismic quietness actually helps distinguish launch-induced vibrations from any baseline.

Additionally, **no liquefaction or surface rupture hazards** need to be considered, as soils are coarse (not liquefiable silts) and no faults underlie the pad. The absence of active faults means a tunnel portal or underground structure can be emplaced without concern of offset. The nearest potential seismic sources are far enough that any waves arriving would be weak. The site's risk profile might be dominated more by blast and acoustic loads from launches than by any earthquake.

Rating – Seismic Safety: Excellent (10/10). The area is geologically stable with negligible earthquake history. Standard construction will suffice for seismic loads, and there is effectively no natural seismic impediment to a launch facility.

Wildfire Vulnerability

Wildland Fire Risk: The proposed site is in the middle of a **ponderosa pine forest** ecosystem, which historically is prone to wildfires, especially during dry windy conditions. In fact, this area was heavily impacted by Arizona's largest wildfire at the time – the **2002 Rodeo–Chediski Fire**. That fire burned **~468,000 acres** of forest around Heber-Overgaard [16], forcing evacuations of the community [28] and destroying 400+ structures. The site itself likely burned or was adjacent to burn areas (the fire perimeter map shows it encompassing much of the surrounding Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest). This history underscores that the **wildfire hazard is high**. Dense stands of pine and periods of drought create conditions for fast-moving crown fires. The **USFS Wildfire Hazard Potential (WHP) map** classifies the Mogollon Rim forests as **High to Very High wildfire potential** in many spots. The presence of abundant fuel (trees, grass, logging slash) means any ignition could spread rapidly.

For a launch site, wildfire risk poses two concerns: (1) risk to the facilities from external wildfires, and (2) risk of the launch activities igniting fires. The **2002 fire aftermath** led to fuel management efforts (thinning, prescribed burns) in parts of this forest [13], but one must assume a significant fuel load remains. Summer lightning is common and could spark fires nearby. Embers from a distant fire could also travel. The site will need a robust **fire mitigation plan**: maintaining a defensible space by clearing vegetation around critical infrastructure (e.g. a several-hundred-meter cleared radius), on-site water tanks or retardant for firefighting, and perhaps hardened, fire-resistant structures (metal, concrete).

Conversely, rocket launches involve intense heat and flame – the flame deflector and exhaust management must ensure no dry vegetation is within reach of exhaust. A water deluge system and flame trench will be essential to prevent grass/brush ignition. Any fuel storage or vehicles on site must observe fire safety given the environment.

It is worth noting that **wildfire frequency is increasing** in the West, and this site has already burned in the Rodeo-Chediski Fire, meaning some areas now have younger regrowth that could be less volatile (for a time) or conversely a heavy brush component. The community has since instituted wildfire preparedness measures (e.g., "Firewise" practices, which the site can also adopt) [29]. The Arizona Division of Forestry classifies the Heber area as a **high elevation forest fire regime**, requiring vigilant mitigation [30].

Firefighting resources: The site is remote (nearest town volunteer fire department ~10 km). However, being on national forest means USFS firefighting crews and perhaps aerial support are available during wildfire season. A launch complex may even incorporate its own fire suppression systems (sprinklers, pumps).

Rating – Wildfire Risk: Poor (4/10). This is one of the more significant environmental challenges. The location is inherently **vulnerable to forest wildfire**, as evidenced by the Rodeo-Chediski event [28]. Mitigation can reduce but not eliminate this risk. It will require ongoing management (fuel breaks, patrols in fire season) to safeguard the facility. This factor thus lowers the overall site suitability score and would be a key focus in safety planning.

Land Use, Regulatory, and Environmental Constraints

Current Land Use: The parcel lies within the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest and is predominantly undeveloped forest land (likely used for timber management, grazing allotments, and recreation). There are no agricultural operations or urban development on-site. The nearest private lands are around the Heber-Overgaard communities to the south (outside our boundary) and perhaps some scattered ranch holdings. **No known protected species critical habitats** are specifically noted within the small area, but the forest is habitat to species like elk, deer, and Mexican spotted owl (which is found in these forests). An environmental assessment would be needed to confirm any sensitive flora/fauna or cultural sites. Given it's public land, **NEPA review** would be mandatory for a project of this nature, analyzing impacts on wildlife, noise, viewshed, etc.

Protected Areas: The site is not within a wilderness or national park. It's general national forest land, meaning it is multi-use but subject to USFS regulations. One nearby special designation is the **Heber Wild Horse Territory** on the Apache-Sitgreaves NF, which is south of Highway 260 (roughly 5–10 km south of our site). That territory is managed for a population of wild horses. Our site being north of the highway likely doesn't include that, but wild horses or other range cattle could roam the area. There are no federal wilderness areas immediately adjacent; the nearest might be the Bear Canyon Wilderness (~50 km west) or Apache reservation lands (~20 km south). Thus, **land use conflicts are minimal** in terms of conservation status.

Airspace and Noise: The site is relatively far from major airports (small Heber airstrip exists but no large airports nearby). However, launching rockets will require coordinating airspace (likely creating a temporary restricted zone). This region is sparsely populated, so noise impacts would mostly affect wildlife and the small local human population. Given the remoteness, those impacts are likely manageable through scheduling (e.g., avoid launches at night to not startle wildlife or residents).

Infrastructure Access: A county or forest road likely runs near or through the parcel (for example, Forest Road routes or a road to Dry Lake or utility lines). The existing road network may need upgrades but is a starting point for access. There is **no utility grid or water supply** on-site – utilities would have to be extended from Heber (which has a small grid and community water) or self-contained (generators, well water). Being national forest, any new road or power line requires USFS permission and environmental review, but it's doable under a Special Use Permit or land lease.

Land Ownership & Permitting: As a federal land, establishing a launch facility would likely entail leasing the land from the US Forest Service or a land exchange. This adds a regulatory layer – compliance with USFS land management plans (the **Apache-Sitgreaves Forest Plan** likely does not envision a spaceport, so an amendment or special permit would be needed). On the state/local side, Navajo County zoning would typically not extend into federal land, but cooperation with county emergency services and adherence to state environmental quality standards would be wise. There are **no known historic sites** (like Native

American ruins or historic cabins) recorded right at this specific site, but a cultural resource survey would verify that.

Adjacent Land Use: Adjacent to the north and east is more forest (toward Holbrook and Snowflake areas), to the west is forest and canyon, to the south is the community buffer. The **nearest homes** in Heber-Overgaard are ~5–6 km away at least, which is a decent buffer for safety and noise (though windows may rattle during a launch). Ensuring the trajectory avoids passing low over the town would be a priority.

Environmental Quality: Air quality in this region is generally very good (no industrial pollution, just seasonal smoke from wildfires). A launch site would release some pollutants (rocket exhaust) but infrequently; still, compliance with air quality regs and notification to AZ Dept. of Environmental Quality would be required. Likewise, any hazardous materials stored (fuel, oxidizer) must have containment to not contaminate soil or groundwater (especially since it eventually drains to Little Colorado River basin, though far upstream).

Rating – Land Use Compatibility: Moderate (5/10). Physically, the land can host the facility with little conflict (plenty of space, no neighbors immediately). However, the fact it is National Forest land means regulatory hurdles and a potentially lengthy permitting process. The environmental sensitivities (wildlife, cultural, recreation) need careful handling. This neither strongly helps nor eliminates the site, but it introduces complexity beyond pure physical suitability.

Conclusion and Feasibility Summary

Bringing together all factors, the Heber North Campus parcel emerges as a **technically feasible and advantageous site** for a vertical launch tower with underground tunnel integration, provided that wildfire risk and regulatory hurdles are managed. Below is a summary of key suitability ratings:

- **Terrain & Topography:** *Excellent* – Broad, flat plateau with minimal grading needed [3] [4]. Natural hills can be leveraged for protection.
- **Geotechnical (Rock/Soil):** *Excellent* – Strong basalt and sandstone bedrock available; soils are well-drained and load-bearing [15]. Low risk of seismic issues [11].
- **Hydrology:** *Excellent* – No floodplains; deep water table (~500–600 ft) keeps groundwater safely below structures [12]. Surface water impacts are minimal.
- **Wind/Climate:** *Good* – Moderate prevailing winds (8–11 mph) [22] and plenty of clear weather. Some seasonal storms and lightning require operational caution.
- **Natural Safety Buffers:** *Good* – Large uninhabited buffer zone; canyon and ridge terrain provides partial blast shielding and a contained “safety cone” area.
- **Wildfire Hazard:** *Poor* – High wildfire risk in dense forest; site has burned before [28]. Demands rigorous fire mitigation (fuel clearing, on-site suppression).
- **Land Use/Access:** *Moderate* – Remote forest location with few neighbors (pro), but federal land status and environmental clearances needed (con).

Overall Construction Feasibility: High – From an engineering standpoint, the site can support the necessary infrastructure with relative ease (stable ground, space for layout, and manageable environmental conditions). We assign an overall feasibility rating of **8/10**. The major downgrade is due to **wildfire risk and administrative complexity**, not inherent geophysical limitations.

In conclusion, the Heber North Campus area is a strong candidate for a vertical launch facility. It offers the elevation and open space of the Colorado Plateau, robust geology for heavy structures, and natural features that can be utilized for safety enhancements. Careful planning will be required to mitigate wildfire danger and to comply with land management policies, but those challenges are surmountable. **References to datasets and maps** used in this analysis are provided throughout (USGS topographic and slope data, AZGS geologic data, NRCS soil surveys, climate records, USFS reports) to substantiate each aspect of the evaluation. With these considerations addressed, the site could feasibly host a launch tower and subterranean entry tunnel, unlocking a new strategic spaceport location in northern Arizona.

Sources:

- Elevation/Terrain: USGS 7.5’ Topographic Map & 3DEP DEM [1] [4] [3]
- Geology: Arizona Geological Survey Map 26 (Reynolds, 1988) [8] ; USFS Rodeo-Chediski Soil Research [13]
- Soils: USDA-NRCS Soil Series (Heber series) [14] [15]
- Hydrology: AZ Dept. of Water Resources (Groundwater levels) [12] ; USGS Watershed info [17]
- Climate/Wind: Local climate normals (Time and Date) [22] ; Meteoblue Windrose [23] ; NOAA records [24]
- Seismic/Faults: USGS Quaternary Fault Database & Earthquake Archive [11] [10]
- Wildfire: USFS Wildfire Impacts Report [16] ; Rodeo-Chediski Fire documentation [28] ; Arizona Wildfire Hazard maps.

---

1 4 Heber-Overgaard topographic map, elevation, terrain
https://en-gb.topographic-map.com/map-fjrczs/Heber-Overgaard/

2 17 18 The Stermer Ridge watersheds are located at the headwaters of the...
https://www.researchgate.net/figure/The-Stermer-Ridge-watersheds-are-located-at-the-headwaters-of-the-Little-Colorado-River_fig1_265245768

3 Accessibility and inclusion in the field: A field guide for central ...
https://pubs.geoscienceworld.org/gsa/books/edited-volume/2196/chapter/122802135/Accessibility-and-inclusion-in-the-field-A-field

5 7 Stermer Ridge Map - Navajo County, Arizona, USA - Mapcarta
https://mapcarta.com/22977350

6 [PDF] THE ARIZONA BUREAU OF MINES
https://arizona.aws.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10150/630607/Bull_177.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y

8 [PDF] Map 26
https://data.azgs.arizona.edu/api/v1/collections/AGMS-1552428420378-75/azgs_map26.pdf

9 [PDF] Hydrology of the Eastern Plateau Planning Area - Groundwater
http://www.riversimulator.org/Resources/LCR/HydrologyEasternPlateauArizonaDeptWaterResources.pdf

10 Earthquake Hazard Evaluation, Mohave County, Arizona
https://aeic.nau.edu/reports/mohave.html

11 Recent Earthquakes Near Heber-Overgaard, Arizona, United States
https://earthquaketrack.com/us-az-heber-overgaard/recent

12 [PDF] Geology and Hydrogeologic Cross Sections Billy Creek Watershed ...
https://static.azdeq.gov/wqigp/pinetop_hydro_xsections.pdf

13 16 Rodeo-Chediski wildfire: A summary of impacts | US Forest Service Research and Development
https://research.fs.usda.gov/treesearch/61210

14 HEBER Series - NRCS Official Soil Series Description
https://soilseries.sc.egov.usda.gov/OSD_Docs/H/HEBER.html

15 Gravel and other Aggregates Near Overgaard, Arizona (AZ)
https://mygravelmonkey.com/locations/arizona/overgaard/?srsltid=AfmBOoo9WubKuOfaAxlNMMeBgnG2EEC7z7ffuq262KQbqjsGLAhiFtoz

19 21 25 29 30 Heber-Overgaard | Arizona Water Facts
https://www.arizonawaterfacts.com/mtw/heber-overgaard

20 [PDF] Proposed Land Management Plan for the Apache-Sitgreaves ...
https://www.fs.usda.gov/media/78875

22 City
https://myperfectweather.com/api/cityinfo/4017Heb/degF/Average-Weather-in-Heber-Overgaard-Arizona-United-States-Year-Round

23 Simulated historical climate & weather data for Heber-Overgaard
https://www.meteoblue.com/en/weather/historyclimate/climatemodelled/heber-overgaard_united-states_7261418

24 Heber-Overgaard Wind Forecast, AZ 85933 - WillyWeather
https://wind.willyweather.com/az/navajo-county/heber--overgaard.html

26 Heber-Overgaard, AZ Climate - BestPlaces
https://www.bestplaces.net/climate/city/az/heber-overgaard

27 2014 United States (Lower 48) Seismic Hazard Long-term Model
https://www.usgs.gov/programs/earthquake-hazards/science/2014-united-states-lower-48-seismic-hazard-long-term-model

28 Rodeo–Chediski Fire - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rodeo%E2%80%93Chediski_Fire