8.1.3  PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT DOCUMENTS—DRAFT EIS

Individuals who commented on the Draft EIS at one of the seven public hearings are listed in table 8.1.3-1 along with their respective commenter ID number. This number can be used to find the public hearing transcript document and each speaker’s comments and to locate the corresponding table on which responses to each comment are provided.

Public Hearing Comments

Exhibit 8.1.3-1 presents reproductions of the public hearing transcript comment documents that were received in response to the Draft EIS. Comment documents are identified by commenter ID number, and each statement or question that was categorized as addressing a separate environmental issue is designated with a sequential comment number.

Response to Public Hearing Comments

Table 8.1.3-2 presents the responses to substantive comments to the Draft EIS that were received in public hearing transcript form. Responses to specific comments can be found by locating the corresponding commenter ID number and sequential comment number identifiers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentor and Affiliation</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Sykes</td>
<td>P-T-0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Garcia - Alaskans for Peace and Justice</td>
<td>P-T-0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Cleary - Citizens Opposed to Defense Experimentation Code</td>
<td>P-T-0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Mikels - Ventura County Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Miller - Congressman Elton Gallegly</td>
<td>P-T-0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Craven - City of Camarillo</td>
<td>P-T-0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lagomarsino - Former Member of U.S. Congress</td>
<td>P-T-0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Schillo - Retired Ventura Co. Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Volante - Councilmember from City of Port Hueneme</td>
<td>P-T-0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Long - Ventura County Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Herrera - City of San Buenaventura</td>
<td>P-T-0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Chaffee - Nuclear Age Peace Foundation</td>
<td>P-T-0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Conroy</td>
<td>P-T-0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Davey - Rockwell Scientific Company</td>
<td>P-T-0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Faubion - Ventura Peace Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Birr - The Beacon Foundation</td>
<td>P-T-0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Conneen</td>
<td>P-T-0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Dodd</td>
<td>P-T-0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Eagle</td>
<td>P-T-0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Norten</td>
<td>P-T-0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Roman</td>
<td>P-T-0021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hayes</td>
<td>P-T-0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Heitman</td>
<td>P-T-0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sirofchuck</td>
<td>P-T-0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Stevens</td>
<td>P-T-0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Stevens - Kodiak Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>P-T-0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Milligan</td>
<td>P-T-0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Foreman - Kodiak Island Convention &amp; Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>P-T-0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Carver</td>
<td>P-T-0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mohr - Executive Director, Port of Everett</td>
<td>P-T-0030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst Petsold</td>
<td>P-T-0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flowers</td>
<td>P-T-0032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jackson</td>
<td>P-T-0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrie Trautman</td>
<td>P-T-0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nagel</td>
<td>P-T-0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Salsman</td>
<td>P-T-0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Moses</td>
<td>P-T-0037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Windt</td>
<td>P-T-0038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Selden</td>
<td>P-T-0039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentor and Affiliation</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Williams - Tulalip Tribes</td>
<td>P-T-0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Baker</td>
<td>P-T-0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elden Boothe - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Carucci</td>
<td>P-T-0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobert Parker</td>
<td>P-T-0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Marinelli</td>
<td>P-T-0046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Morikawa - Fellowship of Reconciliation</td>
<td>P-T-0047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen Redford</td>
<td>P-T-0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Kajihiro - American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>P-T-0049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Dodge</td>
<td>P-T-0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Aila</td>
<td>P-T-0051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Keko'olani-Raymond - Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Yee - Office of Hawaiian Affairs</td>
<td>P-T-0053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Murray</td>
<td>P-T-0054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gosline - 'Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalama Niheu - Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Chism/Lowell</td>
<td>P-T-0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Ruhge</td>
<td>P-T-0058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COLONEL NORGARD: Good evening. I am Colonel Kevin Norgard. I live here in Anchorage. I am the Director for Site Activation Command for GMD. The Missile Defense Agency, formerly known as the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, is the Department of Defense agency responsible for developing and testing a Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the following chart, I will briefly describe the GMD Extended Test Range, provide an overview of the GMD, how it works, and address the decisions that will be made. But before I do, I would like to describe the overall concept of the Ballistic Missile Defense System under development and explain the different segments of the system.

This chart represents the flight of a ballistic missile. A ballistic missile flight path has three basic parts, which we call segments. Those segments are the boost segment (when the missile is traveling through the atmosphere), the midcourse segment (the middle, or ballistic phase, and the terminal segment (where the missile re-enters the earth's atmosphere). Within each of these segments, our missile program has to this point been characterized by discrete, independent programs (which we call elements). Each element worked to shoot down ballistic missiles in that particular segment of flight.

Now, however, the Missile Defense Agency is moving toward an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System. Instead of having discrete, stand-alone elements, we plan to eventually tie the programs for the various elements together so we can shoot down missiles in all segments of flight.

Each segment of Ballistic Missile Defense System could include several elements, which are different ways of providing a defense against the threat missile during the same phase of flight. All segments and elements are designed to work together as such element is developed. At the same time, each element could provide an effective stand-alone defense against a specific type of threat.

The GMD Element is part of the Midcourse Defense Segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. The GMD element is the successor to the National Missile Defense System and includes the same components.

The concept of the GMD element would consist of the components shown on the slide. These components are the Ground-Based Interceptor, existing early warning radars, and satellited, the X-Hound Radar, which performs tracking, discrimination, and assessment of the incoming missile, the Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System, the Missile Defense Command Control, which is the central communication and control point, and finally, the In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal, which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor while the interceptor is in flight. The GMD Extended Test Range may not include all of these elements.

The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This slide indicates the proposed locations for the various components in the Extended Test Range.

As you can see, the extended test range could include components in the Lower 48 through the Pacific and here in Alaska, Kodiak and near the end of the Aleutian Islands uninvolved.

The GMD testing would be of two types. One type of testing would involve an increasingly robust Ground-Based Interceptor flight-test in the Pacific region in scenarios that are operationally realistic as possible. The other would type involve validation of the operational concept through integrated ground test using GMD components. These are the tests using Fort Greely and other locations analyzed in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment. These ground tests do not involve missile flights or intercepts.

The Draft EIS, which is the subject of this hearing, evaluates the first type of GMD testing, involving intercepter flight-testing. This intercepter flight-testing will be the focus of our discussion tonight.

As you can see from this slide, the existing intercepter test capability includes the use of the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and the Reagan Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. Current testing includes launching target missiles from Vandenberg Air Force Base, and launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the Reagan Test Site, with intercepts occurring over the open ocean area. The ground-based radars at the Reagan Test Site is used to track, discriminate, and provide updates to the interceptor during flight, while a radar on Oahu is used as a tracking sensor. For some tests, target missiles are also launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex and viewed by the Early Warning Radar at Beale Air Force Base. Current capability does exist to launch target missiles from the Pacific Missile Range Facility as well. These scenarios present a very limited capability to demonstrate the effectiveness of the GMD element because the Ground-Based Interceptor can be launched only from the Reagan Test Site. This limits ability to test the system in operationally realistic environment.

The extension of the existing GMD test range would increase the realism of GMD testing by using multiple engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometries, distances, speeds of targets, and interceptors to closely resemble an operational scenario involving attack by one or more threat missiles. We are proposing to add dual target and Ground-Based intercepter launch capability at the Kodiak Launch Complex and on Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also proposed are mobile target launch capability and ship-based radars.

The proposed Extended Test Range would provide more operationally realistic flight-testing, as President Bush and Congress have directed.
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Again, equal consideration will be given to all comments, whether they are presented here tonight, e-mailed to us or submitted by regular mail.

Once the Final EIS is complete, we will mail it to all of the individuals who requested a copy. If you are not on our mailing list you can request a copy by writing to the street address here, or to the e-mail address given in the handout, or by filling out a card at the registration table tonight. That concludes the environmental portion of the meeting tonight and I'll turn it back over now to Mr. Michaelson for conclusion of the meeting.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. We are ready to begin calling out the names of those you indicating that you would like to make comments tonight. We have a reserved area, right behind this gentleman seated in front of me for speakers. What I would like to do is I will read out the first few names and if you will come up and sit in those seats it will make the process run more efficiently. We will be using this podium right in front of me for public comments. I will be calling on you in which order you signed up and because we like to record your comments fully and accurately we ask that you speak clearly into the microphone, because of the acoustics it will be important that you speak clearly that to make sure that the Court Reporter can capture everything you have to say. Also, at the beginning of your speaking time state your name for the Court Reporter.

We kindly request that you observe the four-minute limit for oral comments. We are using the four-minute limit in all the hearings in all the states where they are being held to give everyone a fair and equal chance to make their comments. We greatly appreciate your understanding and cooperation in observing this limit.

To aid you in knowing when the four minutes are up, I have a simple method for indicating time. After three minutes, I will raise my index finger indicating that you have one minute left. This should help you find a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. And at the end of four minutes will hold up my closed hand, indicating it is your time is finished. So it is important to look up at me occasionally from your paper if that is what you are doing so you won’t miss the signal.

I have one other request, that is: you please withhold any expressions whether for or against anything a speaker has to say. Speaking in public can be very intimidating, and this will ensure that everyone has an equal chance to offer their comments. This will also ensure that the Court Reporter is capturing all of your comments, expressions until the speaker is finished. Thank you in advance.

If you choose not to make an oral comments remember that you can also hand them in writing, mail them in, email them in so there is a variety of ways to do that and again written comments are given the same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight.

Again, remember there is no decision being made here tonight. The main purpose of the government representatives being here is to learn first hand of your concerns and suggestions. We are going to read the names of the first several speakers and if you would come up to the reserved area I would appreciate it. Jim Sykes, Greg Garcia, Terry Paulo and Don McKenna. Actually, we are going to take a minute to rearrange the microphone.

JIM SYKES: Thank you very much my name is Jim Sykes. I come from Palmer, AK. I appreciate the mailings. I have received the Executive Summary and one other mailing. I would recommend cutting your postage cost though. These two items cost $17.00 for the American taxpayer, which, I thought, was a little excessive. I come here tonight because I have two concerns. One is conceptual, and the other is environmental. I was recently made aware the top Pentagon evaluator of Weapons Programs is Mr. Thomas P. Christy issued a report that asked some serious questions about this whole thing. I think they are kind of starting. He is the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation. Another, clause from the report says, in FY22 the GMD, the Ground-based Midcourse Missile System Program continued to demonstrate the technical feasibility of intercepting a ballistic with a ballistic against single target interceptors however, due to the stage of development and the following testing annulled the GMD element has yet to demonstrate significant operational capability. I think that is a long phrase meaning it doesn’t work. Another item on the report talked about the early entry weapon into production as being a questionable way to go, and I quote “One of my chief concerns is the potential for systems to de-credential the rigorous acquisition process and enter into full reproduction or into the hands of our war fighters without learning operational capabilities and limitations demonstrated by adequate operational testing and evaluation.” Although you might see that as an argument for additional testing so now understand that missiles are going to be installed in Fort Greely without full testing and that brings to question it may make Alaskans at greater risk from one of our own American rockets and then any little fire sticks that North Korea could send our way. And, this concerns me greatly because I don’t see any such evaluations of a potential catastrophe from one of our own rockets that is untested landing on our own waters or land here in Alaska. I think it needs to be part of the examination. There is something else, another quote from the report “I recognized and agreed in principle with the desired to field new capabilities as soon as possible but that desire should be tempered with responsibility to ensure the weapon will not put the Americans at risk and this is precisely the case that we are facing here with an early deployment and your asking for extended test ranges when the operational capabilities of the rockets haven’t even proven to work. In many times in the cases so far and we don’t know how many test were dumbed up.

In relation to the Environmental Impact Statement itself, I did not have the benefit of seeing the whole thing I only have the Executive Summary but I found three troubling entries. One is there is no health or safety issues said to be important enough to recognize in the Impact and Mitigations Summary for the Kodiak Launch Complex and the Ground-Based Interceptor or target. In the broad ocean area there is biological resources said no adverse impact. I think we have to recognize it for a long time, you know kind of seeing the ocean as a big toilet because it takes just takes everything away and nothing happens. I
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EVERTT, WASHINGTON

GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENCE
EXTENDED TEST RANGE
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

MS. ELLIOTT: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for coming tonight. I am Julia Elliott, and I am with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I have been asked by the Missile Defense Agency to serve as the moderator for tonight’s hearing. This is one of seven public hearings being held on the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement. During tonight’s hearing, we will refer to the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense as GMD, and we will refer to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.

This public hearing is being held in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and implementing regulations. The act requires federal agencies to consider the potential environmental impacts of their activities in the decision-making process.

The purpose of tonight’s hearing is to provide you with information on the GMD program and proposed GMD Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize the findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your comments on the Draft EIS.

Let’s look at the agenda for tonight. After I finish the introduction, Commander Robert Dees of the Ground Based Midcourse Defense X-Band Radar Project Office will describe the proposed GMD flight test activities. Then Ms. Sharon Mitchell, Program Manager for the EIS, will describe the process called for in the National Environmental Policy Act. She will also present the environmental analysis and results of the Draft EIS.

The last item on the agenda, the public comment portion, is really the most important. Remember that the Draft EIS is just that — a draft. This is your opportunity to tell the GMD Project Office how it can improve its analysis of potential environmental impacts before the document is finalized and before a decision is made on whether or not to proceed with the proposed action.

Now a few administrative points on making comments tonight. If you have already signed up to speak, that’s good. I have approximately five sign-up cards already. If you have not already filled out a card and would like to speak tonight, please go to the registration table and sign up. Everyone is
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welcome to speak, but it makes the process run more smoothly if I can call on people from a sign-up list. We will also have a reserved area up here of six seats that will be for upcoming speakers, so we can move through the process efficiently.

Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of four minutes and may speak only once. You may not combine or yield speaking times to other people. Elected officials will be given the courtesy of speaking first. All other speakers will be called in the order in which they signed up. There is a court reporter here today, seated to my left, making a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all of your oral comments will be recorded accurately. As part of preparing that transcript, an audio and video recording is being made of tonight's hearing as well.

If you are uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also provide verbal comments by telephone. There is a toll-free telephone number indicated on the handout that you may use for recording those comments.

You may also submit written comments. There are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in written comments that you brought with you tonight either to me or to a person at the registration table. Second, you may use the written comment sheets that are available at the registration table to write down any comments you wish to make and turn them in tonight. Third, you may mail written comments to the name and address that appear on the comment sheet. Or last of all, you may e-mail comments to the address listed on the handout for tonight's hearing.

Your comments will be entered into the formal record of public comments on the Draft EIS, and they will be given the same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight.

If you choose to mail in comments, please note that they must be postmarked by March 24th, 2003 to be considered in the Final EIS.

Also, if you would like to receive a copy of the Final EIS when it becomes available, there are several ways you can do that. If you have already received a Draft EIS in the mail, you are already on the mailing list and will automatically receive the Final EIS, unless you tell us otherwise. If you provide either oral or written comments, you will be sent a copy of the Final EIS. If you are not on the mailing list, you may fill out a request at the registration table. You can also request a copy by sending an e-mail to the address...
listed on the handout. Also, copies of the Final EIS will be placed in area libraries. A list of those libraries is available at the registration table and can also be found in the Draft EIS. The Final EIS will also be put on the Missile Defense Agency website listed on the handout.

Finally, it is important for you to understand that the Government representatives are not here tonight to make any decision. Their main purpose in being here is to listen firsthand to your suggestions and concerns. With that, we will begin with Commander Dux’s presentation.

COMMANDER DUX: Good evening. My name is Commander Robert Dux, and I am a technical advisor for the GMD X-Band Radar Project Office. The Missile Defense Agency, formally known as the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, in the Department of Defense agency responsible for developing and testing a Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the following charts, I will briefly describe the GMD Extended Test Range, provide an overview of the GMD and how it works, and address the decisions to be made. But before I do, I would like to describe the overall concept for the Ballistic Missile Defense System under development and explain the different segments of the system.

This chart represents the flight of a ballistic missile. A ballistic missile flight path has three basic parts, which we call segments. These segments are the boost segment, when the missile is thrusting and leaving the atmosphere; the midcourse segment, the middle or ballistic phase; and the terminal segment, where the missile re-enters the earth’s atmosphere.

Within each of these segments, our missile program has to this point been characterized by discrete, independent programs, which we call elements. Each element worked to shoot down ballistic missiles in a particular segment of flight.

Now, however, the Missile Defense Agency is now moving towards an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System. Instead of having discrete, stand-alone elements, we plan to eventually tie the programs for the various elements together so we can shoot down missiles in all segments of flight. Each segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense System could include several elements, which are different ways of providing a defense against the threat missile during the same phase of its flight. All segments and elements are designed to work together as each element is developed. At the same time, each element could provide an effective
stand-alone defense against a specific type of threat.

The GMD element is part of the Midcourse Defense Segment of the Ballistic Defense System. The GMD element is the successor to National Missile Defense and includes the same components.

The conceptual GMD element would consist of the components shown on the slides. These components are the Ground-Based Interceptor; existing early-warning radars and satellites; the X-Band Radar, which performs tracking, discrimination, and assessment of the incoming missile; the Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System; the Battle Management Command and Control, which is the central communication and control point; and finally, the In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal, which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor while the interceptor is in flight.

The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This slide indicates the proposed locations for the various components in the Extended Test Range. Of particular importance locally -- and it may be hard to see -- is the Sea-Based Test XBR & IBT. This is the part of the system that we are considering for homeporting in the Everett Naval Station.

The GMD testing would be of two types. One type of testing would involve increasingly robust Ground-Based Interceptor flight testing in the Pacific region in scenarios that are as operationally realistic as possible. The other type would involve validation of the operational concept through integrated ground tests using GMD components. These are the tests that may be conducted at other locations analyzed in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment. These ground tests do not involve missile flights or intercepts.

The Draft EIS, which is the subject of this hearing, evaluates the first type of GMD testing, involving interceptor flight-testing. This interceptor flight-testing will be the focus of our discussion tonight.

As you can see from this slide, the existing interceptor test capability includes the use of the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and the Reagan Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. Current testing includes launching target missiles from Vandenberg Air Force Base and launching
Ground-Based Interceptors from the Reagan Test Site, with intercepts occurring over the broad ocean area. The ground-based radar prototype at the Reagan Test Site is used to track, discriminate, and provide updates to the interceptor during flight, while a radar on Oahu is used as a tracking sensor. For some tests, target missiles are also launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex and viewed by the Early Warning Radar at Beale Air Force Base. Current capability does not exist to launch target missiles from the Pacific Missile Range Facility as well. These scenarios present a very limited capability to demonstrate the effectiveness of the GMD element because the Ground-Based Interceptor can be launched only from the Reagan Test Site. This limits our ability to test the system in an operationally realistic environment.

The extension of the existing GMD test range would increase the realism of GMD testing by using multiple engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometries, distances, speeds of targets, and interceptors to closely resemble an operational scenario involving attack by one or more threat missiles. We are proposing to add dual target and Ground-Based Interceptor launch capability at the Kodiak Launch Complex and/or at Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also proposed are mobile target launch capability and shipborne radars. The proposed

Extended Test Range would provide more operationally realistic flight testing, as President Bush and Congress have directed.

A Sea-based Test X-Band Radar, or SXK, is proposed to support the Extended Test Range flight-testing. This SXK is a multi-function radar that performs tracking, discrimination, and intercept assessment of incoming target missiles. The SXK would be assembled at an existing shipyard on the United States Gulf Coast.

Three conceptual SXK performance regions have been identified to accomplish effective radar coverage for flight-testing. The SXK would operate within the confines of one of the three performance regions based on the needs of the particular flight test scenario. Potential primary support bases have been identified based in part on their proximity to these performance regions.

Approximately 10 to 12 days before GMD operational tests, the SXK would leave the Primary Support Base to travel to its performance region in the Pacific Ocean.

The SXK would be stationed at its primary support base between flight test missions. The SXK would have a deep
draft, which would restrict it from many harbors. The SRK may dock to a deep-draft pier if it is available between missions. If a pier is not available, the SRK would most likely be moored 3 to 10 miles off shore while at the primary support base. Potential locations for the primary support base analyzed in the Draft EIS were Port of Valdez and Adak, Alaska naval base Ventura County/San Nicolas Island, near Oxnard, California; Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii; Naval Station Everett, Washington; and Reagan Test Site, Republic of the Marshall Islands. Daily activities provided by the support base might include logistics, re-supply, and maintenance and repair. Radar operations in the vicinity of the Primary Support Base may include tracking of satellites and calibration devices. Vessels from the Primary Support Base would re-supply the SRK. During transit between the primary support base and the test location, periodic radar operation for satellite and calibration devices tracking, including joint satellite tracks with GMD sensors and other pre-mission activities may also occur.

Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS, which may meet some of the enhanced test objectives, include launching target and/or interceptor missiles from the Kodiak Launch Complex, adding interceptor missile launches from Vandenberg Air Force Base, and launching target missiles from mobile platforms over the broad ocean area. The target and interceptor missiles could be launched in sets of two under some testing scenarios from either the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, or Vandenberg Air Force Base.

In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminals would be constructed in close proximity to the proposed Ground-Based Interceptor launch sites and expected intercept area. Existing launch sites and test resources would continue to be used in enhanced test scenarios. Launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the Kodiak Launch Complex may require up to two additional small mobile radars and telemetry stations in South Central or Southwest Alaska for telemetry and flight safety.

Existing shipborne sensors would be used for mid-course tracking of the target missile during Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Sea-Based Test X-band Radar would be constructed and used in tests to perform tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missiles.

The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for the GMD extended test range testing. For Alternative 1, we would propose the following components: First, single and dual
Ground-Based Interceptor launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex and the Reagan Test Site; second, single and dual target launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and the Reagan Test Site; and third, single target launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and a mobile target launch platform. Construction of two Ground-Based Interceptor silos, an additional target launch pad, and associated support facilities would be needed at the Kodiak Launch Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the Kodiak Launch Complex and at a location in the mid-Pacific. The SBX would be used in tests for tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missiles.

Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1, with the exception that Ground-Based Interceptor launches would be from Vandenberg Air Force Base instead of from the Kodiak Launch Complex. The Ground-Based Interceptor Launch would require construction of an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal and modification of existing support facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base.

Alternative 3 would combine activities proposed for Alternatives 1 and 2 and would include Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base, and construction of the required support facilities.

Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD Extended Test Range would not be established and interceptor and target launch scenarios could not be tested under more operationally realistic conditions. The SBX would not be developed. Testing at the existing GMD test ranges using existing launch areas would continue.

The decision to be made is whether to enhance the current GMD flight test capability by selecting from the list of alternatives presented, including the no action alternative.

The Missile Defense Agency is still evaluating the feasibility, safety, and utility to the GMD testing program of conducting a limited number of checkout Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely. The possibility of such flights is too speculative to be analyzed at this time. The Missile Defense Agency will perform an EIS if and when it proposes to conduct Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely.

This concludes the Program Overview. Now I would like to introduce Mrs. Sharon Mitchell, who will describe the...
Environmental Analysis Process.

MS. MITCHELL: Hello. My name is Sharon Mitchell. I'm with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I am the Program Manager for the preparation of the EIS on behalf of the Missile Defense Agency.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires that federal agencies consider environmental consequences of their proposed actions in their decision-making process. The Missile Defense Agency has decided to prepare an EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act to analyze the environmental effects of extending the current GMD Test Range.

As you may be aware, the first phase in the preparation of an EIS is to conduct what is called scoping, to identify environmental and safety issues that should be addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping meetings were held in Kodiak, Anchorage, Adak, and Valdez, Alaska; Guam and Lompoc, California; Honolulu, Hawaii; and Seattle, Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal and state agencies were held to obtain their views concerning the proposed action, its alternatives, and potential environmental effects within their areas of expertise or which are of particular concern to them. Following scoping, the next step was to further refine the feasible alternatives being considered for GMD Extended Range testing. The Draft EIS was then prepared to address reasonable alternatives, including the no-action alternative, reasonably foreseeable future actions, and information on cumulative effects. The Draft EIS has been made available to federal and state agencies and to the general public for review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this comment period, public hearings are being held to receive public input. That brings us to tonight's hearing.

All comments received will be reviewed and considered in preparing the Final EIS. The Final EIS will then be made available to the public for a period of 30 days. No sooner than 30 days after the release of the Final EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will make public its decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Extended Test Range activities.

The Missile Defense Agency identified 15 environmental resource areas that normally require some level of analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on those areas with the most potential for environmental impacts. Each resource area was addressed at each location unless it was determined through initial analysis that the proposed activities would
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not result in an environmental impact to that resource.

The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with implementing the Proposed Action or its alternatives. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with licenses or permits required to implement the proposed action at each of the potential extended test range sites.

The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference several existing environmental analyses associated with current Ballistic Missile Defense System test assets that include the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also incorporated by reference is the analysis of environmental impacts contained in the GES Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment.

The Draft EIS also analyzed the potential for cumulative impacts from other Department of Defense, Government, and commercial activities in areas where OMD actions are proposed.

The potential environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIS are presented in the next several slides. For your convenience, this information has been reproduced as a fact sheet, which is available at the registration table for your review. I would like to highlight a few resource areas that may be important to you. As you can see, minimal impacts are identified from the implementation of the proposed action. Most of the impacts are minimal because the proposed actions are a continuation of existing activities at various locations.

At the Naval Station Everett, an Electromagnetic Radiation/Electromagnetic Interference survey and analysis would be conducted as part of the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process. The results of the survey would be used to define the safe operating area for the OMD. This area would not interfere with airspace operations and would allow for a safe operating environment.

The small quantities of potentially hazardous materials used during construction activities would result in generation of added wastes that would be handled by Naval Station Everett under their normal waste management procedures. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would follow U.S. Navy requirements that, to the maximum extent practical, ships shall retain hazardous waste aboard ship for shore disposal.

In compliance with Uniform National Discharge Standards, the
Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar vessel would incorporate marine pollution control devices, such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues, and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices, in design or routine operation. Handling and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in accordance with State of Washington, Department of Transportation, and Department of Defense policies and procedures.

Implementation of OEB operational safety procedures, including establishment of controlled areas, and limitations in the areas subject to illumination by the radar units would preclude any potential safety hazard to either the public or workforce.

As you can see, the Draft EIS analyzed these resource areas for the other potential primary support bases at Naval Base Ventura County, California; Adak and Fort of Valdez, Alaska; and Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Impacts at each of these sites are expected to be minimal.

The Kodiak Launch Complex, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, the Reagon Test Site, and Vandenberg Air Force Base all have ongoing missile operations. Impacts to air quality, hazardous materials, and health and safety would be minimal from continuation of existing launch activities.

Likewise, the impacts to biological resources would be similar to those from ongoing activities. We expect no adverse impacts to threatened and endangered species.

In particular at the Kodiak Launch Complex, socioeconomic impacts could be expected because of the potential for lodging shortages during the tourist season due to launch activities. To reduce the potential for a lodging shortage, the Missile Defense Agency is considering construction of an addition to the Narrow Cape Lodge and/or the construction of an additional mancamp.

In closing, please keep in mind that our goal is to provide decision-makers with accurate information on the environmental consequences of this proposal. To do this, we are soliciting comments on the proposed OEB Extended Test Range Testing. This feedback will support informed decision-making.

In addition to tonight's hearing, written comments on the Draft EIS will continue to be accepted until March 24, 2003, at the address shown on the slide. After the comment period is over, we will consider all comments, as we conduct the
analysis. Again, equal consideration will be given to all comments, whether they are presented here tonight, e-mailed, or submitted by regular mail to us.

Once the Final EIS is complete, we will mail it to all of the individuals who requested a copy. If you are not on our mailing list, you can request a copy by writing to the street address or e-mail address given in the handout, or by filling out a card at the registration table.

I will now turn the hearing back over to Mr. Elliott.

MS. ELLIOTT: We will now break for a 5-minute recess, and then we will begin taking your comments. If you would like to make verbal comments, please complete the verbal comment card provided at the registration table and turn it in to a person at the registration table.

Please remember that no decision is being made tonight. The main purpose for the government representatives’ presence here tonight is to learn firsthand of your concerns and suggestions.

Thank you for your comments and your courtesy during the evening. 5-minute recess, please.
their comments.

To aid you in knowing when the four minutes are up, I have a simple method for indicating time. After three minutes, I will raise my index finger, indicating that you have one minute left. This should help you find a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. At the end of four minutes, I will raise my closed hand, indicating it is time to finish your comments. So it is important to look up from your paper occasionally to see if you are being given a signal.

I have one other request that will need to be enforced for the sake of the court reporter. That is, you must withhold any expressions either against or in favor of the speaker until the speaker is finished. Otherwise, there is no way that the court reporter can get all of the comments. So while you may be agreeing with the speaker by clapping or speaking out, you are probably making certain that we are not capturing the comments on the record. Please hold all of your expressions until the speaker is finished. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

We also greatly appreciate your cooperation and understanding in observing the four-minute limit. Also keep in mind that oral comments are only one way to share your thoughts and concerns regarding the Draft EIS. You can also hand in written comments tonight, e-mail them, or submit them by regular mail by March 24th, 2003. As I mentioned, written comments are given the same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight.

With that in mind, we will begin. Our first speaker is John Mohr. He will be followed by Horst Petzold.

Mr. Mohr: Good evening. My name is John Mohr. I’m the Executive Director at the Port of Everett. I would like to say that assuming that the no-action alternative is not chosen, the Port is generally supportive of the siting of the SBK platform in Everett. However, it is necessary for us to obtain a more complete understanding of the possible impacts associated with such a facility in Everett. Consequently, the Port recommends that the following items be further studied and evaluated in greater detail in the Project Environmental Impact Statement: one, possible impacts to ship navigation, berthing, and maneuvering at the Port’s deep-draft terminal area; two, possible impacts to recreational, commercial -- recreational and commercial boat traffic in the Snohomish River Channel; and three, possible impacts associated with radar operations while the platform is in port including
those related to public health and safety be given specific considerations; and finally, possible heightened security measures that might impede shipboard commerce as a result of the siting of the PSE be considered. Satisfactory answers to these questions would help the Port confirm its support of the PSE platform in Everett. Thank you.

MS. ELIOT: Horst Petzold and then John Flowers.

MR. PETZOLD: My name is Horst Petzold. I speak with an accent. I hope you understand us. I like to know where you locate the platform in Everett. The next question is: Is there any radiation involved in the testing which affects the public? The next question is: Is any noise involved in the way of electronic noise? I experience quite some electronic noise in my house. I live close to the radio tower. Something is going on. Apparently the Navy is testing something, but we don't know. It's a possibility which I would like to bring up here. Is there any other interference during the testing period? Will the platform work independently, or is the platform connected to any high-voltage or whatever power? For how long will this platform sit over here in Everett? Forever? Or only a period of time during the testing? [Inaudible]. I have a lot of experience in weather science, and I would like to

know if there is any possibility under the area. Thank you for listening.

MS. ELIOT: John Flowers followed by Bob Jackson.

MR. FLOWERS: John Flowers. I'm an attorney in Everett. I've practiced law in Washington since 1984, and in California I practiced there since 1966. I'm here tonight to speak for my adult children and my 12 grandchildren, many of whom are too young to understand what's happening, but would be extremely upset with their grandfather if they knew he had an opportunity to speak out against these things and didn't take the opportunity. I want to present to the people who make these decisions the dilemma they are facing. I'm going to spend most of my time -- half of my time on each dilemma. The first dilemma is that all the defects that were pointed out in the Star Wars system in the early '80s that caused it to be cancelled then -- the only information I have is what I read in the newspapers and on the Internet, but I don't believe that those defects have been corrected. Prices have gone way up. We can ill-afford a system that costs billions and billions of dollars in light of our huge budget deficits, which we are dumping on our children and grandchildren.

Every Minuteman-Model type device like this one in history has been defeated with a small inexpensive countermeasure, which
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led to more weapons, more expensive weapons, to try to
overcome something else. The walls of Jericho were defeated.
The walls of Rome were defeated. The Maginot Line in Europe
was defeated by a simple and run around it, and this Maginot
Line will be defeated as well. The cancellation of the ABM
Treaty triggered off -- it's going to trigger off a massive
new arms race, which the arms race earlier we experienced up
to '89 bankrupted the Soviet Union, caused its collapse just
before it bankrupted our country. But let me just pause for
a moment and present to you -- and I hope this is annexed in
your analysis over the coming months -- what if this system
works perfectly? What are the consequences of that? We have
a long history of developing weapon systems and sharing them
with, quote, allies like Osama Bin Laden, Sadam Hussein, the
Shah of Iran, Ferdinand Marcos. We give them or sell them
these weapons on credit and they have the possession of them,
and then they have a regime change and then we have to fight
the very weapons that we built. Of course, if this one is
built perfectly, we're going to spend a ton of money trying
to overcome it. I understand that we are going to share it
with China, Russia, and any number of countries around the
world who could have a sudden and unexpected regime change.
Ladies and gentlemen, this is going to trigger off another
arms race. I'm deeply concerned mainly for my grandchildren.
Not only the expense involved, the debt we're dumping off on

them, but the extreme danger we're creating for them. We
ought to be vaying peace and not war. Thank you very much.

MS. ELLIOTT: Bob Jackson and then Norrie Troutman.

MR. JACKSON: My name is Bob Jackson. Twenty years ago,
before there was a naval station in Everett, I used to drive
out past the Puget Tug Company onto a pier near the spot at
which the USS Lincoln and other navy ships now dock. On the
end of that pier there was small public place where I could
watch sailboats and people out fishing for the day. This was
a peaceful place to relax and listen to the sounds of the
gulls, sea lions, and the working waterfront. Later the Navy
came, and that place is gone. Now a walking and bicycle
trail is being planned near the waterfront to give back some
of the shoreline access. People will be able to walk down
part of that trail to the mouth of Pigeon Creek No. 1 where a
small park will again offer this community that close-up,
relaxed look out over the bay. On the bottom of page 36 of
the proposed Environmental Impact Statement, the Draft
statement, it is written that -- and I quote -- "Because this
type of activity consistently occurs at Naval Station
Everett, no impacts to visual resources are anticipated," end
quote. To whoever wrote this part of the statement, it may
not seem like adding the SRX facility would have a
significant impact since there are already many ships here, but that is wrong. Because of its size and extraordinary design, this floating platform would have a huge visual impact. Besides its actual presence, the SEK facility would be a powerful symbol. It is a $900 million component in a proposed anti-ballistic missile system that many of us believe should not be built. This is our community. This is where my wife, my neighbors, and I have chosen to live. Many of us are volunteering our time and labor to make this a more desirable community. We already have our fair share of military resources in Everett. I propose that you choose the no-action alternative. If you decide otherwise, I ask that you choose another location. Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Morrie Trautman followed by Mark Nagel.

MR. TRAUTMAN: My name is Morrie Trautman. It's been a little bit hard for us to gain information on this subject through the website and trying to find specific sites. It's hard to address specific, so I would like to just maybe address some concerns tonight and submit some more in writing later on. One of them is just the very nature of the test itself and that is the open-endedness of it. From what my understanding is is that this is a funded program for a test system that really has no end to it until it goes into --

until it tests out solid and is actually set out in the ocean. In looking at that from a standpoint of a local impact, for us that presence of that thing is forever. If there is no end to the test programs and stuff as they continue, we'll look at it forever. We have already in Everett, by entertaining the Navy and some of the other sites that we have down on the waterfront, have made our contribution to aesthetic deficiencies probably. I don't feel that we're under any obligation to entertain any more or take any more additions. I think we have already made our contribution there. One of the other concerns we have is some of the emissions and stuff or the potential emissions of electromagnetic radiation and electromagnetic interference. What are the safety nets that are in place with this system? What are the redundant safety nets that are in place for the system? What are the what-ifs? What if it fails? What happens? What are the implications to the local population? We have a hospital within blocks that is probably very, very sensitive to these kinds of interferences. So I would like to see that addressed. Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Mark Nagel followed by David Salman.

MR. NAGEL: My name is Mark Nagel, resident of Everett, Washington. What I saw in here, I guess, I kind of concur...
with everybody else that came up before me -- a lot of questions. I really don't see the need for this necessarily. I think it's a continuation of some massive delusions by Edward Teller. At any rate, the visual and aesthetic resources -- again, I have no idea how anybody could determine this would have no impact. Zero impact means an absence of something. There is obviously a presence of something here. So how was this measured? Was it just height? Did somebody say, Well, we already have things that are a certain height, so this falls within that height restriction? This clearly is a noise. How much of the noise is above water and is exposed? Is that the measurement that we should be looking for? With regards to measurement, the fellow before me, is there going to be any sort of independent measurements? Can we really trust our government to give us accurate numbers on the emissions that may be radiating from this unit? I would demand that there would be independent testing for various aspects of this. I know that complex systems mean complex failures. Bigger systems mean bigger failures. Are we really prepared for a big failure? It will happen. I was a little bothered by the statement that there are seven public hearings being made. There's not seven in Everett, people. There's one. There's one. So don't take that number to mean anything other than just one hearing here. I have a couple technical questions that can probably go on the record. They would probably bore everybody here. I guess the operative location is out in the ocean. I'm still, I guess, not sure exactly the various operations of this unit, where, whether this will be towed out and then turned on or it will be operating while it's in the bay. Also, likewise I used to sail out in the bay. I'm concerned about obstruction to our normal recreation. That's what Everett is pushing itself for is a recreational community. What I want to know is what will be the peak and average power levels and on what frequencies? You say that it's safe. Well, there is a over-the-horizon radar in Alaska that's known to cook birds that fly through its beam. I don't consider that to be environmentally friendly for our feathered friends. Technical, is this a phased array or is it a conventional rotating beam? And are there any encoding activities in the outgoing radar pulses? They use all sorts of energy sources to generate data streams. Will this system take advantage of the synthetic ionospheric reflectors that are generated by the Harp -- N-A-A-P -- array on the North Slope in Alaska? And that's it.

MS. ELLIOTT: David Salman followed by Dale Morse.

MR. SALMAN: My name is Dave Salman. My question is one of trust. I trusted tonight I would come here and receive
some information so I could understand the potential problem that this might create in my community. I've got nothing so far, folks. Frankly, I'm sorry about that. You show me a picture. The first thing I see here is an example with no frame of reference to Everett or anything else for that matter. In that as big as Gat Island out there, is it as big as the aircraft carrier when it comes through, or is it like a tug boat? You can't tell from what you're showing us.

It's absolutely useless information. I'm a mechanical engineer, retired. I built equipment of a class that would go on that facility for offshore oil rigs. I've installed it in ports. I've installed Navy hardware in ports. Your environmental record is terrible, okay, from personal observation. If it can happen, it will happen. It happened yesterday. It was all over everything. I'm not an expert on radar, but I am an expert on my mother-in-law's garage door opener. When the aircraft carrier came in, we had hearings like this. I'm sure, and everything was explained like this, I'm sure, but when they turned the radars on dozen at the naval base, my God. My mother-in-law's garage door came open four or five times in the middle of the night -- an 85-year-old lady with the garage door open in the middle of the night. It didn't impress me a whole lot. What really didn't impress me was the Navy's keyword and having for the next nine months and delving the fact that it was the aircraft carrier. A matter of trust. If we can't trust you folks to tell us what's happening, when it's happening, give us assistance in the technical solution of problems, then we don't want you here. Okay? Is that understood? We don't want you here unless you face up to the real problems and be upfront with us. I guess that's what I would like to say tonight. This could be a problem. It might not be a problem. We probably need this. I've got a next door neighbor who is on the Lincoln tonight flying drones over God knows where from the deck of that aircraft carrier. He's not here with his family. I've got some sympathy there, but you people when you're working in a community like this and bring this kind of facility in, let's at least be upfront after the fact when you're operational so we can solve problems as they come up. Okay? Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Dale Moses and then Richard Windt.

Mr. NOVEX: My name is Dale Moses. I have been a citizen here in the county for about nine years. I currently work for the County. I don't intend to speak for the County. I would like to state a case that I'm in favor of the SES project coming here. The previous speaker said we don't want you. I don't include myself in that "we." I suspect there are a few other people that would not want to be included in
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that “we” either. I don’t speak for anyone else. I’m only speaking for myself. I may bring a slightly different perspective than some of the folks in the room. I was a navy officer for 35 years. I was in a project office, the cruise missile project office. I went through a couple sitting exercises, so I would like to speak a bit from what the project may see in bringing the SDX to Everett. Specifically I think the whole area here in Puget Sound, particularly Everett, could be superb for the project. You’ve got a workforce that’s the best of any location that I have ever been stationed. You’ve got a quality of life here in the area and several people have spoken to that already, but that also attracts a very high caliber of engineer and technician, and I think that would be important for the project from your standpoint as well. I think you will also find a high level of support from the community if you were to be here and working from here. Yes, there are perhaps some interesting histories of garage door openers. I happen to be involved in that case, and I might point out that it doesn’t happen anymore. We solved the problem. It took the leadership of the community and some technical expertise in all to get to it. There will be problems with this, I'm sure, but I think from what I’ve seen in the community that the leadership and the elected officials and so forth will work to solve those problems. I may not be totally -- get

everybody in this room to agree with me, but I think it’s a very strong pro-military community and a pro-government and a pro-defense community as well, and I found that nine years ago when I first arrived. It’s one of the reasons why my family and I have stayed. Lastly, I can’t speak for the naval station anymore, but I think you will find it a best organization that can give you some pretty darned good service. I may have a little bit of bias in that because I had something to do with it for a couple years. So in conclusion, I hope that you will continue the project. I can’t speak for its technical abilities, but I think it’s the kind of thing the country needs to be investigating unfortunately, but nevertheless needs to do it. I would like to see Everett have a piece of it. Thank you very much. I might also point out I enjoy watching ships, and this is just another ship to watch. It’s fun to watch sailboats. It’s fun to watch eagles. It’s also fun to watch ships. Thanks.

MS. ELLIOTT: Richard Windt followed by Gail Chier/Lovel.

MR. WINDT: Good evening. My name is Richard Windt. I’m on the Everett Board of Park Commissioners. I was a lieutenant in the navy. My brother is in the army, lieutenant colonel retired. He lives in Huntsville. He has repeatedly been based in Kefalonia, Vandenberg, and Redstone.
Arsenal. I'm familiar with the need for some of these things, and yet I cannot think of a worse place than Everett to put this. It's a large metropolitan area, and you don't place things like this in a large metropolitan area. You place them in Valdez. Almost all the other points that you plan on locating this are better. Jetty Island is a beautiful beach. It's just like an ocean beach. You get out there, and you're completely away from everything. Beautiful. We send boats across there all summer long so our citizens can go out there and enjoy it. What they will be looking at is a 250-foot-high dome sitting right out there. Everett has the largest marina north of Marina del Rey in California. It's a pleasure-boat capital. There were sailboats coming out there Sunday. I have been stopped in my boat going by the naval base. What is the area of restricted flow around this when it's out there? Is it really going to interfere with pleasure boating in the city? I just think it's poor planning to put this in Everett. I hope you do not consider Everett the bare for this. Thank you.

MR. ELLIOTT: Sail Chizen/Lowell.

MR. CHIZEN/Lowell: First of all, I want to thank everybody for coming here tonight because I'm an average citizen living in an above-average city, and I think that our voices of the average citizen needs to be heard. I'm a 57-year resident of Snohomish County, and I have been actively involved in my community and the City of Everett for a number of years. I just learned about this Monday, so my questions aren't really fine-tuned. But the question of livability and what that means to me does not mean that. We have taken our fair share. The Navy is here. They've done a good job of integrating into the community, but when the EIS was done before they came, they didn't have to do the EIS as far as the bay and everything, environmental impacts, they quit in protest because what their studies showed and what they found to be true was not the final report. So that does go to trustworthiness and accountability. Also, the fair share is the whole Puget Sound area. We've got Whidbey Island, Bremerton, Fort Lewis, Everett. We've done our fair share. View is very important. In microwave tower fights, view was an overriding consideration, and that's just one little poll sticking up. I see that as a real detriment. I wonder about the wake coming in and out. Tourism -- I don't really think people are going to come to say, Where is this new radar thing? We have given up a lot of our waterfront, and we are just now trying to take it back and give more to the people of Everett that have put their lives on doing everything to make it a better city. Are there any appeals to this, and what's the process? I also want to talk about the no-entry
zone and how far that would be. Is it going to be different than what the ships are now? I ask you to take a no-action position and to choose -- if you do decide to go ahead with this, to take it out of Washington state. Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: That is all the cards that I have. Is there anyone here who did not submit a card and would like to speak?

MR. SELDEN: My name is Walter Selden, and I live in Everett. My first observation is if this is under full strength, this thing should be put far away from us. That would be testing. If you want to test it under full strength, you can't do that here. I guess how do you do it in half measure? How long is it going to be here? Would it be here and where would it be? Consistent questions. I agree with everyone with one exception. If I ran a business that was a -- and this was my business, would I want this in our bay under quarter-strength or a small-percentage strength, and what effect on us would that be? So if you're testing it, can you not test it under full strength where it needs to be tested full strength? It seems to undermine the whole theory of it being used here is to be here at all. The other thought is, without being completely flippant, it seems when I saw that picture I thought of the moon. My last word

MS. ELLIOTT: Sir, may I ask you to leave the card for me? Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Daryl Williams. I live in Marysville, Washington. I work for the Tulalip Tribes in their Governmental Affairs Office. I'm not going to go into any detailed comments right now because just we found out about this two days ago and haven't had anything to review yet. First of all, I would like to say that we think the Navy has been a good neighbor for us here in Everett. When the base was being developed, we were involved in negotiations for that base because of impacts to our commercial fishing operations. The tribes of this country negotiated treaties that basically allowed the United States to take title to the land, but the tribes gained certain rights as a part of that, and our commercial fishing operations are one of those rights retained in our treaties. The tribes also realize that some sacrifices have to be made in order to provide the early-warning systems that this country needs for military actions. I think that the tribes and the military can work together to work out a solution that's agreeable to both of us if this area is selected. I would like to invite a meeting between the military and the
tribes to discuss the issues. With that, I thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Is there anyone else? Thank you for your
courtesy tonight, thank you for your interest, and thank you
for your participation. Good night.
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1. Then Mr. David Harley, the Chief of the U.S. Army Space and
Missile Defense Command, National Environmental Policy Act
Compliance Branch, will describe the purpose of the
National Environmental Policy Act. He will also present
the environmental analysis and results of the Draft EIS.

2. The last item on the agenda, though the public
comment portion, is really the most important. Remember
that this is a Draft EIS, and it is just that -- a draft.

3. This is your opportunity to tell the OMD Project Office how
it can improve its analysis of potential environmental
impacts before the document is finalized and before a
decision is made on whether or not to proceed with the
proposed action.

4. Now a few administrative points on making
comments tonight. If you’re already signed up to speak --
and we have several already -- that’s great. If you have
not, please go to the registration table and fill out a
card. Anyone who would like to speak tonight, we’d
appreciate it, as long as we can do it from a sign-up list.

5. Everyone is welcome. We also have a reserved area up here
that I’ll ask people to come sit in when we get ready to
take speakers after the presentations.

6. Each speaker will be allowed of four minutes, and
then we’ll rotate. You may not dominate or yield
speaking time to other people. All other speakers will be

---

Exhibit 8.1.3-1: Reproductions of Public Hearing Documents (Continued)
There's a court reporter here today, so you will have a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all of your comments will be recorded accurately. As a part of preparing that transcript, an audio recording is being made of tonight's hearing as well. You may have also noticed the television cameras here. These are not part of the military's effort here. That's cable television who's here tonight doing that.

If you're uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also provide verbal comments by telephone. There is a toll-free number indicated on the handout that you may use for recording those comments. Hopefully everyone got one of those when they came in. It has a lot of important information on the process and how to continue to be involved and make comments.

You may also submit your comments in writing, and there are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in written comments you brought with you tonight either to me or to the person at the registration table. Second, you may use the written comment sheet, again available at the registration table, and hand that in. Third, you may mail written comments to the same address that appear on the comment sheet. And, finally, you may e-mail comments to the address listed on the handout.
And with that, we will begin with Commander Doe.

MR. AILA: Can I ask you a question, sir? I have a question regarding your presentation.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I'm sorry.

As far as the ground rules for the meeting tonight?

MR. AILA: Ok, ok.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Yes, what is your question?

MR. AILA: Well, two questions. First, is this -- my understanding is this is a scoping?

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): No, that is incorrect. Scoping was already held on this at the time of the notice of intent. This is a public hearing on the Draft EIS. That's a later stage of a National Environmental Policy Act process.

MR. AILA: So we're past -- we're past scoping?

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Correct.

Was there a second question?

MR. AILA: Was a meeting held on Gabbi?

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): For scoping?

MR. AILA: Yes.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): David?

MR. HALEY: Yes.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Yes.
HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay, can you come up and use this microphone and ask your question, because I want to make sure if there's anything procedural, we get it straight to begin with, and the court reporter can't hear you speaking from there.

MR. AILA: And I can only speak to the part of the proposal that has to do with Hawaii. I can't speak for the other areas.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Could you identify your name too.

MR. AILA: For the record, my name is William Johnson. I come from Hilo, Hawaii.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.

MR. AILA: -- which is on the western side.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): All right.

What's your second question?

MR. AILA: Second question. First of all,

(inaudible). I come from a rural society, an oral society. So four minutes is not enough for me to, I think, present my thoughts to you, which is what your purpose is here tonight. Okay? So can we have some flexibility? I mean, there aren't that many folks in here tonight; that maybe the four minutes could be exercised or maybe I can speak for four minutes, and if anybody's -- everybody's done and there's time, we can come back.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): We have, you know -- actually, I haven't gotten to the part where I explain about the four minutes and why we do it, but I will go ahead and explain it now.

Basically, this is the seventh of seven hearings. And we've used that four-minute limit at all of them -- California, Alaska, and at Washington and here. And in order to provide consistency of opportunity for everyone, we don't allow more time here, less time there. Then we get this uneven set. So four minutes will be the limit for -- for all comments.

MR. AILA: I disagree because, you know, I'm not in Alaska, I'm not in the Marshalls. I'm not in California. I'm in Hawaii where my ancestors were from, and we're an oral society.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

MR. AILA: And I don't think four minutes is enough. Do you want to say that for the record and you want to make your decision, that's fine.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

MR. AILA: But four minutes isn't enough.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): All right.

Thank you.

COMMANDER SEID: But we can take additional...
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Each segment of the missile defense system would include several elements which are different ways of shooting down the threat missile during that phase of flight. All the elements are designed to work together as each element is developed. At the same time, each element can provide an effective stand-alone defense for a specific type of threat.

The GMD element in part of the Midcourse Defense Segment of the missile defense system. The GMD and Ground-based Midcourse Defense element is a successor to the National Missile Defense and includes the same components.

The conceptual GMD element would consist of the components shown on the slide. These components are the Ground-Based Interceptor, existing early warning radars and satellites, the X-Band Radar, which performs tracking, discrimination, and assessment of the incoming missile; the Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System; the Battle Management Command and Control, which is the central communications and control point; and, finally, the In-Flight Interceptor Communications Signal Processor.

We normally abbreviate that as ID -- abbreviation that as IDT. That's transmitted command to the Ground-Based Interceptor while the Interceptor is in flight.

The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This slide indicates the proposed locations for the various components of the Extended Test Range.

Of particular interest here in Hawaii, out at PEAR, we've already been launching targets. That part would continue. We've also got the Sea-based X-Band Radar, which includes an IDT to talk to the Interceptor onboard the platform. That would be a vessel that would take the X-Band Radar and could relocate to test areas, and in between the test, it would return to a port that would be its primary support base. Oahu's in consideration for the location of the primary support base.

The GMD testing is of two types. One type of the testing would involve increasingly robust Ground-Based Interceptor flight testing in the Pacific region in scenarios that are as operationally realistic as possible. The other type is the validation of the operational concept through integrated ground tests of the GMD components. These tests include fort greatly and other locations analyzed in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept. Environmental Assessment. The ground tests do not involve missile flights or intercepts.

The Draft EIS that's the subject of this hearing evaluates the first type of GMD testing which does include...
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The Draft EIS was made available to the public, to federal and state agencies for review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this period, public hearings, like the one being held tonight, are being held to receive public input. All comments received will be reviewed and considered in preparing the Final EIS. The Final EIS will then be made available to the public for a period of 30 days. And as soon as 30 days after release of the Final EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will make public its decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Extended Test Range activities.

Now, the Missile Defense Agency has identified 15 environmental resource areas that normally require some level of analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on those areas with the most potential for environmental impacts. Each resource area was addressed at each location unless it was determined through initial analysis that the proposed activity would not result in environmental impact to that resource.

The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with implementing the proposed action for its alternatives. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with licenses and permits required to implement the proposed action at each of the

potential Extended Test Range sites.

The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference several existing environmental analyses associated with current Ballistic Missile Defense System test sites that include the Noland Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also incorporated by reference in the analysis of environmental impacts contained in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment.

The Draft EIS also analyzed the potential for cumulative impacts from other Department of Defense, Government, and commercial activities in areas where GMD actions are proposed.

The potential environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIS will be presented in the next several slides. For your convenience, this information has also been reproduced as a fact sheet, which was available at the registration table or on the tables in front of the boards tonight.

I would like to highlight a few of the resource areas that might be important to you. As you will see, minimal impacts were identified from the implementation of the proposed action. Most of these impacts are minimal because the proposed actions are actually a continuation of existing activities at the various locations.
At Pearl Harbor, an Electromagnetic
radiation/electromagnetic interference survey and analysis
would be conducted for the radar as part of the spectrum
certification and frequency allocation process. Results of
the survey would be used to determine potential
interference issues and define the safe operating area for
the SRR. This area would be defined to minimize
interference with airspace operations and allow for safe
operating environment.

The small quantities of potentially hazardous
materials which may be used during construction activities
would result in generation of added waste that would be
handled by Pearl Harbor under their normal waste management
procedures. The Sea-based Test X-band Radar would follow
U.S. Navy requirements that, to the maximum extent
practicable, ships shall retain their hazardous waste
aboard for shore disposal. The SRR vessel would
incorporate marine pollution control devices, such as
keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spils and residues
and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices
during the routine operation. Handling and disposal of
hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in
accordance with State of Hawaii, Department of
Transportation, and Department of Defense policies and
procedures.
therefore, we expect no adverse impacts to threatened
or endangered species.
In particular, at Kodiak Launch Complex, there
was determined a potential shortage of temporary
accommodations during the tourist season due to our launch
activities. To reduce this potential shortage, the Missile
Defenses Agency is considering construction of an addition
to either the North Cape Lodge and/or construction of an
additional barracks in that area.
In addition to tonight’s hearing, written
comments on the Final EIS will continue to be accepted
until March 24th, 2013, at the addresses shown on this slide.
After the comment period is over, we will consider all
comments as we conduct our analysis. Again, I’d like to
stress, equal consideration will be given to all comments
whether they’re presented here tonight, e-mailed, or
submitted by regular mail to us.
And once the Final EIS is complete, we will mail
it to all the individuals who requested a copy. And if
you’re not on our mailing list, you can request a copy by
writing to the street address or e-mail address given in
the hand out or by filling out a card at the registration
table tonight.
I’d like to — now I’d like to turn the hearing
back over to Mr. Michaelson.
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they said there was no document there. There are no
hearings on Kealii. This is the only hearing. The fact
that you have only two --

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Excuse me,

Mr. Kajihara. You're -- I even let you get a little bit
over. I want to make sure we get through everybody's first
chance. And then you can come back up for a second helping.
So --

Mr. Kajihara: Okay. Let me just finish this --
this point. If I could --

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

Mr. Kajihara: -- about the public participation.

The fact that there were only two comments from
Honolua in your scoping process tells you something about
the inadequacy of the public participation.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

Mr. Kajihara: No, I would like to request that a
30-day extension be given to the common period so that we
can notify people that there is this process underway and
that people can make their comments known.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. Thank
you,

Mr. Kajihara: And that's part of my
testimony. Thank you.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): All right.

CARRASCO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 332-0222
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1. The purpose of ensuring that the weapons do what they are
2. supposed to do. It is not a frivolous or an expendable
3. part of the procurement process.
4. "The MRS system has yet to demonstrate
5. significant operational capabilities" — this is according
6. to the Department of Defense. Thomas "Chris"Plouffe —
7. "and its testing program needs to go beyond the typical
8. proof of concept demonstration in order to provide a higher
9. confidence in estimates of operational capability."
10. "What is eye opening is that these programs are
11. the furthest along of all the missile defense systems.
12. What in some disheartening in that, if this
13. operational waiver is granted to missile defense programs,
14. other weapon systems will likely attempt to follow suit.
15. This would result in an arsenal of weapons that may or may
16. not work. Confidence in our military technology is too
17. important to be worked out on the battle field during the
18. fog of war."
19. My question relating to this article is this: If
20. this waiver is granted, when would it take effect? Now
21. would the testing program be modified? Would it be
22. scrapped all together? And what increased risk to life —
23. human and otherwise — would be at stake in all of the
24. facilities that the program is involved with? Thank you.
25. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.
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1 priorities in our country today in black and white. And
2 The Advertiser is usually a very pro-business newspaper, and
3 it's very characteristic of this lack of funds for
4 education and as Fred mentioned, healthcare, which is not
5 happening in the United States.
6 I'm here to talk about the opposition that is
7 widespread to the -- what I believe and many believe is
8 part of a U.S. hegemony and domination -- political,
9 economically, and militarily -- primarily through superior
10 technology, militarily, troop strength, and superior
11 weaponry, which is part of a racist militaristic and
12 jingoistic society that has systematically oppressed --
13 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Excuse me.
14 MR. MORIKAWA: -- and is a war against the
15 poor --
16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Excuse me,
17 Todd. Are you --
18 MR. MORIKAWA: -- people of color.
19 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): -- reading
20 from something?
21 MR. MORIKAWA: Yes.
22 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Yeah. It's
23 going way too fast for her to pick it up, so --
24 MR. MORIKAWA: Okay. I'll speak slower.
25 The other issue is the land itself on Kauai is
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1. Waiau, because those are the folks that are affected the most. And it's easy -- it's really expensive for them to fly over here. This meeting should have been on Waiau, and there should have been another meeting in Hana because you plan to put something out here in Hana, not back in Point. Hana. So I'm going to the rest of my time to fix what you've broken and offer a pule.

2. **(Pua`a, in Hawaiian.) And I would point out that -- it's pretty close to my four minutes now, so I'll step back. The pule was to make things pono once again, because it wasn't pono.

3. But realize that, right after your presentation occurred, the heavens opened up and it rained. Waiau, the sky father who I mentioned in the pule, cried. And he cried because this process wasn't pono. And it was real tale-tell because it was right after you guys did your presentation and then opened it up.

4. So I'll come back.

5. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): Okay.

6. Next -- next speaker is Terry Kekoea-Raymond.


8. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Aloha.

9. M. KEOKEOKAI-RAYMOND: **(Hawaiian speaking.) I'm going to make my comments short. First of

10. all, this whole process is very intimidating, as Bill said.

11. So I want to underscore how sensitive this process is for our kind of people. Okay?

12. Another comment I would like to make is: I would really like to know what effects you need to do your out to reach to the community to bring them here for real and for you to listen to their -- to their mana's. You don't have that many people here. How come? And then this thing is so busy, and it will have such a huge impact on our people here in (Kamehameha), which is the Pacific, the North Pacific.

13. Do please on you folks for not doing a better job to get people to come out here. It makes a joke out of the process, actually. If you don't have people in this part of your process to come out and say stuff -- say stuff.

14. Okay. The other thing I would like to say is I would also like to underscore what Kyle brought up that in order to repair this harm, given this system, right, that you have a 30-day extension, which is allow people the time to come and make their comments, and that you do hold a meeting in Waiau where there are many people in our classes who do have something to say because of their experience physically being near the facilities that we're talking about.

15. And, by the way, the Pacific Range facility, as I
Okay, the other thing is is I would like to ask a few questions. All right? Can you answer my questions?

In this part of the process?

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelsole): No, it's not.

Mr. KEO‘OGLI‘RAYMOND: How come?

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelsole): Basically, we had the half-hour before it started for people to ask any questions that they had.

Mr. KEO‘OGLI‘RAYMOND: Okay, I --

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelsole): Let me finish.

Mr. KEO‘OGLI‘RAYMOND: So ahead.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelsole): After we’re done taking comment, that all of the staff that are here will be happy to go back and answer questions that you have. But this is your four minutes to --

Mr. KEO‘OGLI‘RAYMOND: Okay. You know, four minutes for this Environmental Impact Statement, which looks like a doorknob. Okay? I mean, there's so many points in this thing. How do you think people can even address. It takes you four minutes just to look at the...
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I'm the director of Indian and Native rights from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

I had not intended to speak this evening, but I have heard the concerns of the community, and I want to express my concern as well.

We found out at the Office of Hawaiian Affairs about this hearing the way that everybody else here did -- through a small ad in the newspaper. We were not contacted as is usually the protocol. I wish to withhold any substantive comments, but I must protest about the procedural aspects of this -- of this entire comment period. It was not done, as it was said before. It's wrong. And I encourage you to consider extending the comment period as well.

Thank you.

MRS. MODERATOR (Ms. Michaelson): Thank you.

That exhausts the number of speakers each that I have, but in case anyone else has in fact been inspired to speak, I want to make sure everyone has had their first opportunity before we ask people who would like to speak again for a second time.

Is there anyone who has not yet spoken here tonight who would like to do so? If not, if it's all right with you, I'll call all the names again, and if you'd like to come up to speak a second time, please do so.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 57             | the injustice that was done. So you can't have true reconciliation. You can't have true environmental justice if you're not dealing with some restoration of the harm that was done even if it was 100 years ago, you know. Environmental justice is not an exercise of compliance. It has to be about addressing a harm. It has to be about fixing a broken relationship. One of the things that are also not adequately addressed is cumulative impact. And then we talk about cumulative impacts, we're talking about more than just what's happening on that little launch area at the Kauai test facility, you know. Cumulative impacts for people in Hawaii as it pertains to military actions includes the 200,000 acres that the military occupies here. You know, one quarter of this island is controlled by the military. That's a quarter of the land that is not available for the public use, that's not available to native Hawaiian practitioners to do the things that they need to do so that their culture can survive. So those are cumulative impacts.

Not only that, the Army is now proposing to acquire 23,000 acres on Kauai Island, another 2,000 acres here on Oahu as part of its transformation. That's added to the cumulative impacts. Last night, we -- I mentioned the testing out -- regarding Waimea Valley. The Marine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9              | Corps wants to go back and train in Waimea, and the community strongly opposed it. The military is the largest polluter in Hawaii. It has over 1,000 contaminated sites, and it's still -- they're still finding more every year. So those need to be considered in your document. When you look at what are the impacts, there are cumulative impacts that affect Kauai and all of us.

And, finally, you know, programs like missile defense are presented as a way of defending democracy, defending freedom and our rights, but, you know, what's happening when these programs get instituted and restrictions are placed on these lands, it's making the people here less free. How do you measure the impact on that?

The people of the west side of Kauai are less free to use their beach and the resources there. We are less free to go up to Waimea and Kekaha Point and use those resources when the testing is going on, an exclusion zone is created, a no-fly zone is created. So how do you measure that impact in the Environmental Impact Statement? I think your document is inadequate and you need to come back and, as William said, you know, talk to the community on our terms.

Thank you. |
All of the libraries on Kauai. It's a little bitty island.

It's only 35 miles across as the crow flies. However, it's a very rural community, and getting from one end of the island to the other to read a document that isn't currently there at all is very difficult for people. So please make all of your records available at all of the public libraries on Kauai.

Thank you.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.

MR. MURAKAMI: Okay. I'll speak slower this time. Thanks for giving me a second chance.

First, I want to stress what I had said earlier. I want to reiterate that we ought to listen to the world opinion and specifically the communities that are affected -- not only on this issue, but I believe universally on any issue that affects people -- that we should listen to how they feel and how they're affected by it, rather than power imposed from the top, decisions from some executive branch or a privileged elite government.

Therefore, as Mr Lincoln (then said) by of and for the people. That is one that is truly Democratic.

And I want to repeat again that this opposition in this moment is -- is growing. Although you don’t see
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And I think this is really what the American dream is talking about. And it's a step in the face to Dr. King and to the Civil Rights Movement and to the many, many struggles which we've come to -- in order to -- where the world is today to -- to really go backwards and take these rights away from people and start again to socially profile or to continue to -- to not return stolen lands, to continue to occupy territories and areas around the world where it's very clear, as I said, that the people that are affected who are often voicing strong opposition -- for example, in Okinawa or many of the other areas -- and where it -- it just more that's the military or the state department or wherever the folks are that are in charge of -- like the state department and foreign policy, either aren't listening or, again, have their own agenda which seems to be involving a world which is depending not upon equality and human rights and humanitarian interest but primarily around the acquisition of material and oil and power for even the Ku Klux Klan and, I mean, White Supremacy and this and that.

So -- thank. We can't say all this in this little time. I have that other comment too. I agree with everyone. This process is not sufficient.

Thank you.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.
HONOLULU, HAWAII
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Comment Number

COSTING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/NECP RULE 30 (f) (2)

1

William Alii.

2

MR. ALII: Okay, Aloha again. With
3

regards to some of the specifics in the summary of impacts
4

and mitigation regarding the SHS, which I assume is the
5

platform with the radar on it -- okay? -- the impacts and
6

mitigation summary. Pearl Harbor is mentioned because we
7

all know that that vessel is conceptualized with the
8

110-foot draft would never be able to get into Pearl harbor.
9

It would never be able to get into our harbor in Honolulu,
10

including Honolulu Harbor or the Kahului Deep Draft Harbor
11

which current depth is 42 feet. And even if they go with
12

the dredging that they have planned would only take it to
13

97 feet. So we're really talking about offshore Kahului.
14

And it should be stated that way. Because if it was stated
15

that way, I would probably have a lot more fishermen here
16

with me tonight with concerns because then they would
17

understand that it impacts them. As it's summarized here,
18

Pearl Harbor, it doesn't impact them. So you need to be a
19

little bit more truthful in how you communicate what is
20

being proposed.

21

I also see that there's no discussion on cultural
22

resources. And I was very surprised to see the -- or hear
23

from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs' representative that
24

there was no consultation done with OHA. That would be in
25

violation of the National Historic Preservation Act. And
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1. pile of rocks. We have to constantly tell the Army the
2. same thing, too, so you're not alone in that one.
3. In closing, I would seriously recommend you
4. consider a 30-day extension, as mentioned by other
5. speakers. If you want the truth and you want the input,
6. what's 30 more days.
7. Have a meeting on Kauai, because there are
8. guys -- outside of this SB, there are the guys that are
9. most impacted. Those are the guys who have Kupuna buried
10. underground which you're crossing over and doing
11. your testing and operating. Okay? Make that pore. Talk
12. to those guys.
13. And ultimately, I would recommend that there not
14. be any deployment of this ERX platform in Hawaii. Okay?
15. Thank you very much for the opportunity. Thanks
16. for -- I see some understanding now and some heads being
17. nodded and your faces and stuff. So just remember next
18. time, most important thing, pole first.
19. For you, it's very important that you not try to
20. write those Hawaiian words down if you're not Hawaiian
21. because when you speak Hawaiian and when you believe
22. Hawaiian words can bring life, and if you misplace them,
23. words can bring death. So you have to be very, very
24. careful. For yourself, I would recommend you not try to
25. put those down. Okay?

COPYING PROHIBITED BY 606-13/MCF RULE 30 (i) (2)

1. Thank you.
2. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I have had a
3. couple of new cards turned in to me of people who would
4. like to speak, so I'm trying to decide here whether to --
5. since we only have three more of the cards that were going
6. to speak a second time, let's go ahead and do those, and
7. then we'll take the new speakers.
8. Do the next person that would have a second
9. chance is Terry Scho'ibliki-Raymond.
10. MR. KUKU'OGA-'RAMON: I just forgot to add one
11. question, actually, that I would like to have answered, and
12. that is: What right do you have to the air space if
13. someone -- I need to have you folks define that for me, to
14. explain it to me, and document to me what right you have
15. to the air space.
16. And, also, in the cultural part of this, you need
17. to understand how our people see space, yeah. Not -- in
18. the heavens, what it means to us. And, also, you have to
19. understand how our people view the oceans. That is like
20. your land, yeah. That is similar. You know, this is where
21. we have our -- our navigations that have gone on. This is
22. where we come from, yeah. In our Kumu'oku talks about us
23. as a people coming from the ocean, you know. So our ties
24. to the ocean are very deep. Okay?
25. Do I -- but I do want you -- someone to explain
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MR. NISHI: Ohayō.
HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thanks. If you'd just start by giving us your name and then go ahead.
MR. NISHI: My name is William Nishii (phonetic). I'm a member of oba[na] 008B, uh, and nuclear free and independent Pacific.
From my understanding, what it looks like you folks are trying to do is further U.S. domination of the Pacific scene. As things have come out recently in the -- in the so-called war on terrorism, I don't see how what you folks are trying to implement is going to make any of us any safer. We're talking about people -- we're talking about a military machine that is seen times the resources of the next person on the list. And you guys want more and more, more domination, more resources to that -- so that the whole of the U.S. military and the interest behind it can -- can continue a stranglehold on the planet.
I'm totally against this -- opposed to this. It doesn't -- I don't see how it's going to make any of us any safer.
That -- that's about all I have to say.
HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you very much for coming down.
Kailua Kula.

MR. NISHI: "(Hawaiian speaking.)"
My ancestors come from the island of Kauai. Even though I live on Oahu, I am very close to the people who live there. I understand my genealogy. I understand the connections that my oba[na] is particular to Kauai, is particular, west side. And I know some of my own oba[na] who has worked with the Pacific Missile Range Facility for many many years.
But I come here speaking as a part of my oba[na], the Kauai oba[na]. And a significant portion of us are absolutely outraged by these proposals of expanding the Pacific Missile Range Facility and all of the military outcroppings. We consider it like the tentacles of a becone going to strangle the people of the world. And I am very embarrassed to go and sit among my Polynesian cousins and face them with the understanding that the eye of the becone -- the head of this stranglehold comes from our own hands.
I have just come the other -- night before from the Marines saying they want to expand out to the windward side. You guys want to expand. You guys want to keep on building, growing, pushing your tentacles out will this protect you against box cutters?
What you guys are doing is you're further
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they will. If it turns out it's a speculative type
question or something that needs to be resolved with other
technical aspects before it would appear in the Final EIR,
then they may have to decline to try and answer that
question.

So who would like to ask the first question?

(Whispering, court reporter was instructed to go
off the record.)
MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We are going to be having a presentation tonight so we encourage any of you who may be optically challenged or otherwise to move to a forward seat for a better view except for this front row which will be reserved for speakers.

Thank you for coming tonight. I am Lewis Michaelson, and I’ve been asked by the Missile Defense Agency to serve as a moderator for tonight’s hearing. This is one of seven public hearings being held on the Ground-based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement. During tonight’s hearing, we will be referring to the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense as GMD and referring to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.

This public hearing is being held in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and implementing regulations. The Act requires federal agencies to consider the potential environmental impacts of their activities in the decision-making process.

The purpose of tonight’s hearing is to provide you with information on the GMD program and proposed GMD Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize the findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your comments on the Draft EIS.

Looking at the agenda for tonight, after I finish the introduction, Colonel Kevin Norgard, the director of the Site Activation Command for GMD in Alaska, will describe the GMD flight test activities. Then Mr. David Halsey, the Chief of the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, National Environmental Policy Act Compliance Branch, will describe the process called for in the National Environmental Policy Act. He will also present the environmental analysis and results of the Draft EIS.

The last item on the agenda, the public comment portion, is really the most important. Remember that the Draft EIS is just that -- a draft. This is your opportunity to tell your GMD Project Office how you can improve the analysis of the potential environmental impacts before the document is finalized and before a decision is made on whether or not to proceed with the proposed action.

Now a few administrative points on making comments tonight. If you’ve already signed up to speak, that’s great. I have four cards so far. If you’ve not already filled out a card and would like to speak tonight, please go to the registration table and sign up. Everyone is welcome to speak. It just makes the process run more smoothly if I can call on people from a list. We’ve also reserved as I said the first row up here for upcoming speakers so we can move through the process efficiently, and I’ll let you know when it’s time to come up.

Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of four minutes and may speak only once. You may not combine or yield speaking times to other people. Elected officials will be given the courtesy of speaking first. And all other speakers will be called on in the order in which they signed up. There’s a court reporter here today who is seated to my left. She’ll be making a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all of your oral comments will be recorded accurately. As a part of preparing that transcript, an audio and video recording is being made of tonight’s hearing as well.

If you are uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also provide verbal comments by telephone. There is a toll-free number indicated on the handout that you received when you came in tonight. Looks like this. In fact, if you didn’t get one of these, make sure you do. It has a lot of very important information on how to participate in this process.

You may also submit written comments, and there are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in
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written comments that you brought with you tonight, either to me or to the registration table. Second, you may use the written comment sheets that look like this that are available at the registration table, and you can write down any comments and turn them in tonight. Third, you may mail written comments to the name and address that appear on the comment sheet and also on the handout. And, lastly, you may e-mail comments to the address listed on the handout.

Your written comments will be entered into the formal record of public comments on the Final EIS, and they will be given the same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight.

If you do choose to mail in comments, please note that they need to be postmarked by March 24th, 2003 to be considered in the Final EIS.

If you'd like to receive a copy of the Final EIS when it becomes available, there are several ways you can do so as well. If you already received the Draft EIS in the mail, you've already been on the mailing list and will automatically receive the Final EIS unless you indicate otherwise. If you provide oral or written comments and provide us with your address, you will also be sent a copy of the Final EIS. If you are not on the EIS mailing list and would like to receive one, then there's another form at the registration you can fill out to make sure you are on the mailing list. Also copies of the Final EIS will be placed in area libraries in the case of Kodiak as it is the city library. Finally, there's an e-mail address that you can indicate you can write to and indicate that you'd like to be placed on the mailing list. The Final EIS will also be put on the Missile Defense Agency website.

Finally, it is important for you to understand that the government representatives are not here tonight to make a decision. Their main purpose in being here is to listen firsthand to your suggestions and concerns.

With that, we will begin with Colonel Norgard's presentation.

KODIAK, ALASKA

includes the same comments.

The conceptual GMD element would consist of the components shown on this slide. The components are: the Ground-Based Interceptor, existing early warning radars and satellites, X-band Radar, Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System, battle management command and control, that is the central communication and control point; and, finally, the In Flight Interceptor Communication System, which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor while it is in flight.

The GMD Program is proposing to conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This slide indicates the proposed locations for the various components in the Extended Test Range. As you can see on the Extended Test Range could include a component of sites in the Lower 48, throughout the Pacific and parts of Alaska at Kodiak and Shemya.

The GMD testing consists of two types. One type of testing would involve progressively building and testing Ground-Based Interceptor flight testing, in the Pacific region in scenarios that are operationally realistic as possible. The other type would involve validation of the operational concept through integrated ground tests using the GMD components. These are the tests using Fort Greely and other locations available in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment. These ground tests do not involve missile flights or intercepts.

The Draft EIS, which is the subject of this hearing, evaluates another type of GMD testing involving an intercept flight testing. This intercept flight testing is the focus of this discussion tonight.

As you can see on this slide, existing intercept test capability includes the use of the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and the Reagan Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. Current testing includes launching target missiles from Vandenberg Air Force Base and Ground Based Interceptors from the Reagan Test Site with interceptors occurring over the broad oceanic areas.

The ground based radar prototypes at the Reagan Test Site is used to track, discriminate, and provide updates to the interceptors during flight, while a radar on Oahu is used as tracking sensor. For some tests, target missiles are also launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex and viewed by the Early Warning Radar at Sandia Air Force Base. Current capability does exist to launch target missiles from the Pacific Missile Range Facility as well. These scenarios present a very limited capability to demonstrate the effectiveness of the GMD element because the Ground Based Interceptor can only be launched from the Reagan Test Site. This limits our ability to test the system in an operationally realistic environment.

The extension of the existing GMD test range would increase the realism of GMD testing by using multiple engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometries, distances, and speeds of targets and interceptors to closely resemble an operational scenario involving attack by one or more threat missiles.

We propose to add dual target and Ground Based Interceptor launch capability at the Kodiak Launch Complex and/or at Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also proposed are mobile target launch capability and shipborne missiles. The proposed Extended Test Range would provide more operationally realistic testing as President Bush and Congress have directed.

A Sea-based Test X-band Radar, or SSTX, is proposed to support the Extended Test Range flight testing. This SSTX would be a multi-function radar that would perform tracking, discrimination, and intercept assessment of incoming threat missiles and inform intercept missiles. The SSTX would be assembled at an existing shipyard in the United States Gulf Coast.
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Three conceptual SSX performance regions have been identified to accomplish effective electronic detection coverage for flight-testing. The SSX would operate within the confines of one of the three performance regions based on the needs of the particular flight test scenario. Potential primary support bases have been identified in part on their proximity to these performance regions. Approximately 10 to 12 days before GMD operational tests, the SSX would leave the Primary Support Base to travel to its performance region in the Pacific Ocean.

The SSX would be stationed at its primary support base during flight test missions. The SSX would have a deep draft, which would restrict its use in many harbors. The SSX may dock to a deep draft pier if it is available between missions. If a pier is not available, the SSX would be moored to existing facilities or to a temporary pier located at the primary support base. Locations for the primary support base analyzed in the Draft EIS were the sites in Valdez and Adak, Alaska; Naval Base Ventura County, San Nicolas Island near Anacapa, California; Naval Station Everett in Washington, the Reagan Test Site; and Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Daily activities provided by the support base might include logistics, re-supply, maintenance and repair. Radar operations in the vicinity of the Primary Support Base may include tracking of satellites and calibration devices. Vessels from the primary support base would be supplied by the SSX. During transit between the primary support base and the test location, periodic radar operations for satellite and calibration device tracking, including joint satellite tracking with GMD sensors and other pre-mission activities may also occur.

Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS, which may meet some of the enhanced test objectives, include launching target and/or interceptor missiles from the Kodiak Launch Complex, adding interceptor to launch vehicles, and launching target missiles from mobile platforms over the ocean area. The target and interceptor missiles could be launched in sets of two under some test scenarios from the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, or Vandenberg Air Force Base.

In-flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminals would be constructed in close proximity to the proposed Ground Based Interceptor launch sites and expected target area. Existing launch sites and target area resources would continue to be used in enhanced test scenarios. Launching Ground Based Interceptors from the Kodiak Launch Complex may require up to two additional small mobile radars and telemetry stations in South Central or Southeast Alaska for telemetry and flight safety.

Existing shipborne sensors would be used for midcourse tracking of the target missile during launches of Interceptor launchers from both the Kodiak Launch Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Sea Based Test x-Dard Platform would be constructed and used in tests to perform tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missile.

The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for the GMD extended test range testing. For Alternative 1, we would propose the following components: First, single and dual Ground Based Interceptor launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex and the Reagan Test Site; second, single and dual target launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and the Reagan Test Site; and third, single and dual target launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and a mobile target launch platform. Construction of two Ground Based Interceptor sites, an additional target launch pad, and associated support facilities would be needed at the Kodiak Launch Complex. We would also construct an In-flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the Kodiak Launch Complex and on a location in the Pacific. The SSX would be used in tests for tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missiles.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MS. HEITMAN: Min-min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MR. MICHAELSON: Our next speaker is Mike Sirofchuck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MR. SIROFCHUCK: Thank you. I'd like to recommend that the GMD...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MR. MICHAELSON: Could you state your name, please.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8              | MR. SIROFCHUCK: I'm sorry. My name is Mike Sirofchuck. I thought you heard it when I said that.
|                | I would recommend that you pursue the No Action Alternative as described in the Executive Summary in Section E11.1 on page ES-9. A statement was made earlier that wasn't exactly correct, but it left out some important information, that is, why did the Department of Defense decide to do an Environmental Impact Statement for the Kodiak Launch Complex. |
|                | The Department of Defense did not want to do an Environmental Impact Statement. And I'd just like to remind the officials here tonight and the public that, as a condition of Alaska's technical study groups joined with the National Resources Defense Council and filed suit against the Department of Defense. And the settlement of that court action was the Environmental Impact Statement for Kodiak Launch Complex. So that decision did not come from DOD, and certainly not willingly. |
|                | What is suspect is the entire credibility of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement as it relates to the Kodiak Launch Complex. It is based on highly questionable information, much of it provided by the Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation. We know how many launch sites there are but not there in the past, that AADC really needs business. But asking the AADC to provide environmental information is sort of asking the fox to determine if the hen house is safe from predators. |
|                | For example, in the lake directly beneath the ridge where sites are proposed to be built, there's currently an active beaver lodge and beaver activity occurring all along the Fossil Beach Road. Nowhere in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is there any mention of this activity. Now, you might say, well, these sites aren't going to have a couple of beavers down there. The question is, what else has been missed. This is just one detail right there literally within sight of where you would stand at the sites, you can't miss it. So what else has been missed in the many environmental assessments and surveys out there, quite a bit, I would expect. |
|                | One of my main concerns is land use. I sat through quite a few meetings during the 18 months that the Pangnagig Comprehensive Plan was being created. One thing that was very clear was that the community of Kodiak wanted Narrow Cape preserved for recreational purposes. Almost all the land on road system that borders the road system is privately owned except for the state-owned land at Narrow Cape. Carolyn has already addressed the access problem. |
|                | Constructing a marina for 60 people and adding to the "Narrow Cape Lodge" with an additional facility for 60 people means that there would be anywhere from 120 to 200 people living out in that area. The impact on sportfishing, hiking, hunting, both subsistence and sport, are hard to even imagine with that number out there. It would greatly impact that area and totally contradict the wishes of the community in terms of the use of that area. This needs to be studied much more closely. And I would recommend that GMD take a good look at that Pangnagig plan and take into account the wishes of the community as they were expressed in an 18-month public process. Thank you. |
|                | MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Next speaker is Brad Stevens. |
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<td>2</td>
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<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
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<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
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</table>

Mr. Stevens: Good evening. My name is Brad Stevens. I have many comments, but I do not know where to start, but I think that the conclusion that there will be no impact to this process is largely based on information that is either incorrect, inappropriate, incomplete, or of dubious nature. And I’d like to point out some examples of that.

There’s a blanket statement that there will be no environmental impacts to the aquifer resources, and this is based on some work conducted by the University of Alaska for the KLC. I’ve read all those documents, and I find them to be highly questionable for a number of reasons. They did not use appropriate and accepted sampling designs. They used inadequate techniques. They changed the methods in mid-study without calibration. They didn’t obtain replicate samples. They did not sample control sites, and they made no statistical comparisons.

Yet despite this, they say that there are no impacts, although the data that they show do indicate that there were elevated levels of aluminum and reduced stream macrophyte (plant) indices surrounding or associated with a particular launch. I would highly recommend that continued sampling of aluminum and pH levels be conducted in streams around the KLC, including control streams that are outside the influence of rocket launches. And this sampling should be conducted in fish and other subsistence resources within the nearby streams.

There are many places in this document referring to where access would be restricted, other people have spoken to that. I’d like to say that I think AADC and the military organizations involved should outline the community exactly the number of days, the number of opportunities and the length of my planned closures. The reasons that those closures might occur that are given just about anything under the sun, including launches, construction, storage of fuels, rocket transporter storage, and security-related activities, whatever those are.

Carolyn pointed out the fact that the fuels are intended to be stored there are a safety distance of 1425 feet, yet the storage sites are within 500 feet of the road. That’s just unacceptable. How can you do that? It would require you closing the road or closing access or would require people from the community to drive through the safety zone which is really not a safety zone of the storage area to get to Fossil Bench. That’s got to be changed.

Finally, I want to address subsistence uses. The document suggests that there are essentially no subsistence uses of Fossil Bench. And as far as I can tell there was... they didn’t make an effort to find out what the subsistence uses are. In fact, the Department of Fish & Game did an extensive survey in the early 1990s. And reviewed that information and I learned that in a typical year, 35,000 pounds of subsistence resources are taken from the adjacent areas alone.

And there aren’t very many of those on the road system that people have access to as Mike pointed out. So it’s hard to believe that none of that came from the Natio... Where those resources are impacted by pollution or not is... We talk about the conclusion that they’re impacted is going to affect how they use those resources or don’t use those resources and will create pressure on other areas along the road as well. Thank you.

Mr. Michaelson: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Wayne Stevens. Spencer after him if you would please come in the reserved area here are Mike Milligan, Pam Foreman, and Dr. Gary. And again if you’d be there with your name.

Mr. Stevens: Good evening. My name is Wayne Stevens. I’m the Executive Director of the Kodiak Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for being here this evening and hosting this public hearing. Just speak quickly to your socioeconomic impact portion of your study and remind you that we now have a meeting of the committee held in this building on the next day. And thank you for the public hearing.

Mr. Milligan: My name is Mike Milligan and I’m representing myself. It was less than three years ago that President Clinton was proposing to put a hundred missiles in Alaska. I think the process has gone through some good examinations and I’m starting to think of a system which I find is more viable. I would challenge people that are opposed to missile defense to put that proposal on a global perspective and explain to me how the world will be safer if there were to dismantle the US system which they just deployed first and ballistic missile system last October. From my way of thinking, the world will not be safer if Israel were to deploy the system that they just deployed.

But having said that I do have some issues. I share some of the environmental concerns that you’re hearing tonight and that you’ll continue to hear. The first concern I have is with the Aerospace system that I am not want to continue to support missile defense. I do support it, but that support is not qualified support. And that qualified support is based on a pursuit of kill, to kill technology. I don’t see that killing the document. I don’t see that reflected in the document that I would like to see. I would like to see the documentation we’re pursuing a Kill technology. If we choose to not pursue hit to kill technology, then we’re going to lose another IES. And you know, the Ares is not a hit to kill system. It’s an explosive system. So if we go to a different kind of system, I want to see that reflected in the document.

I would also like to see a commitment in the document to use solid fuel rocketry. You’ve heard some concerns about liquid fuels. Now, what I take from the document in reference to those liquid fuels is that those are propellants, hydroxide in particular. I do not see that. We’re talking about, you know, maybe 20,000 gallons of extremely dangerous but highly expensive and very serious materials and different than liquid fueled rockets. I would like to see a commitment in the statement saying we at this time have no intention to use liquid fueled rockets.

I appreciate what someone who’s concerned for peace the fact that we are using existing assets. We’re using Minuteman missiles. We used a missile that was formerly stationed on Great Britain at the launch complex. We got rid of that asset. That asset was deployed with a nuclear missile. So we used that for something else. Using it for targets is certainly good, but I don’t see it addressed. Thank you. I don’t see it addressed in the document what we’re going to use for launch vehicles following the use of these assets. And I think that needs to be addressed.

And in closing, I just want to reiterate what you’re going to hear from others, is that the access is extremely important to me. I think the access has been improved to some extent with the road work that’s been done for the facility, but I want to see a commitment in the document to maintain the access for the public. Thank you.

Mr. Michaelson: Thank you. The next speaker is Pam Foreman.

Ms. Foreman: Hi, my name is Pam Foreman and I’m with the Kodiak Island Convention & Visitors Bureau. My comment is also in regard to the possible construction of additional facilities at the Natio... I don’t think that needs to be addressed.

And in closing, I just want to reiterate what you’re going to hear from others, is that the access is extremely important to me. I think the access has been improved to some extent with the road work that’s been done for the facility, but I want to see a commitment in the document to maintain the access for the public. Thank you.

Mr. Michaelson: Thank you. The next speaker is Pam Foreman.

Mr. Foreman: Hi, my name is Pam Foreman and I’m with the Kodiak Island Convention & Visitors Bureau. My comment is also in regard to the possible construction of additional facilities at the Natio... I encourage you to maximize the use of revenue.
our current local facilities prior to building any additional facilities out there or considering building additional facilities out there. We currently have many months during the year where our local facilities are underused and occupancy rates are low. There are a few months during the summer months I will grant you that it will be a bit of a squeeze to try to get additional people in. But I encourage you to maximize the use of those facilities first.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. The last speaker I have a card from so far is Dr. Cary Carter. Why don't you pull that microphone up. Thanks.

DR. CARTER: Thank you. My name is Dr. Cary Carter. I am a geologist and I specialize in seismic hazard assessment and seismic geology. First, I would like to say that in reading the Draft EIS, I noted that the section on geologic hazards I think rather adequately but in a very general way identifies the nature of the seismic hazards at the Narrow Cape area.

However, I'm concerned about one of the points made in your slide presentation under geology where you allege that the current facilities as they are constructed and designed exceed the present codes. This is based on the material that's presented in Appendix D of the Draft EIS, and is based on a comparison between the 1994 UBC that was used at the time of the design and construction of the present facilities with the present codes that have been adopted in Alaska, the 2000 IBC.

Of concern to me are input parameters into the calculations for the IBC numbers. The first of these is the site class which the consultants at ASCG (ASCG) used a site class A which is a very firm rock site class. It's based on the shear weight velocity of the rock.

I phoned the ASCG people and talked with the preparer of the worksheets that are presented in Appendix D, and he explained to me that he had no specific information about the rocks under the Kodiak Launch facility. And he used instead a general number for the bedrock that's widely found on most of the rest of Kodiak Island. As it turns out, Narrow Cape is underlain by very soft unconsolidated with relatively lower seismic shear weight velocities, and I think that the seismic class A is inappropriate; that probably a seismic class B would be required.

The consequence of this is a different multiplier or parameter that goes into the calculations. Secondly, is a seismic zone group. The consultant that prepared this used a seismic zone group 2. This refers to the use of the facility. And in the IBC manual and codes it specifies that facilities used for critical defense reasons, for national defense purposes, should use a seismic zone group 4. This also results in a substantially different coefficient being entered into the calculations. I worked through the calculations with these two different coefficients in them and found that indeed the numbers were quite different. That the 1994 UBC codes or the industry facility is presently built are far from what is required under the 2000 codes.

This may be a moot point because of the seismic zone group. Those facilities do not care what the use is. They care about what the ground motions are. And secondly, the UBC codes do not take into account surface fault rupture. And yet in the seismic hazard section of this document, you correctly identify several faults which are capable of surface fault rupture at the site. And the research that I've done there and others suggest that there are yet to be identified active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture through the facility.

So I dispute the conclusion that was presented and would like to see it reviewed. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. That exhausts the number of speaker cards that I have. Is there anyone else who has been inspired to add comments to that who's not already spoken?

If not, we are going to adjourn this meeting to the first room that you were in to make available the opportunity for the staff that are here to answer any other questions that you may have. And keep in mind that anything that you say in there is no longer on record, but again anything that you have additionally that you would like to say can be provided either on the 800 number or provided in writing in several different ways. With that, we will adjourn the meeting at 7:33. Goodnight.

(GF record)
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1. LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2003
2. 6:30 P.M.
3. ---oo---
4. (SLIDE NO. 1 - PUBLIC HEARING TITLE PAGE)
5. MR. ELLIOTT: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
6. Thank you for coming tonight. I am Julia Elliott, and I am
7. with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I
8. have been asked by the Missile Defense Agency to serve as
9. the moderator for tonight's hearing. This is one of seven
10. Public Hearings being held on the Ground-Based Midcourse
11. Defense Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact
12. Statement. During tonight's hearing, we will refer to the
13. Ground-Based Midcourse Defense as GMD, and we will refer to
14. the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.
15. This public hearing is being held in accordance
16. with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and
17. implementing regulations. The Act requires federal agencies
18. to consider the potential environmental impacts of their
19. activities in the decision-making process.
20. The purpose of tonight's hearing is to provide you
21. with information on the GMD Program and proposed GMD
22. Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize the
23. findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your
24. comments on the Draft EIS.
25. (SLIDE NO. 2 - PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA)
26. Let's look at the agenda for tonight. After I
27. finish the introduction, Commander Robert Deen, of the
28. Ground-Based Midcourse Defense X-Band Radar Project Office
29. will describe the proposed GMD flight test activities. Then
30. Mrs. Sharon Mitchell, Program Manager for the EIS, will
31. describe the process called for in the National
32. Environmental Policy Act. She will also present the
33. environmental analysis and results of the Draft EIS.
34. The last item on the agenda, the public comment
35. portion, is really the most important. Remember that the
36. Draft EIS is just that, a draft. This is your opportunity
37. to tell the GMD Project Office how it can improve its
38. analysis of potential environmental impacts before the
39. document is finalized, and before a decision is made on
40. whether or not to proceed with the proposed action.
41. (SLIDE NO. 3 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS)
42. How a few administrative points on making comments
43. tonight. If you have already signed up to speak, that's
44. good. I have approximately I sign up cards already. If you
45. have not already filled out a card and would like to speak
46. tonight, please go to the registration table and sign up.
47. Everyone is welcome to speak, but it makes the process run
48. more smoothly if I can call on people from a sign-up list.
49. We will also have a reserved seat area up here up here in

Exhibit 8.1.3-1: Reproductions of Public Hearing Documents (Continued)
LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

1. front that will be for upcoming speakers, so we can move
   through the process efficiently.
2. Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of 4
   minutes, and may speak only once. You may not combine or
   yield speaking times to other people. Elected officials
   will be given the courtesy of speaking first. All other
   speakers will be called in the order in which they signed
   up. There is a court reporter here tonight instead of my far
   left making a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all
   of your oral comments will be recorded accurately. As part
   of preparing that transcript, an audio and video recording
   is being made of tonight’s hearing as well. If you are
   uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also provide
   verbal comments by telephone. There is a toll-free
   telephone number indicated on the handout that you may use
   for recording those comments.

(1) COMMENT
   NUMBER

7. (SLIDE NO. 4 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS - continued)
   You may also submit written comments. There are 4
   ways to do that. First, you may hand in written comments
   that you brought with you tonight, either to me or to a
   person at the registration table. Second, you may use the
   written comment sheets that are available at the
   registration table to write down any comments that you wish
   to make and turn them in tonight. Third, you may mail
   written comments to the name and address that appear on the
   exhibit.

8. COMMENT
   NUMBER
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1. Defense Agency website listed on the handout.
2. Finally, it is important for you to understand
3. that the government representatives are not here tonight to
4. make any decision. Their main purpose is being here is to
5. listen first hand to your suggestions and concerns. With
6. that, we will begin with Commander Bee’s presentation.
7. Commander?
8. (SLIDE NO. 6 - GMD PROGRAM OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE)
9. CHIR. BEE: Good evening, my name is Commander Robert
10. Bee, and I am technical advisor for the GMD X-Band Radar
12. as the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, is the
13. Department of Defense Agency responsible for developing the
14. testing of ballistic missile defense systems. In the
15. following charts, I will briefly describe the GMD Extended
16. Test Range, provide an overview of the GMD and how it works,
17. and address the decisions to be made. But before I do, I
18. would like to describe the overall concept for the Ballistic
19. Missile Defense System under development, and explain the
20. different segments of the system.
21. (SLIDE NO. 7 - BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM)
22. This chart represents the flight of a ballistic
23. missile. A ballistic missile flight path has three basic
24. parts, which we call segments. The segments are the boost
25. segment, when the missile is thrusting and leaving the

1. atmosphere; the mid-course segment, the middle or ballistic
2. phase; and the terminal segment, where the missile re-enters
3. the Earth’s atmosphere. Within each of these segments in
4. our missile program has to this point been characterized by
5. discreet, independent programs, which we call elements.
6. Each element worked to shoot down ballistic missiles in a
7. particular segment of flight.
8. Now the Missile Defense Agency is now moving
10. Instead of having discreet stand-alone elements, we plan to
11. eventually tie the programs for the various elements
12. together so we can shoot down missiles in all segments of
13. flight.
14. Each segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense
15. System could include several elements, which are different
16. ways of providing a defense against a threat missile during
17. the second phase of this plan. All segments and elements
18. are designed to work together as each element is developed.
19. At the same time, each element could provide an effective
20. stand alone defense against a specific type of threat. The
21. GMD element is part of the missile -- is part of the
22. midcourse defense segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense
23. System. The GMD element is the successor to national
24. missile defense and includes the same components.
25. (SLIDE NO. 8 - REPRESENTATIVE GMD CONCEPT)
The conceptual GMD element would consist of the components shown on the slide. These components are the 
Ground-Based Interceptors, existing early warning radars and satellites, the X-Band Radar, which performs tracking, 
discrimination, and assessment of the incoming missile; the 
Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System; the 
Battle Management Command and Control, which is the central 
communications and control points; and finally, the In-Flight 
Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal, which -- 
which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor 
while the interceptor is in flight.

(SLIDE NO. 9 – PROPOSED GMD FTR SITES AND COMPONENTS)

The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to 
conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD 
element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This slide 
indicates the proposed locations for the various components 
in the Extended Test Range.

Of particular interest here, locally, down at the 
bottom of the screen, you'll see the Vandenberg, with the 
IDT, which is the In-Flight Interceptor Communications Data 
Terminal, which alters the interceptors shown as OEM, 
Ground-Based Interceptor, and targets. Targets are already 
being launched for the program at Vandenberg. Nearby, the 
Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar and IDT, one potential home port 
for the OES in San Nicholas Island down off Port Hueneme.

The GMD testing would be of two types. One type 
of testing would involve increasingly robust Ground-Based 
Interceptor flight testing in the Pacific region in 
scenarios that are as operationally realistic as possible. 
The other type would involve validation of the operational 
concept through integrated ground tests using GMD 
components. These are tests using Fort Greely and other 
locations analyzed in the GMD Validation of Operational 
Concept Environmental Assessment. These ground tests do not 
involve missile flights or intercepts.

The Draft EIS, which is the subject of this 
hearing, evaluates the first type of GMD testing involving 
interceptor flight-testing. This interceptor flight-testing 
will be the focus of our discussion tonight.

(SLIDE NO. 10 – CURRENT GMD TEST RANGE)

As you can see from this slide, the existing 
interceptor test capability includes use of the Kodiak 
Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, the Pacific 
Missile Range Facility, and the Reagan Test Site at 
Naval Station at Midway Island. Current testing 
includes launching target missiles from Vandenberg Air Force 
Base, and launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the 
Reagan Test Site, with intercepts occurring over the broad 
Oceania area. The ground-based radar prototype at the Reagan 
Test Site is used to track, discriminate and provide updates.
1. Bush and Congress have directed.
2. (SLIDE NO. 12 - CONCEPTUAL SEA-BASED TEST X-BAND RADAR)
3. A Sea-Based -- a Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar, or
4. SBR, is proposed to support the embedded test Range
5. flight-testing. This SBR is a multi-function radar that
6. performs tracking, discrimination, and intercept assessment
7. of incoming target missiles. The SBR would be assembled at
8. an existing shipyard on the United States Gulf Coast.
9. (SLIDE NO. 13 - POTENTIAL SUPPORT BASES AND
10. CONCEPTUAL SBR PERFORMANCE REGIONS)
11. Three conceptual SBR performance regions have been
12. identified to accomplish effective radar coverage for flight
13. testing. The SBR would operate within the confines of one
14. of the three performance regions based on the needs of the
15. particular flight-test scenario. Potential primary support
16. bases have been identified, based in part on their proximity
17. to these performance regions. Approximately 10 to 12 days
18. before SBR operational tests, the SBR would leave the
19. Primary Support Base to travel to its performance region in
20. the Pacific Ocean.
21. The SBR would be stationed at its primary support
22. base between flight test missions. The SBR would have a
23. deep draft, which would restrict it from many harbors. The
24. SBR may dock at a deep draft pier if it is available between
25. missions. If a pier is not available -- is not available
1 the SOX would most likely be stored 3 to 10 miles off shore
2 while at the primary support base. Potential locations for
3 the primary support base analyzed in the Draft EIS were the
4 Port of Valdez and Adak in Alaska's Naval Base Ventura
5 County/San Nicolas Island, near Osmond, Californian Pearl
6 Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaiian Naval Station Everett, Washington;
7 and Reagan Test Site, Republic of the Marshall Islands.
8 Daily activities provided by the support base might include
9 logistics, re-supply, maintenance and repair. Radar
10 operations in the vicinity of the primary support base may
11 include tracking of satellites and calibration devices.
12 Vessels from the primary support base would re-supply the
13 SOX. During transit between the primary support base and
14 test location, periodic radar operation for satellite and
15 calibration device tracking, including joint -- joint
16 satellite tracking with OMD sensors and other pre-mission
17 activities may also occur.
18 (SLIDE NO. 14 - PROPOSED TEST ACTIVITIES)
19 Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS which may
20 meet some of the enhanced test objectives include launching
21 targets and/or intercept -- interceptor missiles from the
22 Kodiak Launch Complex at an interceptor missile launcher
23 from Vandenberg Air Force Base and launching target missiles
24 from mobile platforms over the broad ocean area. The target
25 interceptor missiles could be launched in sets of two under
26

1 rows testing scenarios, from either Kodiak Launch Complex,
2 the Reagan Test Site or Vandenberg Air Force Base.
3 In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data
4 Terminals would be constructed in close proximity to the
5 proposed Ground-Based Interceptor launch sites and expected
6 to intercept area. Existing launch sites and test resources
7 would continue to be used in enhanced test scenarios.
8 Launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the Kodiak Launch
9 Complex may require up to two additional small mobile radars
10 and telemetry stations in South Central or Southeast Alaska
11 for telemetry and flight safety.
12 Existing shipborne sensors would be used for
13 midcourse tracking of the target missile during ground-based
14 interceptor launches, from both the Kodiak Launch Complex
15 and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Sea-Based Test X-Band
16 radar would be constructed and used in tests to perform
17 tracking, discrimination and assessment of target missiles.
18 (SLIDE NO. 15 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 1)
19 The Draft EIS analyzed 3 alternatives from the OMD
20 Extended Test Range testing. For Alternative 1, we would
21 propose the following components: First, single and dual
22 Ground-Based Interceptor launchers from the Kodiak Launch
23 Complex and the Reagan Test Site. Second, single and dual
24 target launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg
25 Air Force Base and the Reagan Test Site. And third, single
target launchers from the Pacfic Missile Range Facility and
mobile target launch platform. Construction of two
ground-based interceptor sites, an additional target launch
pad and associated support facilities would be needed at the
Kodiak Launch Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight
Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the
Kodiak Launch Complex, and at a location in the
mid-Pacific. The SSM would be used in tests for tracking,
discrimination, and assessment of target missiles.

(SLIDE NO. 16 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 2)

Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1,
with the exception that Ground-Based Interceptor Launches
would be from Vandenberg Air Force Base instead of from the
Kodiak Launch Complex. The Ground-Based Interceptor launch
would require construction of an In-Flight Interceptor
Communications System Data Terminal and modification of
existing support facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base.

(SLIDE NO. 17 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 3)

Alternative 3 would combine activities proposed
for Alternatives 1 and 2, and would include ground-based
interceptor launchers from both the Kodiak Launch Complex and
Vandenberg Air Force Base, and construction of the required
support facilities.

(SLIDE NO. 18 - NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)

Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD Extended

1 Test Range would not be established and interceptor and
target launch scenario could not be tested under more
operational realistic conditions. The SSM would not be
developed. Testing of the existing GMD Test Ranges using
existing launch areas would continue.

(SLIDE NO. 19 - MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY'S
DECISION TO BE MADE)

The decision to be made is whether to enhance the
current GMD Flight Test capability by selecting from the
list of alternatives presented, including the No Action
Alternative.

The Missile Defense Agency is still evaluating the
feasibility, safety, and utility to the GMD Testing Program
of conducting a limited number of checkout Ground-Based
Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely. The possibility
of such flights is too speculative to be analyzed at this
time. The Missile Defense Agency will perform an EIS if and
when it proposes to conduct Ground-Based Interceptor flight
tests from Fort Greely.

This concludes the Program Overview. Now I'd like

1 to introduce Ms. Sharon Mitchell, who will describe the

2 Environmental Analysis Process.

(SLIDE NO. 20 - GMD ENVIRONMENTAL REPRESENTATIVE)

Ms. MITCHELL: Hello, my name is Sharon Mitchell. I'm

3 with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I'm

4
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1 Under Health and Safety, the proposed action will not increase the risk to workers and the general public of current operations. Notices of launches will continue to be announced in advance. Launch activities would be within the current level of activities.
2 Minimal impacts of land use would occur as a result of site preparation of new construction. All of the proposed activities would be in accordance with Coastal Zone Consistency requirements.
3 (SLIDE NO. 27 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - continued: KODIAK LAUNCH COMPLEX, PHRZ and HTJ)
4 Kodiak Launch Complex, the Pacific Missile Range Facility and the Reagan Test Site, like Vandenberg Air Force Base, all have ongoing missile operation. Impacts to air quality, hazardous material, and health and safety would be minimal from continuing -- from the continuation of existing launch activities.
5 Likewise, the impacts to biological resources would be similar to those from ongoing activities. We expect no adverse impacts to threatened or endangered species.
6 In particular, at the Kodiak Launch Complex, socioeconomic impacts could be expected because of the potential lodging shortage during tourist season due to launch activities. To reduce the potential for -- for a lodging shortage, the Missile Defense Agency is considering the construction of an addition to the Narrow Cape Lodge and/or construction of an additional mancamp.
7 (SLIDE NO. 28 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - continued: NAVAL BASE VENTURA COUNTY, NAVALATION STATION EVERETT, ADAK, VALUES, AND PEARL HARBOR)
8 At the Naval Base Ventura County, near Oxnard, California, an Electromagnetic Radiation/Electromagnetic Interference survey and analysis would be conducted as a part of the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process. The results of the survey would be used to define the safe operating area for the SBX. This area would not interfere with airspace operations and would allow for a safe operating environment.
9 The small quantities of potentially hazardous materials used during construction activities would result in generation of waste that would be handled by Naval Base Ventura County under their normal waste management procedures. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would follow U.S. Navy requirements that, to the maximum extent practical, ships shall retain hazardous waste aboard ship for shore disposal. In compliance with Uniform National Discharge standards, the Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar vessel would incorporate marine pollution control devices, such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residue...
and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices, in
design or routine operation. Handling and disposal of
hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in
accordance with the State of California, Department of
Transportation and Department of Defense policies and
procedures. Implementation of SHK operational safety
procedures, including establishment of control areas, and
limitations in the areas subject to illumination by radar
units, would preclude any potential safety hazard to either
the public or workforce.

As you can see, the Draft EIS analyzed these
resource areas for other potential primary support bases at
Naval Station Everett, Washington; Adak and Port of Valdez,
Alaska and Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Impacts at each of those
sites are expected to be minimal.

In closing, please keep in mind that our goal is
to provide the decision makers with accurate information on
the environmental consequences of this proposal. To do
this, we are soliciting comments on the proposed SMS
Extended Test Range Testing. This feedback will support
informed decision-making.

(SLIDE NO. 29 - PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND ADDRESS)

In addition to tonight's hearing, written comments
on the Draft EIS will continue to be accepted until March
21st, 2003, at the address shown on the slide. After the

1. Comment period is over, we will consider all comments as we
2. conduct the analysis. Again, equal consideration will be
3. given to all comments, whether they are presented here
4. tonight, e-mailed, or submitted by regular mail to us.
5. Once the final EIS is complete, we will mail it to
6. all the individuals who requested a copy. If you are not on
7. our mailing list, you can request a copy by writing to the
8. street address or e-mail address given in the handout, or by
9. filling out a card at the registration table.
10. I will now turn the hearing back over to
11. Mr. Elliott.
12. MR. ELLIOTT: We will now break for a 5-minute recess,
13. and then we will begin taking your comments.
14. If you would like to make verbal comments, please
15. complete the verbal comments card provided at the
16. registration table and turn it in to a person at the
17. registration table.
18. Please remember that no decision is being made
19. tonight. The main purpose for the government
20. representatives’ presence here tonight is to learn firsthand
21. of your concerns and suggestions.
22. Thank you for your comments and your courtesy
during the evening.
23. (RECESS TAKEN.)
24. MR. ELLIOTT: We are ready to start calling out the
25.
name of those of you who indicated you would like to make comments tonight. As I mentioned earlier, elected officials will be given the courtesy of speaking first. Are there any elected officials here tonight who, even though you did not sign a registration card, would like to speak? I don't have any handed to me. Okay, we have a reserved area here in the front. This front row across is the reserved area for those who wish to make comments tonight. I will be calling on you in the order in which you signed up. I will start out by calling the first several names so you can get ready to come up front here to use the podium. Because we want to record your comments fully and accurately, we ask that you speak clearly into the microphone. Because of the acoustics in this room, it will be especially important that you speak clearly in order to make certain that the court reporter can capture everything you say. Also, at the beginning of your speaking time, please state your full name for the court reporter.

We kindly request that you observe the four-minute time limit for oral comments. We use the four-minute limit at these hearings to give everyone a fair and equal chance to make their comments. To aid you in knowing when the four minutes are up, I have a simple method for indicating time. After three minutes I will raise my index finger, indicating that you have one minute left. This -- this should help you find a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. At the end of four minutes, I will raise my closed hand indicating it is time to finish your comments. So it is important to look up from your paper occasionally to see if you are being given a signal.

I have one other request that need to be enforced for the sake of the court reporters that is, you must withhold any expressions, either against or in favor of the speaker until the speaker is finished. Otherwise, there's no way that the court reporter can get all of the comments. So while you maybe agreeing with the speaker by clapping or speaking out, you are probably making certain we are not capturing the comments on the record. Please hold all of your expressions until the speaker is finished. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

We also greatly appreciate your cooperation and understanding in observing the four minute limit. Also keep in mind that oral comments are only one way to share your thoughts and concerns regarding the Draft EIR. You can also hand in written comments tonight, e-mail them, or submit them by regular mail by March 24, 2002.

As I mentioned, written comments are given the same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight. With that in mind, we will begin.
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1. MACGREGOR EDYU.
2. offered public commentary on the ONS Extended Test Range
3. Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:
4.
5. MS. EDYU: Hello, my name is MacGregor Edy, I'm a
6. registered nurse, and I'm particularly interested in the
7. health and safety consequences of any public program using
8. our tax dollars.
9. There are 3 things that I think are unsaid behind
10. what is being presented here today. The first is, is that
11. this program is necessary because the initial program was a
12. colossal and publicly embarrassing waste of money and --
13. internationally, and there is no guarantee
14. that the second one will not be that. Certainly it will be
15. a colossal amount of money.
16. As to what we get for it, we need to take a look.
17. What are we -- what are we spending our money on? I pick up
18. this newspaper, it's every newspaper in California right now
19. is talking about, for lack of eight billion dollars, which
20. is a minuscule part of what's being spent here, gang
21. prevention programs in L.A., fire programs, parks and
22. recreations, all being cut. So that's the first thing is
23. the money.
24. The second thing is that the main environmental
25. justification in the program is used the most often is

1. that there will be no impact because what damage being done
2. to the environment is already being done by currently
3. existing programs and launches, therefore there will be no
4. increase. From an environmental point of view, on a fragile
5. planet, where we, the human beings, are the endangered
6. species, I don't think that is an adequate or complete
7. response.
8. The third concern that I have about this program
9. is the health and safety of all of us -- on the planet.
10. We don't have interests that are different from the rest of
11. the people that we share this globe with. And the heavens,
12. the skies above us, are what will we all look up to to dream
13. for the future, and they should not full of reconnaissance,
14. surveillance, targeting, lasers, and weaponry. The sky
15. belongs to us all, so -- just as the land belongs to us
16. all.
17. So I wanted to say, the 3 points I want to make is
18. number 1, this is a colossal amount of money, it's a huge
19. amount of money and very small parts of it, this amount of
20. money, would make big differences in the health and safety
21. of all of us.
22. And number 2, that the environment is already
23. being damaged by massive military spending that does not
24. protect us from the danger of, for example, box cutters.
25. Has no protection from such danger and then the third
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1 concern -- and the money could be better used for production.
2 -- for protection against, for example, gangs in Los
3 Angeles.
4 And then the third concern that I have is that the
5 example that we set for the rest of the world as the world’s
6 wealthiest nation and the world’s, now, only super power,
7 the victors in the cold war, the example that we set for the
8 priorities for poorer nations to spend their wealth on
9 weapons rather than the health and well being and the future
10 of all the children.
11 So someone once said about the initial space
12 program, that it’s sort of that we set foot on the moon, it’s
13 that we set eye on the earth. That we looked at the earth
14 and realized that this is our planet and we’re all
15 responsible for it.
16 So would like to say that the best action would
17 not only be no expansion of this Missile Defense Program,
18 but to stop the currently operating ones. That’s what would
19 be environmentally sensitive.
20 Thank you very much for your time.
21 MS. ELLIOTT: Elden Bud Booth.
22 ///
23 ///
24 ///
25 ///

ELDEN BOOTH: My name is Elden Booth. I view this EIS
1 as an exercise in futility. The military industrial complex
2 will get whatever money to do with whatever they want from
3 the supine congress that is in control of our country.
4 how this system is designed, they say, to protect
5 us from a nonexistent threat, from a nonexistent enemy.
6 Therefore, it can never be proven to be a failure, since it
7 will never be used. The cold war MAD system that we
8 have, Mutual Assured Destruction, has served us well.
9 Now, we very carefully point out, our leaders very
carefully point out, that this system is not designed to
10 protect us from Russia and China, the only two countries
11 that could shoot a nuclear tip missile at this country. But
12 we say, those are all of our friends, so, therefore, we don’t --
13 we don’t design this system to protect from them.
14 It’s a win-win situation for the Military
15 Industrial Complex, because since it will never be used, it
16 can never be proven that it does not work. Although,
17 leading scientists have said it can be overcome in very many
18 different ways if any country was desired to attack us; that
19 will never happen.
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1. But down the road, there is something that truly
does bother me. That is the upcoming Star Wars Program as
pointed out by the Space Command's Vision for 2020, in which
Earth's circling satellite with high intensity lasers,
fueled by nuclear reactors, encircling the globe, will be
able to destroy anything on earth. If that -- if that was
to come to pass -- and incidentally, that is -- the term for
that is Visions For 2020. That's not vision 20/20 that's
the year 2020. And if that -- if that was to come to pass,
our control of the earth would be complete, but in the
process, we could be in fact destroying the earth.
Thank you very much.

JESSE ELLIOTT: James Carucci.

JAMES CARUCCI:
offered public commentary on the NMD Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MR. CARUCCI: The regulations for implementing NEPA are
found in 40 CFR -- ensure me -- Part 1501.1 says, about
scoping, says that an agency shall review their scoping. If
-- I want to read the quote correctly.
"If substantial changes are made later in the
Proposed Action, or if significant new circumstances or
information arises, which bear on the proposal or its

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA
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nuclear weapons stood on alert at Vandenberg. Now you're
bringing us active weapons. Don't call them defensive
weapons, they're active. You make a choice to launch them.
It seems, again, that whether this effect is
direct or indirect, there's clearly a connection between the
Extended Test Range and the four HEMI weapons to be imploded
at Vandenberg. I would urge the Army and the Air Force to
rethink this EIS and to bring it all together in one
document. Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Robert Parker.

Robert Parker,
offered public commentary on the NMD Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

Mr. PARKER: My name is Robert Parker, and it's a
mystery to me why these public hearings are even held.
They're a waste of the taxpayers' money, because this
conclusion to this environmental business, it was already
decided and this is all a waste of time. It's just a
charade.

But I have doubts about the credibility and the
integrity of the military officials, the different agencies
that might be involved in this. I can tell you from
personal experience that the Air Force, several or many of

the people there, from the Commander of Air Force Space
Command on down, would prefer to obfuscate a tree to tell a lie
than stand on the ground and say the truth.

And in the 1950's, near the Ogden Proving
Grounds, or down in there, 50,000 sheep dropped over dead, and
the Army denied responsibility. We all know what happened
about Pearl Harbor, how Admiral Kimmel and General Short
were made scapegoats.

So if there is an accident, we're not -- we can't
-- these people will tell you will a lie, straight-faced,
look you right in the eye and tell you a damn lie, and if
this sincerity, or if the concern to safety is sincere and
genuine, what should be done in issue cyanide pills to every
man, woman, and child that might be anywhere near this when
there's an accident, and there will be an accident. Then
these people will avoid an agonizing death. Cause there's
going to be blunders. And if the people who are pushing
this system are really sincere, they should go and live in
and near these areas and prove their sincerity, as to
whether the possibility of an accident. Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Justin Ruge.

///
///
///
///
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COMMENT NUMBER

1. LORIN BRONSON.
2. offered public testimony on the Draft GMD Extended Test
3. Range Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:
4. MR. BRONSON: My name is Lorin Bronson and I live in
5. Lompoc. North Korea can make us now. We have a moral
6. obligation to defend ourselves. Your opponents are the same
7. people who were wrong about communism and our policy in
8. Southeast Asia. You were at that time, and still are,
9. unwilling to accept responsibility for helping murder
10. 2,000,000 Cambodians.
11. As for the environment, free countries have the
12. best environment. It's the dictatorships that have the
13. worst environment.
14. MS. ELLIOTT: Sit?
15. MR. BRONSON: Yes.
16. MS. ELLIOTT: May I request you to fill out this card
17. for me, please. Thank you.
18. MR. PARKER: I have a question for you. How can you --
19. hey, sir --
20. MR. BRONSON: You're out of order.
21. MR. PARKER: I am not.
22. MR. BRONSON: Yes, you are.
23. MS. ELLIOTT: Yes, sir. Is there anyone else who have
24. not spoken that --

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

1. MR. PARKER: He was out of order when we made
2. presumptive statements about our attitudes and what our
3. history was. He doesn't know a damn thing about it. He was
4. out of order.
5. MS. ELLIOTT: Is there anyone else who have not spoken
6. and would like to speak?
7. Thank you all very kindly for your courtesy
8. tonight. Thank you for your interest, and thank you for
9. your participation. Good night.
10. (The proceedings concluded at 7:24 p.m.)
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
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the findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your comments on the Draft EIS.

(SLIDE NO. 2 - AGENDA)

Let's look at the agenda for tonight. After I finish the introduction, Commander Robert Dees of the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense X-Band Radar Project office will describe the proposed GMD flight test activities. Then Ms. Sharon Mitchell, Program Manager for the EIS, will describe the process called for in the National Environmental Policy Act. She will also present the environmental analysis and results of the Draft EIS.

The last item on the agenda, the public comment portion, is really the most important. Remember that the Draft EIS is just that -- a draft. This is your opportunity to tell the GMD Project Office how it can improve its analysis of potential environmental impacts before the document is finalized and before a decision is made on whether or not to proceed with the proposed action.

(SLIDE NO. 3 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS)

Now a few administrative points on making comments tonight. If you have already signed up to speak, that's good. I have approximately 14 sign-up cards already. If you have not already filled out a card and would like to speak tonight, please go to the registration table and sign up. Everyone is welcome to speak, but it makes the process run more smoothly if I can call on people from a sign-up list. We will also have a reserved area up here of six seats that will be for upcoming speakers so we can move through the process efficiently.

Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of four minutes and may speak only once. You may not combine or yield speaking times to others. Elected officials will be given the courtesy of speaking first. All other speakers will be called in the order in which they signed up. There is a court reporter here today, seated to my left, making a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all of your oral comments will be recorded accurately. As part of preparing that transcript, an audio and video recording is being made of tonight's hearing as well.

If you are uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also provide verbal comments by telephone.

There is a toll-free telephone number indicated on the handout that you may use for recording those comments.

(SLIDE NO. 4 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS - continued)

You may also submit written comments. There are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in
written comments that you brought with you tonight,
either to me or to a person at the registration table.
Second, you may use the written comment sheets that are
available at the registration table to write down any
comments that you wish to make and turn them in	onight. Third, you may mail written comments to the
name and address that appear on the comment sheet. Or,
last of all, you may e-mail comments to the address
listed on the handout for tonight's hearing.

Your comments will be entered into the formal
record, and they will be given the same consideration as
oral comments offered here tonight.

If you choose to mail in comments, please note
that they must be postmarked by March 24, 2002, to be
considered in the Final EIS.
(SLIDE NO. 6 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS - continued)

Also, if you would like to receive a copy of
the Final EIS when it becomes available, there are
several ways you can do that. If you have already
received a Draft EIS in the mail, you are already on the
mailing list and will automatically receive the Final
EIS unless you tell us otherwise. If you provide either
oral or written comments, you will be sent a copy of the
Final EIS. If you are not on the mailing list, you may
fill out a request at the registration table. You can

also request a copy by sending an e-mail to the address
listed on the handout. Also, copies of the Final EIS
will be placed in area libraries. A list of those
libraries is available at the registration table and can
also be found in the Draft EIS. The Final EIS will also
be put on the Missile Defense Agency Web site listed on
the handout.

Finally, it is important for you to understand
that the government representative are not here tonight
to make any decisions. Their main purpose in being here
is to listen firsthand to your suggestions and
concerns.

And with that, we will begin with Commander
Deer's presentation.
(SLIDE NO. 6 - GMD PROGRAM OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE)

CNR: Good evening. My name is
Commander Robert Deer, and I'm a technical adviser for
the GMD X-band Radar Project Office. The Missile
Defense Agency, formerly known as the Ballistic Missile
Defense Organization, is the Department of Defense
agency responsible for developing and testing a
Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the following
charts, I'll briefly describe the GMD Extended Test
Range, provide an overview of the GMD and how it works,
and address the decisions to be made. Before I do, I
would like to describe the overall concept of the Ballistic Missile Defense System under development and explain the different segments of the System.

(SLIDE NO. 7 - BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM)

This chart represents the flight of a ballistic missile. A ballistic missile flight path has three basic parts which we call segments. These segments are the boost segment, when the missile is thrusting and leaving the atmosphere; the midcourse segment, or the middle or ballistic phase; and the terminal segment, where the missile re-enters the earth's atmosphere. Within each of these segments, our missile programs has to this point been characterized by discrete independent programs, which we call elements. Each element worked to shoot down ballistic missiles in a particular segment of flight.

Now, however, the Missile Defense Agency is now moving towards an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System. Instead of having discrete, stand-alone elements, we plan to eventually tie the programs for the various elements together so we can shoot down missiles in all segments of flight. Each segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense System could include several elements, which are different ways of providing a defense against the threat missile during the same phase of its flight. All segments and elements are designed to work together as each element is developed. At the same time, each element could provide an effective stand-alone defense against a specific type of threat.

The GMD element is the Midcourse Defense Segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. The GMD element is the successor to National Missile Defense and includes the same components.

(SLIDE NO. 8 - REPRESENTATIVE GMD CONCEPT)
The conceptual GMD element would consist of the components shown on the slide. These components are the Ground-Based Interceptors existing early warning radars and satellites, the X-Band Radar, which performs tracking discrimination and assessment of the incoming missiles the Defense Support Program for Space-based Infrared Systems the Battle Management Command and Control, which is the central communications and control points and, finally, the In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal, which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor while the interceptor is in flight.

(SLIDE NO. 9 - PROPOSED GMD SITES AND COMPONENTS)
The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This...
Slide indicates the proposed locations for the various components in the Extended Test Range.

Two elements are of particular concern for us in this area. One is the Sea-Based Test XBR and IDT pictured down here. We've also got Vandenberg Air Force Base, just down the road, which has targets, interceptors, and IDTs.

The GMD testing would be of two types. One type of testing would involve increasingly robust Ground-Based Interceptor flight testing in the Pacific region in scenarios that are as operationally realistic as possible. The other type would involve validation of the operational concept through integrated ground tests using GMD components. These are tests using Fort Greely and other locations analyzed in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment. These ground tests do not involve missile flights or intercepts.

The Draft EIS, which is the subject of this hearing, evaluates the first type of GMD testing involving interceptor flight testing. This interceptor flight testing will be the focus of our discussion tonight.

(SLIDE NO. 10 – CURRENT GMD TEST RANGE)

As you can see from this slide, the existing
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multiple engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometries, distances, speeds of targets, and interceptors to closely resemble an operational scenario involving attack by one or more threat missiles. We are proposing to add dual target and ground-based interceptor launch capability at the Kodiak Launch Complex and/or at Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also proposed are mobile target launch capability and shipborne radars. The proposed Extended Test Ranges would provide more operationally realistic flight testing in support of Bush and Congress have directed.

(SLIDE NO. 12 - CONCEPTUAL SEA-BASED TEST X-BAND RADAR)
A Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar, or SXR, is proposed to support Extended Test Ranges flight testing. This SXR is a multi-function radar that performs tracking, discrimination, and intercept assessment of incoming target missiles. The SXR would be deployed at an existing shipyard on the United States Gulf Coast.

(SLIDE NO. 13 - POTENTIAL SUPPORT BASES AND CONCEPTUAL SXR PERFORMANCE REGIONS)
Three conceptual SXR performance regions have been identified to accomplish effective radar coverage for flight testing. The SXR would operate within the confines of one or more performance regions based on the needs of the particular flight-test scenario.

Potential primary support bases have been identified based in part on their proximity to these performance regions. Approximately 10 to 12 days before GMD operational tests, the SXR would leave the primary support base to travel to its performance region in the Pacific Ocean.

The SXR would be stationed at its primary support base between flight test missions. The SXR would have deep draft, which would restrict it from many harbors. SXR may dock to a deep draft pier if it is available between missions. If a pier is not available, the SXR would most likely be moored three to ten miles offshore while at the primary support base. Potential locations for the primary support base analyzed in the Draft EIS were Port of Valdez and Anchorage, Alaska; Naval Basin Ventura County/San Nicolas Island, near Oxnard, California; Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii; Naval Station Everett, Washington and Reagan Test Site, Republic of the Marshall Islands.

Daily activities provided by the support base might include logistics, resupply, and maintenance and repair. Radar operations in the vicinity of the Primary Support Base may include tracking of satellites and calibration devices. Vessels from the primary support base would resupply the SXR. During transit between the
primary support base and the test location, periodic
care of operation for satellite and calibration device
tracking including joint satellite tracks with GMD
sensors and other pre-mission activities may also
curr.
(SLIDE NO. 14 - PROPOSED TEST ACTIVITIES)
Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS, which may
meet some of the enhanced test objectives include
launching target and/or interceptor missiles from the
Kodiak Launch Complex, adding interceptor launch
missiles from Vandenberg Air Force Base, and launching
target missiles from mobile platforms over the broad
ocean area. The target and interceptor missiles could
be launched in sets of two under some testing scenarios
from either the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test
Site, or Vandenberg Air Force Base.
In-Flight Interceptor Communications System
Data Terminals would be constructed in close proximity
to the proposed Ground-Based Interceptor launch sites
and expected intercept area. Existing Launch sites and
test resources would continue to be used in enhanced
test scenarios. Launching Ground-Based Interceptors
from the Kodiak Launch Complex may require up to two
additional small mobile radars and telemetry stations in
South Central or Southwest Alaska for telemetry and

flight safety.
Existing shipborne sensors would be used for
mid-course tracking of the target missile during
Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak
Launch Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The
Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would be constructed and
used in tests to perform tracking, discrimination, and
assessment of target missiles.
(SLIDE NO. 15 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 1)
The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for
the GMS extended test range testing. For Alternative 1
we would propose the following components: First,
single and dual launched ground-based Interceptor
Launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex and the Reagan
Test Site; second, single and dual target launches from
the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base,
and the Reagan Test Site; and third, single target
Launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and a
mobile target launch platform.
Construction of two Ground-Based Interceptor
silos and an additional target launch pad and associated
support facilities would be needed at the Kodiak Launch
Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight
Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the
Kodiak Launch Complex and at a location in the
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mid-Pacific. The S3X would be used in tests for tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missiles.

( SLIDE NO. 16 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 2)

Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1, with the exception that the Ground-Based Interceptor launch would be from Vandenberg Air Force Base, instead of from the Kodiak Launch Complex. The Ground-Based Interceptor launch would require construction of an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal and modification of existing support facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base.

( SLIDE NO. 17 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 3)

Alternative 3 would combine activities proposed for Alternative 1 and 2 and would include Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base and construction of the required support facilities.

( SLIDE NO. 18 - NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)

Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD Extended Test Range would not be established, and interceptor and target launch scenarios would not be tested under more operationally realistic conditions. The S3X would not be developed. Testing at the existing GMD test range using existing launch areas would continue.

(SLIDE NO. 19 - MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY'S DECISION TO BE MADE)

The decision to be made is whether to enhance the current GMD flight test capability by selecting from the list of alternatives presented, including the No Action Alternative. The Missile Defense Agency is still evaluating the feasibility, safety, and utility of the GMD testing program of conducting a limited number of checkout Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely. The possibility of such flights is too speculative to be analyzed at this time. The Missile Defense Agency will perform an EIS if and when it proposes to conduct Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely.

This concludes the Program Overview. I would like to introduce Ms. Sharon Mitchell, who will describe the Environmental Analysis Process.

Ms. MITCHELL: Hello, my name is Sharon Mitchell. I'm with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I'm the program manager in regards the preparation of the EIS on behalf of the Missile Defense Agency.

(SLIDE NO. 21 - DRAFT EIS PROCESS)

The National Environmental Policy Act requires
that federal agencies consider environmental consequences of their proposed actions in their decision-making process. The Missile Defense Agency has decided to prepare an EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act to analyze the environmental effects of extending the current GMD Test Range.

As you may be aware, the first phase in the preparation of an EIS is to conduct what is called scoping to identify environmental and safety issues that should be addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping meetings were held in Kodiak, Anchorage, Adak, and Valdez, Alaska; Umatilla and Longview, California; Honolulu, Hawaii; and Seattle, Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal and state agencies were held to obtain their views concerning the proposed action, its alternatives, and potential environmental effects within their area of expertise or which are of a particular concern to them.

Following scoping, the next step was to further refine the possible alternatives being considered for the GMD Extended Range testing. The Draft EIS was then prepared to address the reasonable alternatives, including the no-action alternative, reasonably foreseeable actions, and information on cumulative effects. The Draft EIS has been made available to federal and state agencies and to the general public for review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this comment period, public hearings are being held to receive public input. That brings us to this hearing tonight.

(SLIDE NO. 22 - FINAL EIS PROCESS)
All of the comments received will be reviewed and considered in preparing the Final EIS. The Final EIS will then be made available to the public for a period of 30 days. No sooner than 30 days after the release of the Final EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will make its decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Test Range activities.

(SLIDE NO. 23 - ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS CONSIDERED)
The Missile Defense Agency identified 15 resource areas that normally require some level of analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on those areas with the most potential for environmental impacts. Each resource area was addressed at each location unless it was determined through initial analysis that the proposed activities would not result in an environmental impact to that resource.

(SLIDE NO. 24 - SCOPE OF THE DRAFT EIS)
The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with implementing the Proposed Action or its
alternative. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed environmental issues associated with licenses or permits required to implement the proposed action at each of the potential extended test range sites.

The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference several existing environmental analyses associated with current Ballistic Missile Defense System test assets that include: Aegis Ashore, the Reagan Test Site, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also incorporated by reference is the analysis of environmental impacts contained in the GOM Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment.

The Draft EIS also analyzed the potential for cumulative impacts from other Department of Defense, Government, and commercial activities in areas where the GOM actions are proposed.

(SLIDE NO. 26 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - NAVAL BASE VENTURA COUNTY)

The potential environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIS are presented in the next several slides. For your convenience, this information has been reproduced as a fact sheet, which is available at the registration table, for your review. I would like to highlight a few resource areas that may be important to you. As you can see, minimal impacts were identified from implementation of the proposed action. Most of the impacts are minimal because the proposed actions are a continuation of existing activities at the various locations.

At the Naval Base Ventura County, an Electromagnetic Radiation/Electromagnetic Interference survey and analysis would be conducted as a part of the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process. The results of the survey would be used to define a safe operating area for the SBN. This area would not interfere with airspace operations and would allow for a safe operating environment.

Small quantities of potentially hazardous materials used during the construction activities would result in generation of added wastes that would be handled by Naval Base Ventura County under their normal waste management procedures. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would follow U.S. Navy requirements that, to the maximum extent practicable, ships shall retain hazardous waste aboard ship for shore disposal. In compliance with the Uniform National Discharge Standards, the Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar vessel would incorporate marine pollution control devices, such as keeping their docks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues, and...
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Again, equal consideration will be given to all
comments, whether they are presented here tonight,
e-mailed, or submitted by regular mail to us.
Once the Final XIS is complete, we will mail it
to all the individuals who have requested a copy. If
you are not on our mailing list, you can request a copy
by writing to the street address or e-mail address given
in the handout or by filling out a card at the
registration table.
I will now turn the hearing back over to
Mr. Elliott.
MS. ELLIOTT: We will now break for a
five-minute recess, and then we will begin taking your
comments.
If you would like to make verbal comments,
please complete the verbal comments card provided at the
registration table and turn it in to a person at the
registration table.
Please remember that no decision is being made
tonight. The main purpose for the government
representatives' presence here tonight is to learn
firsthand of your concerns and suggestions.
Thank you for your comments and your courtesy
during the evening.
(Brief recess.)
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

We kindly request that you observe the four-minute time limit for oral comments. We use the four-minute limit at these hearings to give everyone a fair and equal chance to make their comments.

To aid you in knowing when the four minutes are up, I have a simple method for indicating times. After three minutes, I will raise my index finger indicating that you have one minute left. This should help you find a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. After the end of four minutes, I will raise my closed hand indicating it is time to finish your comments. So it is important to look up from your paper occasionally to see if you are being given a signal.

I have one other request that will need to be enforced for the sake of the court reporter, and that is you must withhold any expressions either against or in favor of the speaker until the speaker is finished. Otherwise there is no way that the court reporter can get all of the comments. So while you may be agreeing with the speaker by clapping or speaking out, you are probably making certain we are not capturing the comments on the record. Please hold all of your expressions until the speaker is finished, and thank you in advance for your cooperation.

We also greatly appreciate your cooperation and understanding in observing the four-minute limit. Also, keep in mind that oral comments are only one way to share your thoughts and concerns regarding the Draft EIR. You can also hand in written comments tonight, e-mail them, or submit them by regular mail by March 24, 2005. As I mentioned, written comments are given the same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight.

So with that our first speaker, Judy Mikels.

JUDY MIKELS

offered public commentary on the OHD Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MS. MIKELS: Thank you very much and welcome once again.

Are we on? I don't think so.

I can yell real loud if it's just the court reporter you're worried about.

Okay. Very quickly. We have -- I have submitted a letter as a formal written comment. So I will be very, very brief.

Welcome to Ventura County. I'm really here.

My name is Judy Mikels. I'm a Ventura County supervisor. I currently serve as chair of the board.
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and I'm also co-chair of Regional Defense Partnership
21st Century, which is a base support group, and I'm
merely here to tell you how supportive we are of our
Navy partners, how happy we are to have Naval Base
Ventura County and its employees here.
We have been briefed on the Sea-Based X-Band
Radar Test platform. We would look forward to having it
here, and we would certainly welcome the personnel to
our county who would be involved in this very important
defense testing. You are always welcome here. I am
available at any time. I have left my card for any
technical comments. We'd be happy to do that.
We've reviewed -- I have reviewed at least the
executive summary of the EIR. I will admit that I will
never read the full EIR. I can't do that because you
never read all of those things. I don't understand
them. But it looks like to me that you have done the
right and looked in the right corners, turned over the
right rocks, and the information that at least I have
seen in the draft I am very comfortable with, and I
thank you for being here this evening and giving not
only myself but all of the citizens of this area an
opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS.
Thank you.
MS. ELLIOTT: Brian Miller.

Brian Miller offered public commentary on the MMD Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MR. MILLER: Thank you again for the
opportunity to comment. My name is Brian Miller. I am
the district chief of staff for Congressman Blumen
Gallegly. The congressman regrets not being here
tonight, but would like to add his strong support for
the siting of the Missile Defense Agency's Sea-Based
X-Band Radar in San Nicholas Island. He too submitted a
letter at your earlier scoping meeting for the written
comment.
San Nicholas Island, which is located 60 miles
off the coast of Point Mugu and is part of Point Mugu's
36,000-square-mile sea test range, would be an ideal
location for the X-Band for two reasons.
First, the range can be expanded north to Big Sur, south to the U.S.-Mexican border, and west into the
Pacific Ocean, to include 126,000 square miles which
would be ample room for testing. Additionally, San Nicholas Island has a 10,000-square-foot runway and
offers an unobstructed area over which the Navy and many
DOD activities currently test their weapon systems.
Second, the island is supported by an array of
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mainland facilities located at Naval Base Ventura County. These include a naval-operated port, airlift capabilities, Laguna Peak which rises 1,500 feet above the ocean and hosts an instrumented extended line-of-site coverage over the sea range and San Nicolas Island, all of which is fiber optically connected to a wide variety of laboratories and command centers.

The Navy, Congress, and U.S. taxpayers have contributed greatly to the unique capabilities that currently exist at Point Magu, and these assets could be easily leveraged to provide facilities required for the extended test range without duplicating expensive infrastructure.

Thank you.

Ms. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

Charlotte Craven.

CHARLOTTE CRAVEN

offered public commentary on the GMT Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

Ms. CRAVEN: Thank you for the opportunity to speak here tonight. My name is Charlotte Craven. I'm mayor of the city of Camarillo, California, and I'm vice chairman of the Regional Defense Partnership for the

P-T-0007

21st Century. I'm here to speak in favor of the approval of the EIS to extend the GMT Test Range for several reasons.

The missile activity is just a continuation of ongoing activities. The local portion would be 60 miles offshore at San Nicolas Island. The radars would be off the surface of the water away from marine life, and the study found no new environmental issues. So I'm here to state community support mainly for the Extended Test Range using the San Nicolas Island facilities as appropriate in the testing.

Ms. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

Robert Lagonari.

ROBERT LAGONARINO

offered public commentary on the GMT Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

Mr. LAGONARINO: Very good. My name is Robert Lagonari, and I am a former member of the U.S. House of Representatives for over 19 years. Prior to that I served 12 years in the California State Senate, and before that I was on the City Council and mayor for the City of Ojai.

I want to endorse and strongly go with the
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1. remarks of the three previous speakers. I think they
2. have laid out the reason why San Nicolas Island would be
3. a good choice for this proposal. The sea range is
4. there. It's controlled. The air is under the control
5. of FAA. There is very little encroachment compared to
6. other areas in the United States, and there is the
7. advantage of an integrated naval base system with a
8. harbor, with Air Force, with a railroad.
9. So thank you for coming. We support the Navy
10. here -- most of us do -- very strongly, and I hope that
11. the decision will be the way we would like it to be.
12. Thank you.
13. MS. ELIOTT: Thank you.
14. Frank Schillo.
15.
16. FRANK SCHILLO
17. offered public commentary on the OMD Extended Test Range
18. Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:
19.
20. MR. SCHILLO: My name is Frank Schillo. I'm a
21. retired county supervisor as of last month, and I
22. support the X-Band Radar at San Nicolas Island, and I
23. want to thank you very much for providing me with the
24. executive summary of the EIS that was sent in the mail.
25. I had an opportunity to review it before I had
26. spoken last time.
27. And to put some advantages on the San Nicolas
28. site, it's centrally located in the Pacific. There's no
29. impact on commercial flights. I think this makes it
30. fairly unique among the sites that you're looking for.
31. We already have the capabilities for support of it
32. through the Pacific Missile Range and from Naval Base
33. Ventura County, and I think it's more realistic to have
34. a radar, X-Band Radar defending the continental United
35. States right close off the offshore.
36. And in looking at the Draft EIS on page 33,
37. with the Impact and Mitigation Summary, Naval Base
38. Ventura County, Fort Wmcllrero, the air quality, airspace,
39. biological resources, hazardous materials, health and
40. safety, utilities, and visual and aesthetic resources
41. basically have no impact. And I think this is a sound
42. decision, you're on the way to making a decision that
43. will reflect easily to choose the San Nicolas site for
44. the X-Band Radar.
45. Thank you very much.
46. MS. ELIOTT: Thank you.
47. Anthony Vozante.
ANTHONY VOLANTE

offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MR. VOLANTE: Good evening. My name is Anthony
Volante. I am a councilmember from the City of Fort
Roosevelt, California. I am a retired colonel, United
States Air Force, with the relative rank of brigadier
general, the State of California. I’m also a member of
the Regional Defense Partnership 21, which supports our
military installations here in Ventura County.

I came before you on October 22, 2022,
supporting the placing of the Sea-Based X-Band Radar
component of the Extended Test Range Project at San
Nicolas Island. I came before you this evening to tell
you that my city strongly supports the placing of this
project at San Nicolas Island. I will also have a
letter requesting unanimous support from the City
Council strongly urging your support of locating SEK on
San Nicolas Island and Naval Base Ventura County as the
primary support base.

Enhanced testing capacity provided by SEK and
ERT project is vital to maintaining an aggressive
posture on national security. Naval Base Ventura County
and San Nicolas Island provide excellent harbor

facilities, communications, security, and logistic
support facilities. They are all key elements to a
successful ETR project and a Sea-Based X-Band Radar.

I thank you, Commander Dees, and your team for
the opportunity to come before you this evening to show
my strong support and also thank you and your staff for
an outstanding presentation and an excellent Draft EIS.

Thank you very much.

MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

Kathy Long.

KATHY LONG

offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MS. LONG: Thank you and good evening and thank
you for providing this opportunity in this community for
a public hearing to take place on this important
contribution to the community. I am too a member of the
ERT 21. My name is Kathy Long, Ventura County
Supervisor and the Port of Hueneme, part of the Naval
Base Ventura County, is in part of my district. And the
letter I have provided tonight is to provide for the
public record the support for the operation of GMD
testing activities at Port Hueneme.
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1. Impacts. While I cannot speak for the entire City Council on this matter at this time, I am the designated representative of the city's Regional Defense Partnership for the 21st Century, and as such I'm charged by my colleagues with the task of remaining informed of the events and developments involving military installations and activities in this geographic area that could impact our city. I believe that upon completion of the review provided, any environmental impacts identified in the review are vigorously mitigated to the extent feasible. This project will have the enthusiastic support of our citizens."

   I'd like to make this part of the record for Councilman Andrews. And again, we would like to show, the City of San Buenaventura would like to show its support for this project, and we welcome the GMD testing in this area.

   Thank you.

   MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

   Are there any other elected officials who would like to speak and did not sign up yet?

   If not, we will begin with the rest of you.

   Our first speaker Devon Chaffee, and the next one will be Bob Convey.

   / / /
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1 intelligent from the NDA standpoint. As you know, it’s
2 the largest instrumented testing training range in the
3 world. I think the opportunity to site your radar there
4 would be a good selection.
5 The County of Ventura strongly supports the
6 Navy – it has for many years – at all three bases,
7 Fort Huachuca, Point Magu, and the Air National Guard
8 Base.
9 I have reviewed the EIS. I see no downside
10 from the standpoint of the NDAs and I, therefore,
11 encourage the selection of that site.
12 Thank you.
13 **W. ELLIOTT**: Following the next one will be
14 David Faulconer.
15
16 **WAYNE DAVIE**: Offered public commentary on the
17 CND Extended Test Range
18 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:
19
20 **MR. DAVIE**: Hello. My name is Wayne Davie. I am currently vice president and chief financial officer
21 at Rockwell Scientific Company. Rockwell Scientific is a privately owned company located in Thousand Oaks and
22 Camarillo. I am here tonight speaking on behalf of my
23 company Rockwell Scientific. I am also speaking tonight
24 **P-T-00014**
25
26 as a business supporter of having the Sea-Based X-Band
27 Radar System at Naval Base Ventura County.
28 This program is a strategic opportunity for our
29 region and Department of Defense, Naval Base Ventura
30 County, and San Nicolas Island is the most logical
31 location for this program, based on our region’s
32 existing infrastructure and accessibility.
33 This program is also strongly supported by the
34 business community in this region. The company I
35 represent, Rockwell Scientific, is one of many examples
36 of the supporters. Rockwell Scientific has been based
37 in this region for over 40 years. We are a nationally
38 recognized research and development company doing work
39 for the U.S. Government, numerous defense contractors,
40 several long-term strategic customers, and many
41 commercial customers. Our full-time and contract head
42 count totals in excess of 500 well-paying jobs. We have
43 approximately 140 Ph.D. scientists on our staff, and
44 many of them will be working on this program.
45 We also play a major role in designing imaging
46 sensors for several national missile defense programs,
47 and we’re really aware of this program. Rockwell
48 Scientific will also design and develop several
49 high-speed electronics and power components which will
50 be used in the Sea-Based X-Band Radar System. Many
51
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other local and regional companies are also well
positioned to support this major program being based in
Naval Base Ventura County. It is our belief that all of
the health, environmental, and safety issues associated
with this program will be adequately addressed.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to
speak here tonight in support of this important
project.

Thank you.

DAVID FAUBION

offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MR. FAUBION: My name is David Faubion, city of
Ventura. I came unprepared without a speech, but just
based on what I'm hearing and just the sheer audacity of
this, it's a legend that SCT is unworkable, that it's
extremely too costly, and it's extremely unnecessary.
So where is the logic in the paradise of Ventura County,
aboard one that's heavily militarized? So what? It's
by default an environmental hazard because it's
unnecessary, it's unworkable, and it's extremely too
costly. So, therefore, it should not be done because any
impact that it has environmentally is too much. There's
nothing more to say about it.

Thank you.

MS. ELIOTT: Thank you.

Gordon Birk and then William Connors.

GORDON BIRR

offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MR. BIRR: My name is Gordon Birk. I'm a
resident of the Channel Islands beach area. I'm also a
technical analyst for the Beacon Foundation. We will be
submitting our report in writing.

And I attended your scoping meeting. I believe
it was in December, and I see the presentation today has
changed considerably from the scoping presentation in
that I did not see any mention today of San Nicolas
Island being a contender for the Sea-Based Radar docking
or mooring. I noticed on your graphics you had three
circles that were strictly mid-Pacific sea ranching. So

I'm wondering if that's still a viable alternative.

Back to the process, when I received the
mailing for tonight's meeting, it came by Priority
Mail, and it cost you guys $4.85 to mail it. I think a
first-class stamp would have been just as appropriate.
And also, as far as the process is concerned, I notice that the only library in the area that has the EIS on file is here at the Oxnard library. The City of Port Hueneme, its library or any of the other Ventura County libraries did not receive a copy. I checked with them, and they were not on the mailing list, and I think you should include at least the City of Port Hueneme’s public library on the final EIS so everyone in the area will have a chance to review it, primarily since they’re the closest neighbor to the Port Hueneme Harbor, and I believe they should be an appraiser on anyone else in the area, especially since now within the Naval Base Ventura County and Port Hueneme you have it listed as the primary suspect base and mooring for the sea-based radar.

I don’t know if that’s in the EIS as such or what its ramifications are, but there is a bottom line statement here that says no impact of visual resources are anticipated. And this thing is ten times as tall as the tallest house in my neighborhood. So there is a visual impact, believe me, and the device is so large, it won’t even fit through the Panama Canal, and I don’t think it will fit inside the Port of Hueneme either, and if it’s going to be moored, it’s going to have to be moored off of Port Hueneme somewhere, if they’re anticipating mooring it for maintenance or testing primarily.

In regards to the testing aspects, going through here briefly, you talked about the Department of Defense safety procedures. We’ve always had this contention with the DNEF facility there at Port Hueneme Base, and its facility has also adhered to the Department of Defense. However, they’re in a civilian area. They should be adhering to the FCC requirements, and the FCC requirements, especially in the X-Band Radar area, the 9, 10, 12 GHz, is where they deviate considerably. Believe me. In an uncontrolled area it’s almost like ten times the radiation exposure permitted with the Department of Defense versus that of the FCC. So that should be looked at and try to adhere to the FCC requirements.

And when you talk about the mitigation summaries, you usually refer to you’re going to track and examine these issues prior to setup and what you should do in mitigate these prior to setup. You know, just don’t track and consent on them. They should be mitigated totally.

I believe that’s the extent of my comments for now, and I’ll reserve the rest for later.

Thank you.
BILL CONNEEN

offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MR. CONNEEN: My name is Bill Conneen. I’ve
been a resident of Camarillo for 25 years. I’m a Navy
veteran, and I actually retired here because it’s such a
lovely place to live and also because the bases here
provide a way to really accomplish things, and I came
out here from Washington, D.C., which is really a
difficult place to get anything done. Actually during
my time in the Navy, I served as a vice commander of the
Pacific Missile Test Center, which is a predecessor to
the current organization. As such, I had an opportunity
to fly in and out of San Nicolas Island a lot, and it’s
a really isolated location. It’s far off the coast, 60
miles, but it seems like a lot farther than that when
you’re trying to operate projects which is what we did
out there.

San Nicolas Island has been a base for a lot of
different Navy projects that also respect the habitat of
some endangered species out there. So that’s a very
important consideration, and the Navy’s taken that into
account and I think has done a wonderful job over the
years of respecting the environment.

I strongly support the selection of San Nicolas
island as a taxpayer meeting the most cost-effective
solution to the Ballistic Missile Defense challenges
that you’re trying to deal with. I believe that it’s
probably one of the lower cost solutions that you’re
looking at. Having reviewed the Draft EIS, I see no
reason for concern for the environment or the California
ecology.

Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: MCP Alexander.

MS. ALEXANDER: I pass.


JACK DODD

offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MR. DODD: Ms. Elliott, Commander Dood,
Ms. Mitchell, how are you doing? Good evening and
welcome to Ventura County. My name is Jack Dodd, and
I’m a private citizen that lives in the city of
Camarillo. I’m here tonight to express my support for
the GMD Extended Test Range EIS and specifically the
using of the X-Band Radar at San Nicolas Island. I
know that perhaps there’s been some confusion in maybe
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some of the materials or presentations, but the folks
that I've talked to that have been studying this
understand that you're talking about putting the X-band
Radar at San Nicolas Island, not in the city of or the
port of Port Hueneme, and that makes a difference in
environmental effects and the scenery off the coast of
Port Hueneme. We understand that.

San Nicolas Island itself, of course, is
located 30 miles off the coast. It offers unlimited
access to the Navy sea range, which also provides
control of radio frequency emissions, it provides
control of the airspace, it provides control over
vessels on the sea surface, on the range and around San
Nicolas Island. And, of course, being off the -- 60
miles off the coast, it certainly minimizes the effects
on the mainland of Southern California.

Additionally, having the Sea-Based Test X-Band
Radar at San Nicolas Island operating on the Point Mugu
sea range leverages the existing environmental approvals
through the sea range on the environmental impact
statement and leverages the environmental effect that
Mr. Connors commented on whereby the Navy is a very good
steward of the environment. In fact, a lot of
endangered species flock to the Navy locations because
they're much more friendly than the surrounding areas.

Additionally, operating on the sea range
leverages the existing operational linkages with
Vandenberg Air Force Base which is part of the extended
test range in proposing both target launching and missile
interceptors. It benefits from both the -- from the
logistics connectivity with both the Port of Hueneme
through surface craft and the airfield at Point Mugu,
both of which are owned and controlled by the Navy and
can provide you dedicated service should you decide to
base the X-band Radar at San Nick.

As you've seen from the meeting tonight,
including all the elected officials and both current and
former and their representatives, there's a widespread
support in Ventura County for all the military
activities, specifically taking their time to come here
tonight to express their support for basing the X-band
Radar at San Nick. You certainly will be welcome here,
and if you have any questions for us, certainly let us
know, and we'll be happy to answer them, but we're
hopeful that in your decisions, we know you have a lot
of data to look at, all the locations that are around
the Pacific, but we hope you'll be favorably impressed
both with population, the geography, and the technical
capabilities of Ventura County in general, and Naval
Base Ventura County in particular, and San Nicolas
P-T-0019
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HENRY NORTEN

offered public commentary on the GND Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MR. NORTEN: My name is Henry Norten. I'm a resident of Oak View. I speak for myself. I didn't come here prepared to talk, but I needed to add a couple of comments. I'm strongly in favor of locating the X-Band Radar at San Nicolas Island. One thing I'd like you to have to consider is that the channel nature of the coast of the western United States causes air traffic flying north and south to fly inland and causes ships traffic to (inadvisable). It's just natural for that. Looking out beyond San Nicolas Island, there is really nothing out there. And so also because of the deep ocean aspect of the fall-off, the shelf of San Nicolas Island, there is really less biological issues to be addressed than nearer inland to the coast. And I look at that as a unique advantage beyond other areas around the Pacific Rim. Thank you.

Gloria Roman

offered public commentary on the GND Extended Test Range
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

MS. ROMAN: Good evening. My name is Gloria Roman. I am also a resident of Oxnard, and I am concerned about the hazardous waste. Our elected officials don't seem to -- one lady mentioned she don't even understand what she read, and she's not concerned about the hazardous waste, what kind of waste? I'm concerned about that. What is the waste, hazardous waste that you mention on your slide up there? And you know, what happened to the missile the missile? We ought to be concerned about this here too.

MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

Anyone else?

Thank you all for your courtesy, your interest, and your participation tonight. Thank you kindly.

(Proceedings concluded at 8:00 p.m.)
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448 Remember you have till March 24, 2003 to submit your comments on the Draft EIS and
449 as we stated before there are many ways to do that. We will conclude tonight’s meeting.
450 Thank you very much.
451 CERTIFICATION: This hearing was recorded by both audio and video equipment and
452 transcribed by the undersigned to the best of his ability and reflects the contents
453 presented. A. L. COZZETTI, Court Reporter and Transcriber. DATED: 3/14/03, at
454 Anchorage, Alaska.
# Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>EIS Section</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Sykes</td>
<td>P-T-0001-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0001-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0001-3</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Health and Safety for GBI and target are discussed in table ES-2, page es-24, of the Draft EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0001-4</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.11.3</td>
<td>See P-E-0032-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0001-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Garcia - Alaskans for Peace and Justice</td>
<td>P-T-0002-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0002-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0002-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0020-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0002-4</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0002-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0002-6</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Cleary - Citizens Opposed to Defense</td>
<td>P-T-0003-1</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4.2</td>
<td>As indicated in section 2.1.4.2, the SBX can exceed the 300 V/m average power threshold at 12 kilometers (7.5 miles). The average power threshold is based upon reducing the time of exposure of aircraft avionics to high intensity radiated field environments in order to preclude shortening the life of the aircraft avionics. The concern is not interference, but a reduction in life of the aircraft avionics. Additional information on the potential effects of EMR on communications-electronics, including aircraft avionics, is provided as appendix G of the EIS. Mitigation measures such as the redundant software that would help minimize potential interference to aircraft systems are discussed in section 2.1.4 as well as in appendix G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GMD launches would not be from Fort Greely. As stated in section 2.1.7 and appendix C, each missile flight test event would occur over unpopulated areas or minimally populated areas to reduce potential risk to the general public. Each flight test would be modeled. The models incorporate a number of variables such as the missile mass, velocity, trajectory, altitude, and descriptions of the environments that may affect the missile in flight, such as surface and high altitude winds. Modeling that is done long ahead of the actual test would use averages, including average weather predictions. Additional modeling done on the day of test verifies safety under actual test conditions. Databases include data on real time local weather conditions, including wind direction and intensity, mission profile, launch vehicle specifics, and the surrounding population distribution. Given a mission profile, the risks will vary in time and space. Therefore, a launch trajectory optimization is performed by the range for each proposed launch, subject to risk minimization and mission objectives constraints. The debris impact probabilities and lethality are then estimated for each launch considering the geographic setting, normal jettisons, failure debris, and demographic data to define and modify launch hazard/clearance areas and destruct lines to confine and/or minimize potential public risk of casualty or property damage. Tests do not proceed unless the Range Safety Office determines that the general population, including ship traffic, would be in a safe position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>EIS Section</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Cleary - Citizens Opposed to</td>
<td>P-T-0003-2</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
<td>GMD launches would not be from Fort Greely. As stated in section 2.1.7 and appendix C, each missile flight test event would occur over unpopulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Experimentation Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>areas or minimally populated areas to reduce potential risk to the general public. Each flight test would be modeled. The models incorporate a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>number of variables such as the missile mass, velocity, trajectory, altitude, and descriptions of the environments that may affect the missile in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flight, such as surface and high altitude winds. Modeling that is done long ahead of the actual test would use averages, including average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weather predictions. Additional modeling done on the day of test verifies safety under actual test conditions. Databases include data on real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>time local weather conditions, including wind direction and intensity, mission profile, launch vehicle specifics, and the surrounding population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>distribution. Given a mission profile, the risks will vary in time and space. Therefore, a launch trajectory optimization is performed by the range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for each proposed launch, subject to risk minimization and mission objectives constraints. The debris impact probabilities and lethality are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>then estimated for each launch considering the geographic setting, normal jettisons, failure debris, and demographic data to define and modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>launch hazard/clearance areas and destruct lines to confine and/or minimize potential public risk of casualty or property damage. Tests do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not proceed unless the Range Safety Office determines that the general population, including ship traffic, would be in a safe position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Mikels - Ventura County Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0004-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0020-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0004-2</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Miller - Congressman Elton</td>
<td>P-T-0005-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallegly</td>
<td>P-T-0005-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0005-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0005-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0005-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Craven - City of Camarillo</td>
<td>P-T-0006-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Craven - City of Camarillo</td>
<td>P-T-0006-2</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.11.3</td>
<td>See P-E-0032-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0006-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lagomarsino - Former Member of U.S. Congress</td>
<td>P-T-0007-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0007-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0007-3</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0007-4</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0007-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Schillo - Retired Ventura Co. Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0008-1</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-T-0007-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0008-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0008-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0008-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Volante - Councilmember from City of Port Hueneme</td>
<td>P-T-0009-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0009-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0009-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Long - Ventura County Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0010-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0010-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0010-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0010-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0010-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Herrera - City of San Buenaventura</td>
<td>P-T-0011-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0011-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Chaffee - Nuclear Age Peace Foundation</td>
<td>P-T-0012-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-3</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.7.3</td>
<td>Comment noted. However, the radar beam would be in motion, making it extremely unlikely that a bird would be in the intense area of the beam and would remain there for any considerable length of time. The power density is also not expected to exceed levels that could impact birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-4</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td>4.8.2 2.1.4.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0008-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-5</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-6</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.7.3</td>
<td>See P-T-0012-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-7</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-8</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-9</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Conroy</td>
<td>P-T-0013-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0013-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0013-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Davey - Rockwell Scientific Company</td>
<td>P-T-0014-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0014-2</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0014-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Faubion - Ventura Peace Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0015-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Birr - The Beacon Foundation</td>
<td>P-T-0016-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>The three circles indicate proposed operating areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>A copy of the Draft EIS has been sent to the Ray D. Prueter Library in Port Hueneme, and it has been added to the distribution list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-4</td>
<td>Visual Aesthetics</td>
<td>4.8.9</td>
<td>See P-E-0011-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.3.1.7</td>
<td>If NBVC Port Hueneme is selected as the PSB location for the SBX, the actual port is not wide enough to allow the SBX to have pier side operations. However, San Nicolas Island provides an excellent mooring location. Mooring would probably be on the leeward side of the island. Water depths there allow for mooring approximately 800 meters (2,625 feet) offshore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-6</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-7</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4, 2.1.8, 4.3.5.2.5, 4.6.5.2, 4.8.5.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0005-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-8</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Impacts and Mitigation Summary in Document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Conneen</td>
<td>P-T-0017-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from the PMRF on the island of Kauai are current on-going activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned. For this reason, the scoping process and hearings were not held on Kauai but in Honolulu, which is closest to the location of the new proposed activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Dodd</td>
<td>P-T-0018-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0018-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0018-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0018-4</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.7.3</td>
<td>Comment noted. Most DoD installations tend to have large numbers of sensitive resources since they are aggressively managed and public access is generally controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Dodd</td>
<td>P-T-0018-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0018-6</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Eagle</td>
<td>P-T-0019-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team of experts with no conflict of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0019-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Norten</td>
<td>P-T-0020-1</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td>4.8.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0008-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0020-2</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.7.2</td>
<td>Comment noted. No significant adverse long-term impacts to biological resources are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Roman</td>
<td>P-T-0021-1</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>4.7.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0208-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0021-2</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>4.7.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0208-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hayes</td>
<td>P-T-0022-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Heitman</td>
<td>P-T-0023-1</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0005-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test interceptors have been proposed for KLC. However, test launches are not planned for Fort Greely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0020-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>A mobile telemetry unit and mobile C-band radar may be placed at King Salmon as discussed in chapter 2. The program does not currently plan on using the existing radars at King Salmon and Chiniak. These radar do not impact operations at KLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-5</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>The GBI configuration proposed is the Orion 50SXLG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-6</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-T-0023-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-7</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>See P-E-0020-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Heitman</td>
<td>P-T-0023-8</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>4.1.8.2.1</td>
<td>Section 4.1.8.2.1 states that public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sirofchuck</td>
<td>P-T-0024-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>The decision to produce an EIS, including analysis of proposed activities at KLC, was done in accordance with CEQ Regulations (40 CFR 1502.14(d)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0024-2</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Upland areas have been selected to the greatest extent practicable to minimize impacts to wetlands and the wildlife that depend upon them. Beaver is one of the species listed on page 3-7 as occurring at KLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0024-3</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>4.1.8.2.1</td>
<td>As discussed in section 4.1.8.2.1, the Proposed Action would only temporarily restrict public access and fail to significantly impact any aspect of land utilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0024-4</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.1.15</td>
<td>The additional personnel associated with the project would not all be involved in sportfishing, hiking, and hunting. In addition, those involved in these activities would go to other areas in addition to Narrow Cape. Section 4.1.15 has been revised to state that personnel would be restricted to KLC during working hours and significant impacts to subsistence hunting, recreational hunting, hiking, or other recreational activities or areas are not anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Stevens</td>
<td>P-T-0025-1</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Additional sampling of aluminum and pH levels would be conducted in accordance with AADC guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0025-2</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>4.1.8.2.1</td>
<td>The exact dates and length of closures have not been established at this time. The five MDA launches are included in the nine launches per year currently authorized at KLC. Section 4.1.8.2.1 on page 4-69 states that ESQDs at KLC would not impact transportation routes and public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road. In addition, there is no plan to close roads or limit access during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0025-3</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.3.1 4.1.7</td>
<td>See P-E-0020-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0025-4</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.1.15</td>
<td>Text has been revised in section 4.1.15 to state that several documents were analyzed to determine the effects to subsistence caused by the program and that the program would only effect a small amount of the intertidal areas for up to a single day of closure approximately five times per year. This would result in minimal impacts to subsistence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Stevens -</td>
<td>P-T-0026-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>4.1.10</td>
<td>Coordination with local accommodations will be the priority method for accommodating personnel in support of the GMD effort. Construction of additional facilities at Narrow Cape would be secondary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Stevens - Kodiak Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>P-T-0026-2</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.1.10</td>
<td>Text has been revised in section 4.1.10 to state that coordination with existing accommodations will be carried out to maximize their use while minimizing any potential long-term impacts. Construction of additional facilities at Narrow Cape is a secondary mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Milligan</td>
<td>P-T-0027-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0027-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0027-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0020-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0027-4</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>4.1.8.2.1</td>
<td>As acknowledged in section 4.1.8.2.1 on page 4-69, public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Foreman - Kodiak Island Convention &amp; Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>P-T-0028-1</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.1.10</td>
<td>See P-T-0026-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Carver</td>
<td>P-T-0029-1</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>The calculations in appendix D were re-run using a seismic class B for the bedrock at KLC. However, even when the seismic class B is factored into the overall equation, the answer does not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0029-2</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>The facilities at KLC proposed by MDA are test facilities and, as such, would not be classified as facilities used for critical defense reasons. Critical defense facilities are those that are required for post-earthquake recovery or those housing mission-essential functions that are absolutely critical to mission continuation of the activity. The proposed GMD test facilities at KLC would not meet either of these criteria and therefore the calculations would stand as presented in appendix D of the Draft EIS. As stated in the Draft EIS, all available information and current codes will be considered in the design of the GMD facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mohr - Executive Director, Port of Everett</td>
<td>P-T-0030-1</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0209-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0030-2</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0005-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0030-3</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0209-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst Petsold</td>
<td>P-T-0031-1</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0005-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0031-2</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>The beam from the SBX would not remain stationary during operation for any period of time, thus the odds of interference from high power effects with any electronic equipment on the ground would be slight, 0.0001% of the time (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). The effects would not damage any electronic equipment and would last for less than 1 second, should this occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0031-3</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>As mentioned in section 2.1.4.3, electrical power requirements for the SBX platform if moored near a PSB would generally be accommodated by three of the on-board generators: one for daily ship functions and two for powering the radar, as needed. However, when mooring at Naval Station Everett Pier Alpha or Pier Bravo would be utilized. A utility hookup, similar to other vessels at Naval Station Everett, would be used for on board lighting and other basic needs. Utility levels would be typical of that for other ships and would be considered routine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0031-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-O-0099-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flowers</td>
<td>P-T-0032-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0032-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>See P-E-0020-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0032-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jackson</td>
<td>P-T-0033-1</td>
<td>Visual Aesthetics</td>
<td>4.8.9</td>
<td>See P-E-0011-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrie Trautman</td>
<td>P-T-0034-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>The GMD ETR testing activities would likely occur over a period of approximately 10 years following a decision to proceed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0034-2</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>4.8.5</td>
<td>See P-E-0208-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nagel</td>
<td>P-T-0035-1</td>
<td>Visual Aesthetics</td>
<td>4.8.9</td>
<td>See P-E-0011-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0035-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>See P-T-0017-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0035-3</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0209-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>EIS Section</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nagel</td>
<td>P-T-0035-4</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.8.3</td>
<td>A discussion of power densities is provided in the health and safety section on pages 4-218 and 4-219. The power density is calculated to be 2.5 milliwatts per cubic centimeter at a distance of 150 meters (492 feet) for the fully populated radar and 85 meters (279 feet) for the 65 percent populated radar. MPELs, which define the maximum time-averaged RF power density allowed for uncontrolled human exposure and is independent of body size or tissue density being exposed, are capped at 5 milliwatts per cubic centimeter for frequencies greater than 1,500 MHz. OSHA has established a radiation protection guide of 10 milliwatts per cubic centimeter or electromagnetic energy of frequencies of 10 to 100 MHz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Salsman</td>
<td>P-T-0036-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>The SBX is a phased array radar. The SBX Project Office has no knowledge of any encoding activities, and no knowledge of the HARP array.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Moses</td>
<td>P-T-0037-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>The dimensions of the SBX are provided in table 2.1.4-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Windt</td>
<td>P-T-0038-1</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Selden</td>
<td>P-T-0039-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0347-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Williams - Tulalip Tribes</td>
<td>P-T-0040-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Baker</td>
<td>P-T-0041-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0041-2</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>4.1.6</td>
<td>Emergency response would be required in the event of a pre-launch or post-launch event which resulted in the partial destruction of a missile. Such an event could result in the rupture of a rocket engine and exposure of the solid or liquid fuel. In the event of such mishap, spillage of the propellants could occur. The incident would be handled as an explosive ordnance event, and remaining potentially hazardous materials would be regarded as hazardous waste for management purposes. Removal and disposal of nonhazardous and hazardous waste from the accident location would be in accordance with applicable state and federal requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0042-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0042-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0042-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0042-4</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>4.4.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0004-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0043-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0043-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0044-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0044-2</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>2.3.2.1</td>
<td>The ETR's proposed activities do not include the placement of any new GBI silos at Vandenberg AFB. LF-21 and LF-23, currently used for Booster Verification testing, would be used for interceptor testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0044-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0044-4</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0045-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0046-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions concerning the overall management of the GMD Test Program are outside the scope of this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0046-2</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0046-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Draft EIS has been sent to the Hanapepe Public Library, Kapaa Public Library, Koloa Public and School Library, Lihue Public Library, Princeville Public Library, and Waimea Public Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0047-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0047-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0047-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0047-4</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0048-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Kajihiro - American</td>
<td>P-T-0049-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>P-T-0049-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0020-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0049-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0049-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0049-5</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ads were placed in both the Honolulu papers and The Environmental Bulletin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0049-6</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-T-0046-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0049-7</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0049-8</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0049-9</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0049-10</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from the PMRF on the island of Kauai are current ongoing activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Dodge</td>
<td>P-T-0050-1</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4, 2.1.8, 4.3.5.2.5, 4.6.5.2, 4.8.5.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0005-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0050-2</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0319-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0050-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0050-4</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Aila</td>
<td>P-T-0051-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0051-2</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Aila</td>
<td>P-T-0051-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is acknowledged that Pearl Harbor is not deep enough to permit the SBX to enter the harbor. However, the harbor can host a resupply ship that would service the SBX. A mooring site off of Barbers Point has been proposed for the SBX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0051-4</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0051-5</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>As stated in section 4.6, cultural resources were not analyzed because there is minimal potential for impacts. While some mooring locations may have traditional importance, such as native fishing grounds, the SBX would occupy a very small area on a temporary basis. The remaining time the area would remain open with no security restrictions related to the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0051-6</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0051-7</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Keko'olani-Raymond - Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0052-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ads were placed in both papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0052-2</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0052-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not affecting state of Hawaii lands, the SBX would be moored outside 4.8-kilometer (3-mile) limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0052-4</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>Under PPL 85-725, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the FAA is charged with the safe and efficient use of our nation’s airspace and has established certain criteria and limits to its use. The method used to provide this service is the National Airspace System. This system is “…a common network of U.S. airspace; air navigation facilities, equipment and services, airports or landing areas; aeronautical charts, information and services; rules, regulations and procedures, technical information and manpower and material.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Yee - Office of Hawaiian Affairs</td>
<td>P-T-0053-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Murray</td>
<td>P-T-0054-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gosline - 'Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0055-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalama Niheu - Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0056-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Chism/Lowell</td>
<td>P-T-0057-1</td>
<td>Visual Aesthetics</td>
<td>4.8.8</td>
<td>See P-E-0026-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0057-2</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0013-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0057-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>The NEPA process allows for public input. All comments received on the Draft EIS are considered in preparing the Final EIS. The decision on whether to proceed with the Proposed Action or alternatives can not be made until 30 days after the Final EIS is released. Comments received on the Final EIS will also be considered by the decision maker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0057-4</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0230-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Ruhge</td>
<td>P-T-0058-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>