

**Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability
Final Environmental Impact Statement**

December 1998

Volume 2

The annotated version of Volume 2 is “book marked” for quick access to the various sections of the volume. The bookmarks are located on the left side of the Acrobat Reader window and are identified by section heading. To jump to a particular section within the volume click on the desired bookmark.

In addition to the bookmarks, sections of the document referred to in Chapter 7 of Volume 2, Consultation Letters and Responses, are linked to various sections of Volumes 1, 2, and 3. For example, if a response letter refers to section 4.2.2 then clicking on the 4.2.2 link will open that particular section of the document.

Magenta boxes placed on the response letters identify the links.

To configure Acrobat Reader so that more than one PDF file can be opened at one time:

- Click the "File" heading located on the menu bar at the top left corner of the Acrobat window. A menu list will appear.
- Select the "Preferences" option from the list by clicking on "Preferences", holding your mouse button down and then selecting the "General" option. A Viewing Preference window will appear.
- Uncheck the "Open Cross Document Links in the Same Window " option.
- Click OK



Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability

**Final
Environmental Impact Statement**

Volume 2 of 3

December 1998



PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
ENHANCED CAPABILITY
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

VOLUME 2 OF 3

December 1998

Department of Land and Natural Resources
Kalanimoku Building
1151 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Commanding Officer
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

COVER SHEET
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY (PMRF) ENHANCED CAPABILITY

- a. Lead Agency: U.S. Department of the Navy
- b. Cooperating Agencies: U.S. Army; U.S. Air Force; Department of Energy; Defense Special Weapons Agency; Ballistic Missile Defense Organization
- c. Proposed Action: Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capabilities
- d. Affected Jurisdictions: Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai County, Hawaii; Makaha Ridge, Kauai County, Hawaii; Kokee Park, Kauai County, Hawaii; Kamokala Magazines, Kauai County, Hawaii; Port Allen, Kauai County, Hawaii; Niihau, Kauai County, Hawaii; Kaula, Honolulu County, Hawaii; Maui Space Surveillance System, Maui County, Hawaii; Kaena Point, Honolulu County, Hawaii; Wheeler Network Segment Control, Honolulu County, Hawaii; DOE Communication Sites, Kauai and Honolulu counties, Hawaii. Both Tern Island, Honolulu County, Hawaii; and Johnston Atoll have been eliminated.
- e. Inquiries on this document may be directed to: Ms. Vida Mossman, Pacific Missile Range Facility, P.O. Box 128, Kekaha, Kauai, Hawaii 96752-0128, (808) 335-4740
- f. Designation: Final Environmental Impact Statement
- g. Abstract: This EIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Hawaii Revised Statutes, and Executive Order 12114, Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions. Two alternatives—the No-action Alternative and the Proposed Action—were analyzed in this EIS. The No-action Alternative is the continuation of existing range and land-based training and operations; existing research and development test and evaluation; and ongoing base operations and maintenance at PMRF. The Proposed Action, the Preferred Alternative, would result in the continuation of PMRF existing activities and enhancement of the capabilities of PMRF that would allow theater ballistic missile defense (TBMD) testing and training and theater missile defense (TMD) testing. The enhancement would include upgrading existing radar and communications and constructing and operating additional missile launch sites, sensors and instrumentation facilities, and a missile storage magazine. The Proposed Action would also include the revision to an existing restrictive easement for 28 years over State of Hawaii land to allow the U.S. Government to clear a ground hazard area during missile launch activities. The locations where activities would occur are listed in Item d above.

This EIS addresses the potential environmental impacts that would result from activities that would occur under the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action. Environmental resource topics evaluated include air quality, airspace, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials and hazardous waste, health and safety, land use, noise, socioeconomics, transportation, utilities, visual and aesthetics, water resources, the ocean area, and environmental justice. The potential cumulative effects of each of these resources were also evaluated.

In compliance with HRS 343, any new information, clarification, and deletions made between a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and a Final EIS are to be highlighted to aid the reader (the public) in finding these changes. To highlight the changes in this EIS, additions have been underlined and deletions have been crossed-out. Minor grammatical and stylistic edits to the original Draft EIS have been made, but are not highlighted. Changes to the Executive Summary have not been highlighted, as it presents the results of this Final EIS.

Table of Contents

VOLUME 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	
1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED	1-1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1.1 BACKGROUND	1-2
1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION	1-3
1.3 COOPERATING AGENCIES	1-5
1.4 DECISION(S) TO BE MADE	1-5
1.5 SCOPE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	1-11
1.5.1 RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION	1-14
1.6 SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PROCESS	1-16
1.7 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION AND REVIEW PROCESS	1-18
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES.....	2-1
2.1 INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.2 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-2
2.2.1 RANGE TRAINING AND OPERATIONS—NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-2
2.2.1.1 Range Support Sites.....	2-4
2.2.1.2 External Support Agencies.....	2-4
2.2.1.3 Range Safety and Range Control	2-6
2.2.1.3.1 Range Safety.....	2-6
2.2.1.3.2 Range Control.....	2-7
2.2.1.3.2.1 Operational Areas.....	2-7
2.2.1.3.2.2 Operational Controls.....	2-7
2.2.1.3.2.3 Clearance of Restrictive Easement.....	2-7
2.2.1.4 Fleet Training	2-8
2.2.1.4.1 Missile Firings	2-8
2.2.1.4.2 Air Operations.....	2-8
2.2.1.4.3 Gunnery.....	2-11
2.2.1.4.4 Bombing	2-11
2.2.1.4.5 Mine Warfare Exercises.....	2-11
2.2.1.4.6 Electronic Warfare Exercises.....	2-11
2.2.1.4.7 Anti-Submarine Warfare Exercises.....	2-12
2.2.1.4.8 Submarine Operations Exercises	2-12
2.2.1.4.8.1 Underwater Minefield Detection Training.....	2-12
2.2.1.4.9 Underwater Tracking.....	2-14
2.2.1.4.9.1 Naval Gunfire Scoring System.....	2-14
2.2.1.5 Land-based Training and Operations.....	2-17
2.2.1.5.1 Aerial Target and Missile Launches.....	2-17

2.2.1.5.1.1	Missile Launch Preparation.....	2-17
2.2.1.5.1.2	Missile Launch and Flight.....	2-17
2.2.1.5.1.3	Solid Propellant Target Launch Vehicles.....	2-20
2.2.1.5.1.4	Liquid Propellant Target Launch Vehicles.....	2-20
2.2.1.5.2	Electronic Warfare Operations.....	2-20
2.2.1.5.2.1	Electronic Countermeasures.....	2-20
2.2.1.5.2.2	Simulator Systems.....	2-21
2.2.1.5.2.3	Weapons (Pyrotechnics) Used.....	2-21
2.2.1.5.3	Sensor Instrumentation Operations.....	2-21
2.2.1.5.3.1	Radar Systems.....	2-21
2.2.1.5.3.2	Optical Systems.....	2-22
2.2.1.5.3.3	Telemetry Systems.....	2-22
2.2.1.5.4	Communications System Operations.....	2-22
2.2.1.5.4.1	Range Telecommunications Systems.....	2-23
2.2.1.5.4.2	Base Communication Systems.....	2-24
2.2.1.5.4.3	Frequency Monitoring.....	2-24
2.2.1.5.5	Land-based Training.....	2-24
2.2.1.5.6	Other Miscellaneous Exercises and Activities.....	2-24
2.2.1.6	Testing and Evaluation Activities.....	2-24
2.2.1.7	Summary of Range Testing and Operations.....	2-26
2.2.1.8	Future Activities at Pacific Missile Range Facility: Business Base Projections.....	2-27
2.2.2	BASE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE—NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-27
2.2.2.1	Ordnance.....	2-27
2.2.2.2	Aerial Targets Support.....	2-28
2.2.2.3	Surface Targets Support.....	2-28
2.2.2.4	Range Boats Support.....	2-30
2.2.2.4.1	Berthing Facilities.....	2-30
2.2.2.5	Air Support Operations.....	2-30
2.2.2.5.1	Aircraft Maintenance.....	2-31
2.2.2.6	Diving Support.....	2-31
2.2.2.7	Visual Imaging.....	2-31
2.2.2.7.1	Range Video Services.....	2-31
2.2.2.7.2	Video Teleconferencing Services.....	2-31
2.2.2.7.3	Optical Services.....	2-31
2.2.2.8	Calibration Laboratory.....	2-31
2.2.2.9	Meteorology and Oceanography.....	2-32
2.2.2.9.1	Meteorology.....	2-32
2.2.2.9.2	Oceanography.....	2-32
2.2.2.10	Other Support Facilities.....	2-32
2.2.2.11	Pacific Missile Range Facility Tenant Organizations.....	2-33
2.2.2.11.1	Hawaii Air National Guard.....	2-33
2.2.2.11.1.1	154 th Air Control Squadron Training Area.....	2-34
2.2.2.11.2	National Institute of Standards and Technology.....	2-34
2.2.2.11.3	Naval Undersea Warfare Center.....	2-34
2.2.2.11.4	Kauai Test Facility.....	2-34

	2.2.2.11.5	Kauai Educational Association of Science and Astronomy Laboratory	2-35
	2.2.2.11.6	Dynasonde Array.....	2-35
	2.2.2.12	Ongoing Maintenance and Operations.....	2-35
	2.2.2.12.1	Utilities	2-35
	2.2.2.12.2	Transportation.....	2-35
	2.2.2.12.3	Recreation	2-36
	2.2.2.12.4	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Management.....	2-36
2.2.3		CANDIDATE SITES—NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-36
	2.2.3.1	Tern Island	2-36
	2.2.3.2	Johnston Island.....	2-38
	2.2.3.2.1	North, East, and Sand Islands.....	2-38
2.3		PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-39
2.3.1		TARGET MISSILE SYSTEMS—PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-45
	2.3.1.1	Target Missiles	2-45
	2.3.1.2	Target Missile Payloads	2-46
	2.3.1.3	Target System Launch Requirements.....	2-46
	2.3.1.3.1	Fixed Ground-based Target Launch Preparation....	2-46
	2.3.1.3.2	Mobile Platform Sea-based Target Launch Preparation.....	2-48
	2.3.1.3.3	Aerial Platform-based Target Launches.....	2-51
	2.3.1.3.4	Land-based Target Missile Launch and Flight.....	2-53
	2.3.1.3.5	Modification of the Restrictive Easement.....	2-56
	2.3.1.4	Target System Facility Requirements.....	2-56
2.3.2		DEFENSIVE MISSILE SYSTEMS—PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-56
	2.3.2.1	Defensive Missiles.....	2-56
	2.3.2.2	Defensive Missile Payloads.....	2-57
	2.3.2.3	Defensive Missile Launch Requirements.....	2-57
	2.3.2.3.1	Ship-based Defensive Missiles.....	2-57
	2.3.2.3.2	Land-based Defensive Missiles.....	2-58
2.3.3		SENSOR SYSTEMS—PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-58
	2.3.3.1	Radar Systems.....	2-58
	2.3.3.2	Telemetry Systems.....	2-59
	2.3.3.3	Optical Systems	2-59
	2.3.3.4	Communication Systems.....	2-60
	2.3.3.5	Support Infrastructure Requirements.....	2-60
2.3.4		CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS—PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-60
	2.3.4.1	Pacific Missile Range Facility/Main Base (Kauai Test Facility)	2-61
	2.3.4.1.1	Launch Facilities—Targets	2-61
	2.3.4.1.1.1	Existing	2-61
	2.3.4.1.1.2	Modification, Expansion, and Replacement...	2-61
	2.3.4.1.1.3	New	2-61

2.3.4.1.2	Launch Facilities—Interceptors.....	2-66
2.3.4.1.3	Instrumentation Facilities	2-66
2.3.4.1.3.1	Existing	2-66
2.3.4.1.3.2	Modification, Expansion, and Replacement...2-66	
2.3.4.1.3.3	New	2-68
2.3.4.1.4	Communications, Command, and Control Facilities	2-68
2.3.4.1.4.1	Existing	2-68
2.3.4.1.4.2	Modification, Expansion, and Replacement...2-68	
2.3.4.1.4.3	New	2-68
2.3.4.1.5	Infrastructure—Facilities	2-68
2.3.4.2	Niihau.....	2-68
2.3.4.2.1	Launch Facilities—Targets	2-71
2.3.4.2.2	Launch Facilities—Interceptors.....	2-71
2.3.4.2.3	Instrumentation Facilities	2-71
2.3.4.2.4	Communications, Command, and Control Facilities	2-71
2.3.4.2.5	Infrastructure—Facilities	2-71
2.3.4.3	Tern Island	2-72
2.3.4.3.1	Launch Facilities—Targets	2-72
2.3.4.3.1.1	Modification, Expansion, Replacement.....	2-72
2.3.4.3.1.2	New	2-72
2.3.4.3.2	Instrumentation Facilities	2-72
2.3.4.3.3	Communications, Command, and Control Facilities	2-72
2.3.4.3.4	Infrastructure—Facilities	2-75
2.3.4.4	Johnston Atoll.....	2-75
2.3.4.4.1	Launch Facilities—Targets	2-75
2.3.4.4.1.1	New	2-75
2.3.4.4.2	Instrumentation Facilities	2-75
2.3.4.4.3	Communications, Command, and Control Facilities	2-75
2.3.4.4.4	Infrastructure—Facilities	2-78
2.3.5	RANGE OPERATIONS AND TRAINING—PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-78
2.3.5.1	Fleet Operations and Training.....	2-78
2.3.5.1.1	Missile Operations	2-78
2.3.5.1.1.1	Developmental and Operational Testing.....	2-78
2.3.5.1.1.2	Fleet Training.....	2-82
2.3.5.1.2	Electronic Warfare	2-82
2.3.5.2	Land-based Operations and Training.....	2-83
2.3.5.2.1	Missile Launches	2-83
2.3.5.2.2	Electronic Warfare Operations.....	2-83
2.3.5.2.3	Sensor—Instrumentation Operations.....	2-83
2.3.5.2.4	Communications Systems	2-83
2.3.5.2.5	Land-based Training.....	2-83

2.3.6	Base Operations and Maintenance—Proposed Action Alternative	2-83
2.3.6.1	Ordnance	2-83
2.3.6.2	Range Boats	2-84
2.3.6.3	Air Operations	2-84
2.3.6.4	Diving Support.....	2-84
2.3.6.5	Visual Imaging.....	2-84
2.3.6.6	Meteorology and Oceanography.....	2-84
2.3.6.7	Other Support Services.....	2-84
2.3.6.8	Construction.....	2-84
2.3.6.9	Ongoing Maintenance and Operations.....	2-84
2.3.6.9.1	Utilities	2-85
2.3.6.9.2	Transportation.....	2-85
2.3.6.9.2.1	Air	2-85
2.3.6.9.2.2	Ground.....	2-85
2.3.6.9.2.3	Marine.....	2-85
2.3.6.9.3	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste Management.....	2-85
2.3.7	EMPLOYMENT AND POPULATION-PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE	2-85
2.4	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD	2-86
2.4.1	APPLICATION OF EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA	2-86
2.4.1.1	Transport Capability	2-86
2.4.1.2	Accessibility.....	2-86
2.4.1.3	Safety.....	2-87
2.4.1.4	Area Narrowing Results.....	2-87
2.5	COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	2-87
2.6	OTHER CONCURRENT PROGRAMS TO BE EVALUATED FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....	2-87
3.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3-1
3.1	PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY	3-1
3.1.1	PMRF/MAIN BASE	3-3
3.1.1.1	Air Quality—PMRF/Main Base	3-3
3.1.1.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-3
3.1.1.1.2	Affected Environment	3-12
3.1.1.1.2.1	Regional Climate	3-12
3.1.1.1.2.2	Regional Air Quality	3-14
3.1.1.1.2.3	Air Pollution Emissions Sources.....	3-14
3.1.1.2	Airspace—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-14
3.1.1.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-17
3.1.1.2.2	Affected Environment	3-17
3.1.1.2.2.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	3-17
3.1.1.2.2.2	Special Use Airspace.....	3-20
3.1.1.2.2.3	En Route Airways and Jet Routes	3-21
3.1.1.2.2.4	Airports and Airfields.....	3-21
3.1.1.2.2.5	Air Traffic Control.....	3-21
3.1.1.3	Biological Resources—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-22

3.1.1.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-22
3.1.1.3.2	Affected Environment	3-22
3.1.1.3.2.1	Terrestrial.....	3-22
3.1.1.3.2.2	Marine.....	3-23
3.1.1.3.2.3	Special Habitats.....	3-26
3.1.1.3.2.4	Candidate, Threatened, and Endangered Species.....	3-27
3.1.1.4	Cultural Resources—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-37
3.1.1.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-37
3.1.1.4.2	Affected Environment	3-38
3.1.1.4.2.1	Archaeological Resources (Prehistoric and Historic).....	3-39
3.1.1.4.2.2	Historic Buildings and Structures.....	3-41
3.1.1.4.2.3	Traditional Resources.....	3-44
3.1.1.4.2.4	Existing Archaeological and Cultural Mitigation Measures.....	3-44
3.1.1.5	Geology and Soils—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-45
3.1.1.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-45
3.1.1.5.2	Affected Environment	3-45
3.1.1.5.2.1	Physiography.....	3-45
3.1.1.5.2.2	Geology	3-46
3.1.1.5.2.3	Soil.....	3-46
3.1.1.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste— PMRF/Main Base	3-47
3.1.1.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-48
3.1.1.6.2	Affected Environment	3-48
3.1.1.6.2.1	Hazardous Materials.....	3-48
3.1.1.6.2.2	Hazardous Waste.....	3-49
3.1.1.6.2.3	Pollution Prevention.....	3-51
3.1.1.6.2.4	Installation Restoration Program.....	3-51
3.1.1.6.2.5	Storage Tank Management.....	3-51
3.1.1.6.2.6	Pesticide Management.....	3-51
3.1.1.6.2.7	Radon Management.....	3-53
3.1.1.6.2.8	Ordnance Management.....	3-53
3.1.1.6.2.9	Polychlorinated Biphenyls Management.....	3-53
3.1.1.6.2.10	Medical and Biohazard Waste Management.....	3-53
3.1.1.6.2.11	Radioactive Waste Management.....	3-54
3.1.1.6.2.12	Lead-based Paint Management.....	3-54
3.1.1.6.2.13	Asbestos Management.....	3-54
3.1.1.7	Health and Safety—PMRF/Main Base	3-55
3.1.1.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-55
3.1.1.7.2	Affected Environment	3-55
3.1.1.7.2.1	Fire and Crash Safety.....	3-55
3.1.1.7.2.2	Aircraft Safety.....	3-55
3.1.1.7.2.3	Range Safety.....	3-56
3.1.1.7.2.4	Ordnance Safety.....	3-59

3.1.1.7.2.5	Area Clearance.....	3-59
3.1.1.7.2.6	KTF Safety.....	3-61
3.1.1.7.2.7	Transportation Safety.....	3-62
3.1.1.7.2.8	Small Arms Firing Range.....	3-62
3.1.1.8	Land Use—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-62
3.1.1.8.1	Region of Influence.....	3-62
3.1.1.8.2	Affected Environment.....	3-62
3.1.1.8.2.1	Land Use.....	3-62
3.1.1.8.2.2	Recreation.....	3-67
3.1.1.9	Noise—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-70
3.1.1.9.1	Region of Influence.....	3-71
3.1.1.9.2	Affected Environment.....	3-71
3.1.1.10	Socioeconomics—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-74
3.1.1.10.1	Region of Influence.....	3-74
3.1.1.10.2	Affected Environment.....	3-74
3.1.1.10.2.1	Population and Income.....	3-75
3.1.1.10.2.2	Housing.....	3-76
3.1.1.10.2.3	Employment.....	3-76
3.1.1.10.2.4	Agriculture.....	3-77
3.1.1.10.2.5	Tourism.....	3-77
3.1.1.10.2.6	Pacific Missile Range Facility.....	3-78
3.1.1.11	Transportation—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-79
3.1.1.11.1	Region of Influence.....	3-79
3.1.1.11.2	Affected Environment.....	3-79
3.1.1.12	Utilities—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-79
3.1.1.12.1	Region of Influence.....	3-79
3.1.1.12.2	Affected Environment.....	3-79
3.1.1.12.2.1	Electrical Supply.....	3-79
3.1.1.12.2.2	Solid Waste Disposal.....	3-80
3.1.1.12.2.3	Wastewater Treatment.....	3-80
3.1.1.12.2.4	Water.....	3-81
3.1.1.13	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-81
3.1.1.13.1	Region of Influence.....	3-81
3.1.1.13.2	Affected Environment.....	3-81
3.1.1.14	Water Resources—PMRF/Main Base.....	3-82
3.1.1.14.1	Region of Influence.....	3-83
3.1.1.14.2	Affected Environment.....	3-83
3.1.1.14.2.1	Surface Water.....	3-83
3.1.1.14.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-83
3.1.2	RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT (GROUND HAZARD AREA).....	3-86
3.1.2.1	Air Quality—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-87
3.1.2.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-87
3.1.2.1.2	Affected Environment.....	3-87
3.1.2.2	Biological Resources—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-88
3.1.2.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-88

3.1.2.2.2	Affected Environment	3-88
3.1.2.2.2.1	Vegetation	3-88
3.1.2.2.2.2	Wildlife	3-89
3.1.2.2.2.3	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	3-89
3.1.2.3	Cultural Resources—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-89
3.1.2.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-89
3.1.2.3.2	Affected Environment	3-89
3.1.2.3.2.1	Records Search.....	3-89
3.1.2.3.2.2	Archaeological Resources (Prehistoric and Historic).....	3-90
3.1.2.3.2.3	Historic Buildings and Structures.....	3-91
3.1.2.3.2.4	Traditional Resources.....	3-91
3.1.2.4	Geology and Soils—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-92
3.1.2.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-92
3.1.2.4.2	Affected Environment	3-92
3.1.2.4.2.1	Physiography.....	3-92
3.1.2.4.2.2	Geology	3-92
3.1.2.4.2.3	Soils.....	3-93
3.1.2.5	Hazardous Materials and Waste—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-96
3.1.2.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-96
3.1.2.5.2	Affected Environment	3-96
3.1.2.5.2.1	Hazardous Materials.....	3-96
3.1.2.5.2.2	Hazardous Waste.....	3-96
3.1.2.6	Health and Safety—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-97
3.1.2.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-97
3.1.2.6.2	Affected Environment	3-97
3.1.2.7	Land Use—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area)....	3-97
3.1.2.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-97
3.1.2.7.2	Affected Environment	3-97
3.1.2.7.2.1	Land Use.....	3-97
3.1.2.7.2.2	Recreation	3-98
3.1.2.8	Noise—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-101
3.1.2.8.1	Region of Influence.....	3-101
3.1.2.8.2	Affected Environment	3-101
3.1.2.9	Socioeconomics—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-101
3.1.2.9.1	Region of Influence.....	3-101
3.1.2.9.2	Affected Environment	3-102
3.1.2.10	Transportation—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area)	3-102
3.1.2.10.1	Region of Influence.....	3-102
3.1.2.10.2	Affected Environment	3-102

3.1.2.11	Utilities—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-102
3.1.2.11.1	Region of Influence.....	3-102
3.1.2.11.2	Affected Environment	3-104
3.1.2.11.2.1	Electricity	3-104
3.1.2.11.2.2	Water Supply.....	3-104
3.1.2.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-104
3.1.2.12.1	Region of Influence.....	3-104
3.1.2.12.2	Affected Environment	3-104
3.1.2.13	Water Resources—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	3-105
3.1.2.13.1	Region of Influence.....	3-105
3.1.2.13.2	Affected Environment	3-105
3.1.2.13.2.1	Surface Water	3-105
3.1.2.13.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-105
3.1.3	MAKAHA RIDGE	3-106
3.1.3.1	Air Quality—Makaha Ridge	3-106
3.1.3.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-106
3.1.3.1.2	Affected Environment	3-106
3.1.3.2	Airspace—Makaha Ridge.....	3-106
3.1.3.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-106
3.1.3.2.2	Affected Environment	3-106
3.1.3.3	Biological Resources—Makaha Ridge.....	3-106
3.1.3.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-106
3.1.3.3.2	Affected Environment	3-107
3.1.3.3.2.1	Vegetation	3-107
3.1.3.3.2.2	Wildlife	3-107
3.1.3.3.2.3	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	3-107
3.1.3.4	Cultural Resources—Makaha Ridge.....	3-107
3.1.3.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-107
3.1.3.4.2	Affected Environment	3-108
3.1.3.4.2.1	Archaeological Resources (Prehistoric and Historic).....	3-108
3.1.3.4.2.2	Historic Buildings and Structures.....	3-108
3.1.3.4.2.3	Traditional Resources.....	3-108
3.1.3.5	Geology and Soils—Makaha Ridge.....	3-109
3.1.3.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-109
3.1.3.5.2	Affected Environment	3-109
3.1.3.5.2.1	Physiography.....	3-109
3.1.3.5.2.2	Geology	3-109
3.1.3.5.2.3	Soils.....	3-110
3.1.3.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Makaha Ridge.....	3-110
3.1.3.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-110
3.1.3.6.2	Affected Environment	3-110
3.1.3.7	Health and Safety—Makaha Ridge.....	3-111
3.1.3.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-111

3.1.3.7.2	Affected Environment	3-111
3.1.3.8	Land Use—Makaha Ridge.....	3-111
3.1.3.8.1	Region of Influence.....	3-111
3.1.3.8.2	Affected Environment	3-111
3.1.3.8.2.1	Land Use.....	3-111
3.1.3.8.2.2	Recreation	3-112
3.1.3.9	Noise—Makaha Ridge.....	3-112
3.1.3.9.1	Region of Influence.....	3-112
3.1.3.9.2	Affected Environment	3-112
3.1.3.10	Transportation—Makaha Ridge.....	3-112
3.1.3.10.1	Region of Influence.....	3-112
3.1.3.10.2	Affected Environment	3-112
3.1.3.11	Utilities—Makaha Ridge	3-113
3.1.3.11.1	Region of Influence.....	3-113
3.1.3.11.2	Affected Environment	3-113
3.1.3.11.2.1	Electricity	3-113
3.1.3.11.2.2	Solid Waste	3-113
3.1.3.11.2.3	Wastewater	3-113
3.1.3.11.2.4	Water.....	3-113
3.1.3.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Makaha Ridge.....	3-114
3.1.3.12.1	Region of Influence.....	3-114
3.1.3.12.2	Affected Environment	3-114
3.1.3.13	Water Resources—Makaha Ridge.....	3-114
3.1.3.13.1	Region of Influence.....	3-114
3.1.3.13.2	Affected Environment	3-114
3.1.3.13.2.1	Surface Water	3-114
3.1.3.13.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-115
3.1.4	KOKEE	3-115
3.1.4.1	Air Quality—Kokee	3-115
3.1.4.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-115
3.1.4.1.2	Affected Environment	3-116
3.1.4.2	Airspace—Kokee.....	3-116
3.1.4.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-116
3.1.4.2.2	Affected Environment	3-116
3.1.4.3	Biological Resources—Kokee.....	3-116
3.1.4.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-116
3.1.4.3.2	Affected Environment	3-116
3.1.4.3.2.1	Vegetation	3-116
3.1.4.3.2.2	Wildlife.....	3-116
3.1.4.3.2.3	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	3-117
3.1.4.4	Cultural Resources—Kokee	3-117
3.1.4.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-117
3.1.4.4.2	Affected Environment	3-117
3.1.4.4.2.1	Archaeological Resources.....	3-117
3.1.4.4.2.2	Historic Resources.....	3-117
3.1.4.4.2.3	Traditional Resources.....	3-118
3.1.4.5	Geology and Soils—Kokee	3-118

3.1.4.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-118
3.1.4.5.2	Affected Environment	3-118
3.1.4.5.2.1	Physiography.....	3-118
3.1.4.5.2.2	Geology	3-118
3.1.4.5.2.3	Soils.....	3-118
3.1.4.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Kokee.....	3-119
3.1.4.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-119
3.1.4.6.2	Affected Environment	3-119
3.1.4.7	Health and Safety—Kokee.....	3-120
3.1.4.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-120
3.1.4.7.2	Affected Environment	3-120
3.1.4.8	Land Use—Kokee.....	3-120
3.1.4.8.1	Region of Influence.....	3-120
3.1.4.8.2	Affected Environment	3-120
3.1.4.8.2.1	Land Use.....	3-120
3.1.4.8.2.2	Recreation	3-120
3.1.4.9	Noise—Kokee	3-121
3.1.4.9.1	Region of Influence.....	3-121
3.1.4.9.2	Affected Environment	3-121
3.1.4.10	Transportation—Kokee.....	3-121
3.1.4.10.1	Region of Influence.....	3-121
3.1.4.10.2	Affected Environment	3-121
3.1.4.11	Utilities—Kokee	3-121
3.1.4.11.1	Region of Influence.....	3-121
3.1.4.11.2	Affected Environment	3-121
3.1.4.11.2.1	Electricity	3-122
3.1.4.11.2.2	Solid Waste	3-122
3.1.4.11.2.3	Wastewater	3-122
3.1.4.11.2.4	Water.....	3-122
3.1.4.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Kokee.....	3-123
3.1.4.12.1	Region of Influence.....	3-123
3.1.4.12.2	Affected Environment	3-123
3.1.4.13	Water Resources—Kokee.....	3-124
3.1.4.13.1	Region of Influence.....	3-124
3.1.4.13.2	Affected Environment	3-124
3.1.4.13.2.1	Surface Water	3-124
3.1.4.13.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-124
3.1.5	KAMOKALA MAGAZINES	3-124
3.1.5.1	Air Quality—Kamokala Magazines	3-124
3.1.5.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-124
3.1.5.1.2	Affected Environment	3-124
3.1.5.2	Biological Resources—Kamokala Magazines.....	3-125
3.1.5.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-125
3.1.5.2.2	Affected Environment	3-125
3.1.5.3	Cultural Resources—Kamokala Magazines.....	3-125
3.1.5.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-125
3.1.5.3.2	Affected Environment	3-125

3.1.5.3.2.1	Archaeological Resources.....	3-125
3.1.5.3.2.2	Historic Resources.....	3-126
3.1.5.3.2.3	Traditional Resources.....	3-126
3.1.5.4	Geology and Soils—Kamokala Magazines.....	3-126
3.1.5.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-126
3.1.5.4.2	Affected Environment.....	3-127
3.1.5.4.2.1	Physiography.....	3-127
3.1.5.4.2.2	Geology.....	3-127
3.1.5.4.2.3	Soils.....	3-127
3.1.5.5	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes— Kamokala Magazines.....	3-127
3.1.5.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-127
3.1.5.5.2	Affected Environment.....	3-127
3.1.5.6	Health and Safety—Kamokala Magazines.....	3-128
3.1.5.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-128
3.1.5.6.2	Affected Environment.....	3-128
3.1.5.7	Land Use—Kamokala Magazines.....	3-128
3.1.5.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-128
3.1.5.7.2	Affected Environment.....	3-128
3.1.5.7.2.1	Land Use.....	3-128
3.1.5.7.2.2	Recreation.....	3-129
3.1.5.8	Transportation—Kamokala Magazines.....	3-129
3.1.5.8.1	Region of Influence.....	3-129
3.1.5.8.2	Affected Environment.....	3-129
3.1.5.9	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Kamokala Magazines..	3-129
3.1.5.9.1	Region of Influence.....	3-129
3.1.5.9.2	Affected Environment.....	3-129
3.1.5.10	Water Resources—Kamokala Magazines.....	3-130
3.1.5.10.1	Region of Influence.....	3-130
3.1.5.10.2	Affected Environment.....	3-130
3.1.5.10.2.1	Surface Water.....	3-130
3.1.5.10.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-130
3.1.6	PORT ALLEN.....	3-130
3.1.6.1	Air Quality—Port Allen.....	3-130
3.1.6.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-130
3.1.6.1.2	Affected Environment.....	3-130
3.1.6.2	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Port Allen...	3-131
3.1.6.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-131
3.1.6.2.2	Affected Environment.....	3-131
3.1.6.3	Health and Safety—Port Allen.....	3-131
3.1.6.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-131
3.1.6.3.2	Affected Environment.....	3-132
3.1.6.4	Land Use—Port Allen.....	3-132
3.1.6.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-132
3.1.6.4.2	Affected Environment.....	3-132

	3.1.6.4.2.1	Land Use.....	3-132
	3.1.6.4.2.2	Recreation.....	3-132
	3.1.6.5	Noise—Port Allen.....	3-132
	3.1.6.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-132
	3.1.6.5.2	Affected Environment.....	3-133
	3.1.6.6	Transportation—Port Allen.....	3-133
	3.1.6.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-133
	3.1.6.6.2	Affected Environment.....	3-133
	3.1.6.7	Utilities—Port Allen.....	3-133
	3.1.6.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-133
	3.1.6.7.2	Affected Environment.....	3-133
	3.1.6.7.2.1	Electricity.....	3-133
	3.1.6.7.2.2	Solid Waste.....	3-133
	3.1.6.7.2.3	Wastewater.....	3-133
	3.1.6.7.2.4	Water.....	3-134
	3.1.6.8	Visual and Aesthetic Resources.....	3-134
	3.1.6.8.1	Region of Influence.....	3-134
	3.1.6.8.2	Affected Environment.....	3-134
	3.1.6.9	Water Resources—Port Allen.....	3-134
	3.1.6.9.1	Region of Influence.....	3-134
	3.1.6.9.2	Affected Environment.....	3-134
	3.1.6.9.2.1	Surface Water.....	3-134
	3.1.6.9.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-134
3.2	SUPPORT SITES.....		3-135
	3.2.1	NIIHAU.....	3-135
	3.2.1.1	Air Quality—Niihau.....	3-135
	3.2.1.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-135
	3.2.1.1.2	Affected Environment.....	3-135
	3.2.1.2	Airspace—Niihau.....	3-135
	3.2.1.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-135
	3.2.1.2.2	Affected Environment.....	3-135
	3.2.1.3	Biological Resources—Niihau.....	3-137
	3.2.1.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-137
	3.2.1.3.2	Affected Environment.....	3-137
	3.2.1.3.2.1	Vegetation.....	3-137
	3.2.1.3.2.2	Wildlife.....	3-137
	3.2.1.3.2.3	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	3-137
	3.2.1.4	Cultural Resources—Niihau.....	3-138
	3.2.1.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-138
	3.2.1.4.2	Affected Environment.....	3-138
	3.2.1.4.2.1	Archaeological Resources.....	3-138
	3.2.1.4.2.2	Historic Resources.....	3-139
	3.2.1.4.2.3	Traditional Resources.....	3-139
	3.2.1.5	Geology and Soils—Niihau.....	3-139
	3.2.1.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-140
	3.2.1.5.2	Affected Environment.....	3-140
	3.2.1.5.2.1	Physiography.....	3-140

3.2.1.5.2.2	Geology.....	3-140
3.2.1.5.2.3	Soils.....	3-141
3.2.1.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Niihau.....	3-141
3.2.1.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-141
3.2.1.6.2	Affected Environment.....	3-141
3.2.1.7	Health and Safety—Niihau.....	3-142
3.2.1.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-142
3.2.1.7.2	Affected Environment.....	3-142
3.2.1.8	Land Use—Niihau.....	3-142
3.2.1.8.1	Region of Influence.....	3-142
3.2.1.8.2	Affected Environment.....	3-142
3.2.1.8.2.1	Land Use.....	3-142
3.2.1.9	Noise—Niihau.....	3-144
3.2.1.9.1	Region of Influence.....	3-144
3.2.1.9.2	Affected Environment.....	3-144
3.2.1.10	Socioeconomics—Niihau.....	3-144
3.2.1.10.1	Region of Influence.....	3-144
3.2.1.10.2	Affected Environment.....	3-144
3.2.1.11	Transportation—Niihau.....	3-146
3.2.1.11.1	Region of Influence.....	3-146
3.2.1.11.2	Affected Environment.....	3-146
3.2.1.12	Utilities—Niihau.....	3-146
3.2.1.12.1	Region of Influence.....	3-146
3.2.1.12.2	Affected Environment.....	3-146
3.2.1.13	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Niihau.....	3-146
3.2.1.13.1	Region of Influence.....	3-146
3.2.1.13.2	Affected Environment.....	3-146
3.2.1.14	Water Resources—Niihau.....	3-147
3.2.1.14.1	Region of Influence.....	3-147
3.2.1.14.2	Affected Environment.....	3-147
3.2.1.14.2.1	Surface Water.....	3-147
3.2.1.14.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-147
3.2.2	KAULA.....	3-147
3.2.2.1	Airspace—Kaula.....	3-149
3.2.2.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-149
3.2.2.1.2	Affected Environment.....	3-149
3.2.2.2	Biological Resources—Kaula.....	3-149
3.2.2.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-149
3.2.2.2.2	Affected Environment.....	3-149
3.2.2.2.2.1	Vegetation.....	3-149
3.2.2.2.2.2	Wildlife.....	3-149
3.2.2.2.2.3	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	3-149
3.2.2.3	Cultural Resources—Kaula.....	3-150
3.2.2.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-150
3.2.2.3.2	Affected Environment.....	3-150
3.2.2.3.2.1	Archaeological Resources.....	3-150
3.2.2.3.2.2	Historic Resources.....	3-150

	3.2.2.3.2.3	Traditional Resources.....	3-150
	3.2.2.4	Geology and Soils—Kaula.....	3-150
	3.2.2.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-150
	3.2.2.4.2	Affected Environment.....	3-151
	3.2.2.4.2.1	Physiography.....	3-151
	3.2.2.4.2.2	Geology.....	3-151
	3.2.2.4.2.3	Soils.....	3-151
	3.2.2.5	Health and Safety—Kaula.....	3-152
	3.2.2.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-152
	3.2.2.5.2	Affected Environment.....	3-152
	3.2.2.6	Land Use—Kaula.....	3-152
	3.2.2.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-152
	3.2.2.6.2	Affected Environment.....	3-152
	3.2.2.6.2.1	Land Use.....	3-152
	3.2.2.6.2.2	Recreation.....	3-153
	3.2.2.7	Water Resources—Kaula.....	3-153
	3.2.2.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-153
	3.2.2.7.2	Affected Environment.....	3-153
	3.2.2.7.2.1	Surface Water.....	3-153
	3.2.2.7.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-153
	3.2.3	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM.....	3-154
	3.2.4	KAENA POINT.....	3-154
	3.2.5	WHEELER NETWORK SEGMENT CONTROL/PMRF COMMUNICATION SITES.....	3-154
	3.2.6	DOE COMMUNICATION SITES.....	3-158
3.3		CANDIDATE SITES.....	3-158
	3.3.1	TERN ISLAND.....	3-158
	3.3.1.1	Air Quality—Tern Island.....	3-159
	3.3.1.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-159
	3.3.1.1.2	Affected Environment.....	3-159
	3.3.1.2	Airspace—Tern Island.....	3-159
	3.3.1.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-159
	3.3.1.2.2	Affected Environment.....	3-159
	3.3.1.3	Biological Resources—Tern Island.....	3-159
	3.3.1.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-159
	3.3.1.3.2	Affected Environment.....	3-159
	3.3.1.3.2.1	Vegetation.....	3-159
	3.3.1.3.2.2	Wildlife.....	3-160
	3.3.1.3.2.3	Special Habitats.....	3-160
	3.3.1.3.2.4	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	3-162
	3.3.1.4	Cultural Resources—Tern Island.....	3-163
	3.3.1.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-163
	3.3.1.4.2	Affected Environment.....	3-163
	3.3.1.4.2.1	Archaeological Resources.....	3-163
	3.3.1.4.2.2	Historical Resources.....	3-163
	3.3.1.4.2.3	Traditional Resources.....	3-164
	3.3.1.5	Geology and Soils—Tern Island.....	3-164

3.3.1.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-164
3.3.1.5.2	Affected Environment	3-164
3.3.1.5.2.1	Physiography.....	3-164
3.3.1.5.2.2	Geology	3-164
3.3.1.5.2.3	Soils.....	3-164
3.3.1.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Tern Island.....	3-164
3.3.1.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-164
3.3.1.6.2	Affected Environment	3-164
3.3.1.7	Health and Safety —Tern Island	3-165
3.3.1.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-165
3.3.1.7.2	Affected Environment	3-165
3.3.1.8	Land Use—Tern Island	3-166
3.3.1.8.1	Region of Influence.....	3-166
3.3.1.8.2	Affected Environment	3-166
3.3.1.8.2.1	Land Use.....	3-166
3.3.1.8.2.2	Recreation	3-167
3.3.1.9	Noise—Tern Island.....	3-167
3.3.1.9.1	Region of Influence.....	3-167
3.3.1.9.2	Affected Environment	3-167
3.3.1.10	Transportation—Tern Island.....	3-167
3.3.1.10.1	Region of Influence.....	3-167
3.3.1.10.2	Affected Environment	3-168
3.3.1.11	Utilities—Tern Island	3-168
3.3.1.11.1	Region of Influence.....	3-168
3.3.1.11.2	Affected Environment	3-168
3.3.1.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Tern Island.....	3-168
3.3.1.12.1	Region of Influence.....	3-168
3.3.1.12.2	Affected Environment	3-168
3.3.1.13	Water Resources—Tern Island.....	3-168
3.3.1.13.1	Region of Influence.....	3-168
3.3.1.13.2	Affected Environment	3-168
3.3.1.13.2.1	Surface Water	3-168
3.3.1.13.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-169
3.3.2	JOHNSTON ATOLL.....	3-169
3.3.2.1	Air Quality—Johnston Atoll.....	3-169
3.3.2.1.1	Region of Influence.....	3-169
3.3.2.1.2	Affected Environment	3-170
3.3.2.2	Airspace—Johnston Atoll.....	3-170
3.3.2.2.1	Region of Influence.....	3-170
3.3.2.2.2	Affected Environment	3-170
3.3.2.3	Biological Resources—Johnston Atoll.....	3-170
3.3.2.3.1	Region of Influence.....	3-170
3.3.2.3.2	Affected Environment	3-170
3.3.2.3.2.1	Vegetation	3-171
3.3.2.3.2.2	Wildlife	3-171
3.3.2.3.2.3	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	3-172

3.3.2.4	Cultural Resources—Johnston Atoll.....	3-172
3.3.2.4.1	Region of Influence.....	3-172
3.3.2.4.2	Affected Environment	3-172
3.3.2.4.2.1	Archaeological Resources.....	3-173
3.3.2.4.2.2	Historic Resources.....	3-173
3.3.2.4.2.3	Traditional Resources.....	3-173
3.3.2.5	Geology and Soils—Johnston Atoll.....	3-173
3.3.2.5.1	Region of Influence.....	3-174
3.3.2.5.2	Affected Environment	3-174
3.3.2.5.2.1	Physiography.....	3-174
3.3.2.5.2.2	Geology	3-174
3.3.2.5.2.3	Soils.....	3-175
3.3.2.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Johnston Atoll	3-175
3.3.2.6.1	Region of Influence.....	3-175
3.3.2.6.2	Affected Environment	3-175
3.3.2.7	Health and Safety—Johnston Atoll.....	3-176
3.3.2.7.1	Region of Influence.....	3-176
3.3.2.7.2	Affected Environment	3-176
3.3.2.8	Land Use—Johnston Atoll.....	3-177
3.3.2.8.1	Region of Influence.....	3-177
3.3.2.8.2	Affected Environment	3-177
3.3.2.8.2.1	Land Use.....	3-177
3.3.2.8.2.2	Recreation	3-178
3.3.2.9	Noise—Johnston Atoll.....	3-178
3.3.2.9.1	Region of Influence.....	3-178
3.3.2.9.2	Affected Environment	3-178
3.3.2.10	Transportation—Johnston Atoll.....	3-178
3.3.2.10.1	Region of Influence.....	3-178
3.3.2.10.2	Affected Environment	3-178
3.3.2.11	Utilities—Johnston Atoll.....	3-178
3.3.2.11.1	Region of Influence.....	3-178
3.3.2.11.2	Affected Environment	3-178
3.3.2.11.2.1	Electricity	3-178
3.3.2.11.2.2	Solid Waste	3-179
3.3.2.11.2.3	Wastewater	3-179
3.3.2.11.2.4	Water.....	3-179
3.3.2.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Johnston Atoll.....	3-179
3.3.2.12.1	Region of Influence.....	3-179
3.3.2.12.2	Affected Environment	3-179
3.3.2.13	Water Resources—Johnston Atoll.....	3-179
3.3.2.13.1	Region of Influence.....	3-179
3.3.2.13.2	Affected Environment	3-180
3.3.2.13.2.1	Surface Water	3-180
3.3.2.13.2.2	Groundwater.....	3-180
3.4	OCEAN AREA (OUTSIDE U.S. TERRITORY)	3-180
3.4.1	AIRSPACE USE—OCEAN AREA (OUTSIDE U.S. TERRITORY)	3-180

3.4.1.1	DESCRIPTION OF RESOURCE	3-180
3.4.1.2	Region of Influence.....	3-180
3.4.1.3	Affected Environment.....	3-180
3.4.1.3.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	3-181
3.4.1.3.2	Special Use Airspace.....	3-181
3.4.1.3.3	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	3-181
3.4.1.3.4	Airports and Airfields.....	3-185
3.4.1.3.5	Air Traffic Control.....	3-185
3.4.2	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES—OCEAN AREA (OUTSIDE U.S. TERRITORY)	3-185
3.4.2.1	Description of Resource.....	3-185
3.4.2.2	Region of Influence.....	3-185
3.4.2.3	Affected Environment.....	3-185
3.4.2.3.1	Physical and Chemical Properties.....	3-185
3.4.2.3.1.1	Salinity	3-188
3.4.2.3.1.2	Density.....	3-188
3.4.2.3.1.3	Temperature.....	3-188
3.4.2.3.1.4	pH.....	3-189
3.4.2.3.1.5	Dissolved Gases.....	3-189
3.4.2.3.2	Biological Diversity.....	3-189
3.4.2.3.3	Ocean Zones.....	3-190
3.4.2.3.3.1	Pelagic Zone.....	3-191
3.4.2.3.3.2	Benthic Zone	3-191
3.4.2.3.4	Special Habitats.....	3-191
3.4.2.3.5	Candidate, Threatened, and Endangered Species.....	3-191
3.4.3	HEALTH AND SAFETY—OCEAN AREA (OUTSIDE U.S. TERRITORY)	3-192
3.4.3.1	Description of Resource.....	3-192
3.4.3.2	Region of Influence.....	3-192
3.4.3.3	Affected Environment.....	3-192
3.4.4	TRANSPORTATION—OCEAN AREA (OUTSIDE U.S. TERRITORY)	3-193
3.4.4.1	Description of Resource.....	3-193
3.4.4.2	Region of Influence.....	3-193
3.4.4.3	Affected Environment.....	3-193
3.4.5	WATER RESOURCES—OCEAN AREA (OUTSIDE U.S. TERRITORY)	3-195
3.5	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE.....	3-195
3.5.1	BACKGROUND.....	3-195
3.5.2	METHODOLOGY.....	3-195
3.5.3	PUBLIC OUTREACH.....	3-200
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES	4-1
4.1	PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY	4-2
4.1.1	PMRF/MAIN BASE	4-2
4.1.1.1	Air Quality—PMRF/Main Base	4-2
4.1.1.1.1	No-action Alternative—Air Quality, PMRF/Main Base	4-2

4.1.1.1.1	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-6
4.1.1.1.2	Proposed Action—Air Quality, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-6
4.1.1.2	Airspace—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-8
4.1.1.2.1	No-action Alternative—Airspace, PMRF/Main Base	4-8
4.1.1.2.1.1	Land-Based Training and Operations.....	4-8
4.1.1.2.1.2	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-10
4.1.1.2.2	Proposed Action—Airspace, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-10
4.1.1.2.2.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-10
4.1.1.2.2.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-11
4.1.1.2.2.3	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-11
4.1.1.2.2.4	Airports and Airfields.....	4-11
4.1.1.3	Biological Resources, PMRF/Main Base	4-12
4.1.1.3.1	No-action Alternative—Biological Resources, PMRF Main Base.....	4-12
4.1.1.3.1.1	Land-Based Training and Operations.....	4-12
4.1.1.3.1.2	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-13
4.1.1.3.1.3	Offshore Operations.....	4-15
4.1.1.3.1.4	Submarine-launched Mobile Mines Exercise.....	4-17
4.1.1.3.1.5	Submarine Operations Exercises	4-21
4.1.1.3.2	Proposed Action—Biological Resources, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-23
4.1.1.3.2.1	Construction	4-23
4.1.1.3.2.2	Range Training and Operations.....	4-23
4.1.1.3.2.3	Base Operations and Maintenance	4-23
4.1.1.4	Cultural Resources—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-24
4.1.1.4.1	No-action Alternative—Cultural Resources, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-25
4.1.1.4.2	Proposed Action—Cultural Resources, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-26
4.1.1.5	Geology and Soils—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-27
4.1.1.5.1	No-action Alternative—Geology and Soils, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-27
4.1.1.5.1.1	Land-Based Training and Operations.....	4-27
4.1.1.5.1.2	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-27
4.1.1.5.2	Proposed Action—Geology and Soils, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-27
4.1.1.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste— PMRF/Main Base	4-29
4.1.1.6.1	No-action Alternative—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-29
4.1.1.6.1.1	Land-Based Training and Operations.....	4-29
4.1.1.6.1.2	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-30
4.1.1.6.2	Proposed Action—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-30

4.1.1.6.2.1	Facility Construction	4-31
4.1.1.6.2.2	Target and Defensive Missile Launches.....	4-31
4.1.1.7	Health and Safety—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-33
4.1.1.7.1	No-action Alternative—Health and Safety, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-33
4.1.1.7.1.1	Land-based Training and Operations.....	4-33
4.1.1.7.1.2	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-41
4.1.1.7.1.3	Other Support Facilities	4-43
4.1.1.7.1.4	PMRF Tenant Organizations	4-43
4.1.1.7.1.5	Ongoing Maintenance and Operations	4-44
4.1.1.7.2	Proposed Action—Health and Safety, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-45
4.1.1.7.2.1	Facility Construction	4-45
4.1.1.7.2.2	Target Missile Systems.....	4-45
4.1.1.7.2.3	Defensive Missile Systems	4-54
4.1.1.7.2.4	Land-based Defensive Missile System Launches.....	4-54
4.1.1.7.2.5	Sensor Systems.....	4-56
4.1.1.7.2.6	Range Operations and Training.....	4-57
4.1.1.7.2.7	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-58
4.1.1.8	Land Use—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-59
4.1.1.8.1	No-action Alternative—Land Use, PMRF/Main Base	4-59
4.1.1.8.1.1	Land Use.....	4-59
4.1.1.8.1.2	Land-based Training and Operations.....	4-59
4.1.1.8.1.3	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-59
4.1.1.8.1.4	Recreation	4-60
4.1.1.8.2	Proposed Action—Land Use, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-61
4.1.1.8.2.1	Recreation	4-62
4.1.1.9	Noise—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-63
4.1.1.9.1	No-action Alternative—Noise, PMRF/Main Base	4-63
4.1.1.9.1.1	Land-based Training and Operation.....	4-63
4.1.1.9.1.2	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-63
4.1.1.9.2	Proposed Action—Noise, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-68
4.1.1.10	Socioeconomics—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-73
4.1.1.10.1	No-action Alternative—Socioeconomics, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-73
4.1.1.10.2	Proposed Action—Socioeconomics, PMRF/Main Base	4-74
4.1.1.10.2.1	Population and Income.....	4-74
4.1.1.10.2.2	Housing	4-75
4.1.1.10.2.3	Employment.....	4-75
4.1.1.10.2.4	Agriculture	4-75
4.1.1.10.2.5	Tourism and Commercial Fishing	4-75
4.1.1.11	Transportation—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-76
4.1.1.11.1	No-action Alternative—Transportation, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-76

4.1.1.11.2	Proposed Action—Transportation, PMRF/Main Base	4-76
4.1.1.12	Utilities—PMRF/Main Base	4-77
4.1.1.12.1	No-action Alternative—Utilities, PMRF/Main Base....	4-77
4.1.1.12.2	Proposed Action—Utilities, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-77
4.1.1.12.2.1	Electricity	4-77
4.1.1.12.2.2	Solid Waste	4-77
4.1.1.12.2.3	Wastewater	4-77
4.1.1.12.2.4	Water.....	4-77
4.1.1.13	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-78
4.1.1.13.1	No-action Alternative—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-78
4.1.1.13.2	Proposed Action—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-78
4.1.1.14	Water Resources—PMRF/Main Base.....	4-79
4.1.1.14.1	No-action Alternative—Water Resources, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-79
4.1.1.14.1.1	Land-based Training and Operations.....	4-79
4.1.1.14.1.2	Base Operations and Maintenance.....	4-80
4.1.1.14.2	Proposed Action—Water Resources, PMRF/Main Base.....	4-80
4.1.2	RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT (GROUND HAZARD AREA)	4-81
4.1.2.1	Air Quality—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area)	4-81
4.1.2.2	Biological Resources—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-82
4.1.2.3	Cultural Resources—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-82
4.1.2.4	Geology and Soils—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-83
4.1.2.5	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-83
4.1.2.6	Health and Safety—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-84
4.1.2.7	Land Use—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area)....	4-84
4.1.2.7.1	Recreation	4-85
4.1.2.8	Noise—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-85
4.1.2.9	Socioeconomics—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-86
4.1.2.10	Transportation—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area)	4-87
4.1.2.11	Utilities—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-88
4.1.2.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-88

4.1.2.13	Water Resources—Restrictive Easement (Ground Hazard Area).....	4-88
4.1.3	MAKAHA RIDGE	4-89
4.1.3.1	Air Quality—Makaha Ridge	4-89
4.1.3.1.1	No-action Alternative—Air Quality, Makaha Ridge	4-89
4.1.3.1.2	Proposed Action—Air Quality, Makaha Ridge	4-89
4.1.3.2	Airspace—Makaha Ridge.....	4-89
4.1.3.2.1	No-action Alternative—Airspace, Makaha Ridge.....	4-89
4.1.3.2.1.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-89
4.1.3.2.1.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-90
4.1.3.2.1.3	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-90
4.1.3.2.1.4	Airports and Airfields.....	4-90
4.1.3.2.2	Proposed Action—Airspace, Makaha Ridge.....	4-90
4.1.3.2.2.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-90
4.1.3.2.2.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-91
4.1.3.2.2.3	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-91
4.1.3.2.2.4	Airports and Airfields.....	4-91
4.1.3.3	Biological Resources—Makaha Ridge.....	4-91
4.1.3.3.1	No-action Alternative—Biological Resources, Makaha Ridge.....	4-91
4.1.3.3.2	Proposed Action—Biological Resources, Makaha Ridge	4-91
4.1.3.4	Cultural Resources—Makaha Ridge.....	4-92
4.1.3.4.1	No-action Alternative—Cultural Resources, Makaha Ridge.....	4-92
4.1.3.4.2	Proposed Action—Cultural Resources, Makaha Ridge	4-92
4.1.3.5	Geology and Soils—Makaha Ridge.....	4-93
4.1.3.5.1	No-action Alternative—Geology and Soils, Makaha Ridge.....	4-93
4.1.3.5.2	Proposed Action—Geology and Soils, Makaha Ridge	4-93
4.1.3.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Makaha Ridge.....	4-94
4.1.3.6.1	No-action Alternative—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes, Makaha Ridge.....	4-94
4.1.3.6.2	Proposed Action—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Makaha Ridge.....	4-94
4.1.3.7	Health and Safety—Makaha Ridge.....	4-95
4.1.3.7.1	No-action Alternative—Health and Safety, Makaha Ridge.....	4-95
4.1.3.7.2	Proposed Action—Health and Safety, Makaha Ridge	4-95
4.1.3.8	Land Use—Makaha Ridge.....	4-97
4.1.3.8.1	No-action Alternative—Land Use, Makaha Ridge....	4-97

4.1.3.8.1.1	Land Use.....	4-97
4.1.3.8.1.2	Recreation.....	4-97
4.1.3.8.2	Proposed Action—Land Use, Makaha Ridge.....	4-97
4.1.3.8.2.1	Land Use.....	4-97
4.1.3.8.2.2	Recreation.....	4-98
4.1.3.9	Noise—Makaha Ridge.....	4-98
4.1.3.9.1	No-action Alternative—Noise, Makaha Ridge.....	4-98
4.1.3.9.2	Proposed Action, Noise Makaha Ridge.....	4-98
4.1.3.10	Transportation—Makaha Ridge.....	4-99
4.1.3.10.1	No-action Alternative—Transportation, Makaha Ridge	4-99
4.1.3.10.2	Proposed Action—Transportation, Makaha Ridge... ..	4-99
4.1.3.11	Utilities—Makaha Ridge	4-99
4.1.3.11.1	No-action Alternative—Utilities, Makaha Ridge.....	4-99
4.1.3.11.2	Proposed Action—Utilities, Makaha Ridge	4-100
4.1.3.11.2.1	Electricity	4-100
4.1.3.11.2.2	Solid Waste	4-100
4.1.3.11.2.3	Wastewater	4-100
4.1.3.11.2.4	Water.....	4-100
4.1.3.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Makaha Ridge.....	4-100
4.1.3.12.1	No-action Alternative—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Makaha Ridge.....	4-100
4.1.3.12.2	Proposed Action—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Makaha Ridge.....	4-101
4.1.3.13	Water Resources—Makaha Ridge.....	4-101
4.1.3.13.1	No-action Alternative—Water Resources, Makaha Ridge.....	4-101
4.1.3.13.2	Proposed Action—Water Resources, Makaha Ridge	4-101
4.1.4	KOKEE	4-102
4.1.4.1	Air Quality—Kokee	4-102
4.1.4.1.1	No-action Alternative—Air Quality, Kokee	4-102
4.1.4.1.2	Proposed Action—Air Quality, Kokee.....	4-102
4.1.4.2	Airspace—Kokee.....	4-102
4.1.4.2.1	No-action Alternative—Airspace, Kokee.....	4-102
4.1.4.2.1.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-102
4.1.4.2.1.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-103
4.1.4.2.1.3	Military Training Routes	4-103
4.1.4.2.1.4	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-103
4.1.4.2.1.5	Airports and Airfields.....	4-103
4.1.4.2.2	Proposed Action—Airspace, Kokee.....	4-103
4.1.4.2.2.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-104
4.1.4.2.2.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-104
4.1.4.2.2.3	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-104
4.1.4.2.2.4	Airports and Airfields.....	4-104
4.1.4.3	Biological Resources—Kokee.....	4-104

4.1.4.3.1	No-action Alternative—Biological Resources, Kokee	4-104
4.1.4.3.1.1	Operations.....	4-104
4.1.4.3.2	Proposed Action—Biological Resources, Kokee....	4-104
4.1.4.4	Cultural Resources—Kokee.....	4-105
4.1.4.4.1	No-action Alternative—Cultural Resources, Kokee	4-105
4.1.4.4.2	Proposed Action—Cultural Resource, Kokee.....	4-105
4.1.4.5	Geology and Soils—Kokee	4-105
4.1.4.5.1	No-action Alternative—Geology and Soils, Kokee..	4-105
4.1.4.5.2	Proposed Action—Geology and Soils, Kokee.....	4-106
4.1.4.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Kokee.....	4-106
4.1.4.6.1	No-action Alternative—Hazardous Material and Hazardous Waste, Kokee.....	4-106
4.1.4.6.2	Proposed Action—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Kokee.....	4-107
4.1.4.7	Health and Safety—Kokee.....	4-107
4.1.4.7.1	No-action Alternative—Health and Safety, Kokee..	4-107
4.1.4.7.2	Proposed Action—Health and Safety, Kokee.....	4-108
4.1.4.8	Land Use—Kokee.....	4-109
4.1.4.8.1	No-action Alternative—Land Use, Kokee	4-109
4.1.4.8.1.1	Recreation	4-109
4.1.4.8.2	Proposed Action—Land Use, Kokee.....	4-110
4.1.4.8.2.1	Land Use.....	4-110
4.1.4.8.2.2	Recreation	4-110
4.1.4.9	Noise—Kokee	4-111
4.1.4.9.1	No-action Alternative—Noise, Kokee.....	4-111
4.1.4.9.2	Proposed Action—Noise, Kokee.....	4-111
4.1.4.10	Transportation—Kokee	4-111
4.1.4.10.1	No-action Alternative—Transportation, Kokee.....	4-111
4.1.4.10.2	Proposed Action—Transportation, Kokee.....	4-111
4.1.4.11	Utilities—Kokee	4-112
4.1.4.11.1	No-action Alternative—Utilities, Kokee	4-112
4.1.4.11.2	Proposed Action—Utilities, Kokee.....	4-112
4.1.4.11.2.1	Electricity	4-112
4.1.4.11.2.2	Solid Waste	4-112
4.1.4.11.2.3	Wastewater	4-112
4.1.4.11.2.4	Water.....	4-112
4.1.4.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Kokee.....	4-112
4.1.4.12.1	No-action Alternative—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Kokee.....	4-112
4.1.4.12.2	Proposed Action—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Kokee.....	4-113
4.1.4.13	Water Resources—Kokee.....	4-113

4.1.4.13.1	No-action Alternative—Water Resources, Kokee...	4-113
4.1.4.13.2	Proposed Action—Water Resources, Kokee.....	4-114
4.1.5	KAMOKALA MAGAZINES	4-114
4.1.5.1	Air Quality—Kamokala Magazines	4-114
4.1.5.1.1	No-action Alternative—Air Quality, Kamokala Magazines	4-114
4.1.5.1.2	Proposed Action—Air Quality, Kamokala Magazines	4-114
4.1.5.2	Biological Resources—Kamokala Magazines.....	4-114
4.1.5.2.1	No-action Alternative—Biological Resources, Kamokala Magazines.....	4-114
4.1.5.2.2	Proposed Action—Biological Resources, Kamokala Magazines.....	4-115
4.1.5.3	Cultural Resources—Kamokala Magazines.....	4-115
4.1.5.3.1	No-action Alternative—Cultural Resources, Kamokala Magazines.....	4-115
4.1.5.3.2	Proposed Action—Cultural Resources, Kamokala Magazines	4-116
4.1.5.4	Geology and Soils—Kamokala Magazines.....	4-116
4.1.5.4.1	No-action Alternative—Geology and Soils, Kamokala Magazines.....	4-116
4.1.5.4.2	Proposed Action—Geology and Soils, Kamokala Magazines	4-117
4.1.5.5	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Kamokala Magazines.....	4-117
4.1.5.5.1	No-action Alternative—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Kamokala Magazines.....	4-117
4.1.5.5.2	Proposed Action—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Kamokala Magazine.....	4-117
4.1.5.6	Health and Safety—Kamokala Magazines.....	4-118
4.1.5.6.1	No-action Alternative—Health and Safety, Kamokala Magazines.....	4-118
4.1.5.6.2	Proposed Action—Health and Safety, Kamokala Magazines	4-118
4.1.5.7	Land Use—Kamokala Magazines.....	4-119
4.1.5.7.1	No-action Alternative—Land Use, Kamokala Magazines	4-119
4.1.5.7.1.1	Land Use.....	4-119
4.1.5.7.1.2	Recreation.....	4-119
4.1.5.7.2	Proposed Action—Land Use, Kamokala Magazines	4-120
4.1.5.7.2.1	Land Use.....	4-120
4.1.5.7.2.2	Recreation.....	4-120
4.1.5.8	Transportation—Kamokala Magazines.....	4-121
4.1.5.8.1	No-action Alternative—Transportation, Kamokala Magazines	4-121

4.1.5.8.2	Proposed Action—Transportation, Kamokala Magazines	4-121
4.1.5.9	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Kamokala Magazines..	4-121
4.1.5.9.1	No-action Alternative—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Kamokala Magazines.....	4-121
4.1.5.9.2	Proposed Action—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Kamokala Magazines.....	4-122
4.1.5.10	Water Resources—Kamokala Magazines.....	4-122
4.1.5.10.1	No-action Alternative—Water Resources, Kamokala Magazines.....	4-122
4.1.5.10.2	Proposed Action—Water Resources, Kamokala Magazines	4-123
4.1.6	PORT ALLEN	4-123
4.1.6.1	Air Quality—Port Allen.....	4-123
4.1.6.1.1	No-action Alternative—Air Quality, Port Allen	4-123
4.1.6.1.2	Proposed Action—Air Quality, Port Allen.....	4-123
4.1.6.2	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Port Allen..	4-124
4.1.6.2.1	No-action Alternative—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Port Allen.....	4-124
4.1.6.2.2	Proposed Action—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Port Allen.....	4-124
4.1.6.3	Health and Safety—Port Allen.....	4-124
4.1.6.3.1	No-action Alternative—Health and Safety, Port Allen.....	4-124
4.1.6.3.2	Proposed Action—Health and Safety, Port Allen...	4-125
4.1.6.4	Land Use—Port Allen.....	4-125
4.1.6.4.1	No-action Alternative—Land Use, Port Allen.....	4-125
4.1.6.4.1.1	Land Use	4-125
4.1.6.4.1.2	Recreation	4-126
4.1.6.4.2	Proposed Action—Land Use, Port Allen.....	4-126
4.1.6.5	Noise—Port Allen	4-126
4.1.6.5.1	No-action Alternative—Noise, Port Allen	4-126
4.1.6.5.2	Proposed Action—Noise, Port Allen.....	4-126
4.1.6.6	Transportation—Port Allen	4-127
4.1.6.6.1	No-action Alternative—Transportation, Port Allen ..	4-127
4.1.6.6.2	Proposed Action—Transportation, Port Allen.....	4-127
4.1.6.7	Utilities—Port Allen	4-127
4.1.6.7.1	No-action Alternative—Utilities, Port Allen	4-127
4.1.6.7.2	Proposed Action—Utilities, Port Allen	4-127
4.1.6.8	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Port Allen.....	4-128
4.1.6.8.1	No-action Alternative—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Port Allen.....	4-128

	4.1.6.8.2	Proposed Action—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Port Allen.....	4-128
	4.1.6.9	Water Resources—Port Allen	4-128
	4.1.6.9.1	No-action Alternative—Water Resources, Port Allen.....	4-128
	4.1.6.9.2	Proposed Action—Water Resources, Port Allen....	4-128
4.2	SUPPORT SITES.....		4-129
	4.2.1	NIIHAU.....	4-129
	4.2.1.1	Air Quality—Niihau	4-129
	4.2.1.1.1	No-action Alternative—Air Quality, Niihau	4-129
	4.2.1.1.2	Proposed Action—Air Quality—Niihau.....	4-129
	4.2.1.2	Airspace—Niihau.....	4-131
	4.2.1.2.1	No-action Alternative—Airspace, Niihau.....	4-131
	4.2.1.2.1.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-131
	4.2.1.2.1.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-131
	4.2.1.2.1.3	Military Training Routes	4-131
	4.2.1.2.1.4	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-131
	4.2.1.2.1.5	Airports and Airfields.....	4-131
	4.2.1.2.2	Proposed Action—Airspace, Niihau.....	4-131
	4.2.1.2.2.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-131
	4.2.1.2.2.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-132
	4.2.1.2.2.3	Military Training Routes	4-132
	4.2.1.2.2.4	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-132
	4.2.1.2.2.5	Airports and Airfields.....	4-132
	4.2.1.3	Biological Resources—Niihau.....	4-133
	4.2.1.3.1	No-action Alternative—Biological Resources, Niihau	4-133
	4.2.1.3.1.1	Operations.....	4-133
	4.2.1.3.2	Proposed Action—Biological Resources, Niihau....	4-133
	4.2.1.3.2.1	Construction	4-133
	4.2.1.3.2.2	Operations.....	4-134
	4.2.1.4	Cultural Resources—Niihau.....	4-136
	4.2.1.4.1	No-action Alternative—Cultural Resources, Niihau	4-136
	4.2.1.4.2	Proposed Action—Cultural Resources, Niihau.....	4-136
	4.2.1.5	Geology and Soils—Niihau	4-138
	4.2.1.5.1	No-action Alternative—Geology and Soils, Niihau..	4-138
	4.2.1.5.2	Proposed Action—Geology and Soils, Niihau.....	4-138
	4.2.1.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Niihau.....	4-140
	4.2.1.6.1	No-action Alternative—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Niihau.....	4-140
	4.2.1.6.2	Proposed Action—Hazardous Material and Hazardous Waste, Niihau.....	4-141
	4.2.1.7	Health and Safety—Niihau.....	4-142
	4.2.1.7.1	No-action Alternative—Health and Safety, Niihau..	4-142

4.2.1.7.2	Proposed Action—Health and Safety, Niihau.....	4-143
4.2.1.8	Land Use—Niihau.....	4-148
4.2.1.8.1	No-action Alternative—Land Use, Niihau.....	4-148
4.2.1.8.1.1	Land Use.....	4-148
4.2.1.8.1.2	Recreation.....	4-148
4.2.1.8.2	Proposed Action—Land Use, Niihau.....	4-149
4.2.1.8.2.1	Recreation.....	4-150
4.2.1.9	Noise—Niihau.....	4-150
4.2.1.9.1	No-action Alternative—Noise, Niihau.....	4-150
4.2.1.9.2	Proposed Action—Noise, Niihau.....	4-151
4.2.1.10	Socioeconomics—Niihau.....	4-153
4.2.1.10.1	No-action Alternative—Socioeconomics, Niihau.....	4-153
4.2.1.10.2	Proposed Action—Socioeconomics, Niihau.....	4-154
4.2.1.10.2.1	Employment and Income.....	4-154
4.2.1.10.2.2	Subsistence.....	4-154
4.2.1.11	Transportation—Niihau.....	4-155
4.2.1.11.1	No-action Alternative—Transportation, Niihau.....	4-155
4.2.1.11.2	Proposed Action—Transportation, Niihau.....	4-155
4.2.1.12	Utilities—Niihau.....	4-156
4.2.1.12.1	No-action Alternative—Utilities, Niihau.....	4-156
4.2.1.12.2	Proposed Action—Utilities, Niihau.....	4-156
4.2.1.13	Visual and Aesthetic Resources.....	4-156
4.2.1.13.1	No-action Alternative—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Niihau.....	4-156
4.2.1.13.2	Proposed Action—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Niihau.....	4-157
4.2.1.14	Water Resources—Niihau.....	4-158
4.2.1.14.1	No-action Alternative—Water Resources, Niihau.....	4-158
4.2.1.14.2	Proposed Action—Water Resources, Niihau.....	4-158
4.2.1.14.2.1	Construction Activities.....	4-158
4.2.1.14.2.2	Flight Test Activities.....	4-159
4.2.2	KAULA.....	4-161
4.2.2.1	Airspace—Kaula.....	4-161
4.2.2.1.1	No-action Alternative—Airspace, Kaula.....	4-161
4.2.2.1.1.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-161
4.2.2.1.1.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-161
4.2.2.1.1.3	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-161
4.2.2.1.1.4	Airports and Airfields.....	4-161
4.2.2.1.2	Proposed Action—Airspace, Kaula.....	4-162
4.2.2.2	Biological Resources—Kaula.....	4-162
4.2.2.2.1	No-action Alternative—Biological Resources, Kaula.....	4-162
4.2.2.2.1.1	Operations.....	4-162
4.2.2.2.2	Proposed Action—Biological Resources, Kaula.....	4-162
4.2.2.3	Cultural Resources—Kaula.....	4-163

	4.2.2.3.1	No-action Alternative—Cultural Resources, Kaula	4-163
	4.2.2.3.2	Proposed Action—Cultural Resources, Kaula.....	4-163
	4.2.2.4	Geology and Soils—Kaula	4-163
	4.2.2.4.1	No-action Alternative—Geology and Soils, Kaula...	4-163
	4.2.2.4.2	Proposed Action—Geology and Soils, Kaula.....	4-164
	4.2.2.5	Health and Safety—Kaula.....	4-164
	4.2.2.5.1	No-action Alternative—Health and Safety, Kaula...	4-164
	4.2.2.5.2	Proposed Action—Health and Safety, Kaula.....	4-164
	4.2.2.6	Land Use—Kaula.....	4-165
	4.2.2.6.1	No-action Alternative—Land Use, Kaula	4-165
	4.2.2.6.1.1	Land Use.....	4-165
	4.2.2.6.1.2	Recreation	4-165
	4.2.2.6.2	Proposed Action—Land Use, Kaula.....	4-165
	4.2.2.7	Water Resources—Kaula.....	4-166
	4.2.2.7.1	No-action Alternative—Water Resources, Kaula...	4-166
	4.2.2.7.2	Proposed Action—Water Resources, Kaula.....	4-166
	4.2.3	MOUNT HALEAKALA TRACKING FACILITIES	4-166
	4.2.4	KAENA POINT.....	4-166
	4.2.5	WHEELER NETWORK SEGMENT CONTROL/PMRF COMMUNICATION SITES	4-166
	4.2.6	DOE COMMUNICATION SITES	4-167
4.3	CANDIDATE SITES		4-167
	4.3.1	TERN ISLAND.....	4-167
	4.3.1.1	Air Quality—Tern Island	4-167
	4.3.1.1.1	No-action Alternative—Air Quality, Tern Island.....	4-167
	4.3.1.1.2	Proposed Action—Air Quality, Tern Island.....	4-167
	4.3.1.2	Airspace—Tern Island.....	4-168
	4.3.1.2.1	No-action Alternative—Airspace, Tern Island	4-168
	4.3.1.2.2	Proposed Action—Airspace, Tern Island.....	4-168
	4.3.1.3	Biological Resources—Tern Island.....	4-169
	4.3.1.3.1	No-action Alternative—Biological Resources, Tern Island.....	4-169
	4.3.1.3.2	Proposed Action—Biological Resources, Tern Island	4-170
	4.3.1.3.2.1	Construction	4-170
	4.3.1.3.2.2	Operations.....	4-170
	4.3.1.4	Cultural Resources—Tern Island.....	4-174
	4.3.1.4.1	No-action Alternative—Cultural Resources, Tern Island	4-174
	4.3.1.4.2	Proposed Action—Cultural Resources, Tern Island	4-174
	4.3.1.5	Geology and Soils—Tern Island.....	4-175
	4.3.1.5.1	No-action Alternative—Geology and Soils, Tern Island	4-175

4.3.1.5.2	Proposed Action—Geology and Soils, Tern Island.....	4-175
4.3.1.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Tern Island.....	4-176
4.3.1.6.1	No-action Alternative—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Tern Island.....	4-176
4.3.1.6.2	Proposed Action—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Tern Island.....	4-177
4.3.1.7	Health and Safety—Tern Island.....	4-178
4.3.1.7.1	No-action Alternative—Health and Safety, Tern Island.....	4-178
4.3.1.7.2	Proposed Action—Health and Safety, Tern Island.....	4-178
4.3.1.8	Land Use—Tern Island.....	4-181
4.3.1.8.1	No-action Alternative—Land Use, Tern Island.....	4-181
4.3.1.8.1.1	Land Use.....	4-181
4.3.1.8.2	Proposed Action—Land Use, Tern Island.....	4-182
4.3.1.8.2.1	Land Use.....	4-182
4.3.1.8.2.2	Recreation.....	4-183
4.3.1.9	Noise—Tern Island.....	4-183
4.3.1.9.1	No-action Alternative—Noise, Tern Island.....	4-183
4.3.1.9.2	Proposed Action—Noise, Tern Island.....	4-183
4.3.1.10	Transportation—Tern Island.....	4-186
4.3.1.10.1	No-action Alternative—Transportation, Tern Island.....	4-186
4.3.1.10.2	Proposed Action—Transportation, Tern Island.....	4-186
4.3.1.11	Utilities—Tern Island.....	4-187
4.3.1.11.1	No-action Alternative—Utilities, Tern Island.....	4-187
4.3.1.11.2	Proposed Action—Utilities, Tern Island.....	4-187
4.3.1.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Tern Island.....	4-187
4.3.1.12.1	No-action Alternative—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Tern Island.....	4-187
4.3.1.12.2	Proposed Action—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Tern Island.....	4-187
4.3.1.13	Water Resources—Tern Island.....	4-188
4.3.1.13.1	No-action Alternative—Water Resources, Tern Island.....	4-188
4.3.1.13.2	Proposed Action—Water Resources, Tern Island.....	4-188
4.3.1.13.2.1	Construction Activities.....	4-188
4.3.1.13.2.2	Flight Test Activities.....	4-188
4.3.2	JOHNSTON ATOLL.....	4-190
4.3.2.1	Air Quality—Johnston Atoll.....	4-191
4.3.2.1.1	No-action Alternative—Air Quality, Johnston Atoll.....	4-191
4.3.2.1.2	Proposed Action—Air Quality, Johnston Atoll.....	4-191
4.3.2.2	Airspace—Johnston Atoll.....	4-192

4.3.2.2.1	No-action Alternative—Airspace, Johnston Atoll.....	4-192
4.3.2.2.2	Proposed Action—Airspace, Johnston Atoll.....	4-192
4.3.2.3	Biological Resources—Johnston Atoll.....	4-192
4.3.2.3.1	No-action Alternative—Biological Resources, Johnston Atoll.....	4-192
4.3.2.3.2	Proposed Action—Biological Resources, Johnston Atoll.....	4-192
4.3.2.3.2.1	Construction	4-192
4.3.2.3.2.2	Operations.....	4-193
4.3.2.4	Cultural Resources—Johnston Atoll.....	4-194
4.3.2.4.1	No-action Alternative—Cultural Resources, Johnston Atoll.....	4-194
4.3.2.4.2	Proposed Action—Cultural Resources, Johnston Atoll.....	4-194
4.3.2.5	Geology and Soils—Johnston Atoll.....	4-195
4.3.2.5.1	No-action Alternative—Geology and Soils, Johnston Atoll.....	4-195
4.3.2.5.2	Proposed Action—Geology and Soils, Johnston Atoll.....	4-195
4.3.2.6	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Johnston Atoll	4-196
4.3.2.6.1	No-action Alternative—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Johnston Atoll.....	4-196
4.3.2.6.2	Proposed Action—Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Johnston Atoll.....	4-197
4.3.2.7	Health and Safety—Johnston Atoll.....	4-198
4.3.2.7.1	No-action Alternative—Health and Safety, Johnston Atoll.....	4-198
4.3.2.7.2	Proposed Action—Health and Safety, Johnston Atoll.....	4-198
4.3.2.8	Land Use—Johnston Atoll.....	4-201
4.3.2.8.1	No-action Alternative—Land Use, Johnston Atoll...	4-201
4.3.2.8.2	Proposed Action—Land Use, Johnston Atoll.....	4-201
4.3.2.8.2.1	Land Use.....	4-201
4.3.2.8.2.2	Recreation	4-201
4.3.2.9	Noise—Johnston Atoll.....	4-202
4.3.2.9.1	No-action Alternative—Noise, Johnston Atoll	4-202
4.3.2.9.2	Proposed Action—Noise, Johnston Atoll.....	4-202
4.3.2.10	Transportation—Johnston Atoll.....	4-205
4.3.2.10.1	No-action Alternative—Transportation, Johnston Atoll.....	4-205
4.3.2.10.2	Proposed Action—Transportation, Johnston Atoll..	4-205
4.3.2.11	Utilities—Johnston Atoll.....	4-206
4.3.2.11.1	No-action Alternative—Utilities, Johnston Atoll	4-206

	4.3.2.11.2	Proposed Action—Utilities, Johnston Atoll.....	4-206
	4.3.2.12	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Johnston Atoll.....	4-206
	4.3.2.12.1	No-action Alternative—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Johnston Atoll.....	4-206
	4.3.2.12.2	Proposed Action—Visual and Aesthetic Resources, Johnston Atoll.....	4-206
	4.3.2.13	Water Resources—Johnston Atoll.....	4-207
	4.3.2.13.1	No-action Alternative—Water Resources, Johnston Atoll.....	4-207
	4.3.2.13.2	Proposed Action—Water Resources, Johnston Atoll.....	4-207
	4.3.2.13.2.1	Construction Activities	4-207
	4.3.2.13.2.2	Flight Test Activities	4-208
4.4	OCEAN AREA (OUTSIDE U.S. TERRITORY)		4-209
4.4.1	NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE—OCEAN AREA (OUTSIDE U.S. TERRITORY)		4-210
4.4.1.1	Airspace Use—Ocean Area (Outside U.S. Territory).....		4-210
	4.4.1.1.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-210
	4.4.1.1.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-210
	4.4.1.1.3	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-210
	4.4.1.1.4	Airports and Airfields.....	4-211
4.4.1.2	Biological Resources—Ocean Area (Outside U.S. Territory).....		4-211
4.4.1.2.1	Missile Training Exercises.....		4-213
	4.4.1.2.1.1	Launches of Target Drones and Missiles from Shore.....	4-213
	4.4.1.2.1.2	Launches of Target Drones from MATSS....	4-214
	4.4.1.2.1.3	Live Missile Firings by Aircraft Versus Target Drones.....	4-214
	4.4.1.2.1.4	Anti-Air Warfare Exercises.....	4-216
4.4.1.2.2	Air Operations Exercises		4-217
	4.4.1.2.2.1	Air Combat Maneuvering	4-217
4.4.1.2.3	Gunnery Exercises		4-217
	4.4.1.2.3.1	Gun Exercises by Aircraft Using Surface Targets or Kaula.....	4-217
	4.4.1.2.3.2	Army Surface-to-Air Gunnery Exercises.....	4-219
4.4.1.2.4	Bombing Exercises.....		4-219
4.4.1.2.5	Mining Exercises.....		4-219
	4.4.1.2.5.1	Aerial Mining Exercises.....	4-219
	4.4.1.2.5.2	Mining Readiness Certification Inspection Exercises	4-220
4.4.1.2.6	Electronic Warfare Exercises.....		4-220
4.4.1.2.7	Undersea Warfare Exercises.....		4-220
	4.4.1.2.7.1	Air Anti-Submarine Warfare Exercises	4-220
	4.4.1.2.7.2	Anti-Submarine Warfare Exercises.....	4-222
	4.4.1.2.7.3	Surface Weapons System Accuracy Tests.....	4-225

4.4.1.2.8	Submarine Operations Exercises	4-226
4.4.1.2.8.1	Submarine Warfare Exercises.....	4-226
4.4.1.2.8.2	Torpedo Exercises Using Retrievable Non-explosive Torpedoes.....	4-227
4.4.1.2.8.3	Mine Warfare Training during Submarine Transit of a Field of Bottom-Moored Practice Mines	4-228
4.4.1.2.8.4	Range Exercise	4-228
4.4.1.2.8.5	Torpedo Training and Certification Program.....	4-228
4.4.1.2.8.6	Submarine Target Tracking System Exercises	4-229
4.4.1.2.8.7	Submarine Transit Operations (Surfaced and Submerged) to and from Ports and Operating Areas	4-229
4.4.1.2.9	Fleet Training Exercises	4-229
4.4.1.2.9.1	Rim-of-the-Pacific Exercise.....	4-230
4.4.1.2.9.2	Low Flying Tactical Helicopter Flights.....	4-231
4.4.1.2.9.3	Landings, Takeoffs and Training Flights at Altitudes above 15.2 Meters (50 Feet) by Helicopters from Ships.....	4-231
4.4.1.2.9.4	Transit Operations Between Harbors and Operating Areas	4-232
4.4.1.2.10	Testing and Evaluation Exercises.....	4-232
4.4.1.3	Health and Safety—Ocean Area (Outside U.S. Territory) ..	4-233
4.4.1.4	Transportation—Ocean Area (Outside U.S. Territory).....	4-234
4.4.1.5	Water Resources—Ocean Area (Outside of U.S. Territory).....	4-236
4.4.1.5.1	Water Quality Impacts from Target Drones and Missile Exercises	4-236
4.4.1.5.2	Water Quality Impacts from Rocket Launch Programs	4-237
4.4.2	PROPOSED ACTION—OCEAN AREA (OUTSIDE U.S. TERRITORY)	4-237
4.4.2.1	Airspace Use—Ocean Area (Outside U.S. Territory).....	4-237
4.4.2.1.1	Controlled and Uncontrolled Airspace.....	4-237
4.4.2.1.2	Special Use Airspace.....	4-238
4.4.2.1.3	En Route Airways and Jet Routes.....	4-239
4.4.2.1.4	Airports and Airfields.....	4-240
4.4.2.2	Biological Resources—Ocean Area (Outside U.S. Territory).....	4-240
4.4.2.2.1	Sonic Boom Overpressure Impacts	4-242
4.4.2.2.2	Shock Wave Impact or Direct Contact.....	4-242
4.4.2.2.3	Ingestion of Toxic Solutions Generated from the Unburned Propellant Mixed with Seawater.....	4-243
4.4.2.2.4	Ingestion of Pieces of Unburned Propellant.....	4-243

	4.4.2.2.5	Entanglement with the Submerged Parachute.....	4-243
	4.4.2.3	Health and Safety—Ocean Area (Outside U.S. Territory) ..	4-244
	4.4.2.4	Transportation— Ocean Area (Outside U.S. Territory).....	4-245
	4.4.2.5	Water Resources—Ocean Area (Outside U.S. Territory)...	4-245
	4.4.2.5.1	Land and Sea-launched Target Missiles.....	4-245
	4.4.2.5.2	Air Launched Target Missiles.....	4-247
4.5		ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	4-248
	4.5.1	KAUAI.....	4-249
	4.5.1.1	Air Quality—Kauai	4-249
	4.5.1.2	Biological Resources—Kauai.....	4-249
	4.5.1.3	Cultural Resources—Kauai.....	4-249
	4.5.1.4	Geology and Soils—Kauai.....	4-249
	4.5.1.5	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Kauai	4-250
	4.5.1.6	Health and Safety—Kauai.....	4-250
	4.5.1.7	Land Use—Kauai.....	4-250
	4.5.1.8	Noise—Kauai	4-251
	4.5.1.9	Socioeconomics—Kauai	4-251
	4.5.1.10	Visual and Aesthetic Resources—Kauai.....	4-252
	4.5.1.11	Water Resources—Kauai.....	4-252
	4.5.2	NIHAU.....	4-252
	4.5.2.1	Air Quality—Niihau	4-252
	4.5.2.2	Biological Resources—Niihau	4-252
	4.5.2.3	Cultural Resources—Niihau	4-252
	4.5.2.4	Geology and Soils—Niihau	4-253
	4.5.2.5	Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste—Niihau.....	4-253
	4.5.2.6	Health and Safety—Niihau.....	4-253
	4.5.2.7	Land Use—Niihau.....	4-254
	4.5.2.8	Noise—Niihau	4-254
	4.5.2.9	Socioeconomics—Niihau.....	4-254
	4.5.2.10	Visual and Aesthetic Resources-Niihau.....	4-255
	4.5.2.11	Water Resources-Niihau.....	4-255
4.6		CONFLICTS WITH FEDERAL, REGIONAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS	4-255
4.7		ENERGY REQUIREMENTS AND CONSERVATION POTENTIAL	4-256
4.8		NATURAL OR DEPLETABLE RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS.....	4-256
4.9		ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED.....	4-256
4.10		RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY	4-257
4.11		IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES ..	4-257
4.12		SUMMARY OF UNRESOLVED ISSUES.....	4-257

VOLUME 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	5-1
6.0	GLOSSARY OF TERMS	6-1
7.0	CONSULTATION COMMENTS AND RESPONSES (SCOPING)	7-1
8.0	PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS, COMMENTS, RESPONSES, AND PETITIONS	8-1

VOLUME 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

9.0	CONSULTATION COMMENTS AND RESPONSES (PUBLIC HEARING).....	9-1
10.0	REFERENCES	10-1
11.0	DISTRIBUTION LIST	11-1

APPENDIXES

A	WEAPONS SYSTEMS
B	NOTICE OF INTENT, NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY, OEQC ARTICLES, AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
C	LEASES AND EASEMENTS
D	ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE DETERMINATION
E	LAND TITLE
F	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT, KAUAI, HAWAII
G	TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR USE OF NIIHAU ISLAND FACILITIES AND HELICOPTER SERVICES (PROTOCOL)
H	POTENTIAL PERMITS, LICENSES, AND ENTITLEMENTS REQUIRED
I	COOPERATING AGENCIES ACCEPTANCE LETTERS
J	LAWS AND REGULATIONS CONSIDERED
K	CONSULTATION REQUEST AND RESPONSE LETTERS
L	MITIGATIONS TABLES
M	PROPOSED MITIGATIONS BASED ON U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE ANALYSIS PROVIDED IN THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED TERN ISLAND SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT
N	MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY AND THE HAWAII STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

Index

FIGURES

1.4-1	Decisions by Activities	1-7
1.5-1	Relationship of PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS with Other Missile Defense NEPA Documents.....	1-13
1.5-2	Relationship of PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS with Other PMRF/State of Hawaii Documents	1-14
2.2.1-1	Location of Pacific Missile Range Facility and Related Sites on Kauai, Kauai, Hawaii	2-3
2.2.1-2	Pacific Missile Range Facility and Related Support Locations, Hawaiian Islands.....	2-5
2.2.1-3	Typical Exercise Aerial Targets Used at PMRF.....	2-9
2.2.1-4	Typical TBMD Target and Interceptor Missile Vehicle Comparison.....	2-10
2.2.1-5	Current Fleet Operation and Anti-Submarine Warfare Training at PMRF: Notional Illustration.....	2-13
2.2.1-6	Pacific Missile Range Facility Underwater Ranges, Hawaiian Islands.....	2-15
2.2.1-7	Hawaiian Area Tracking System, Hawaiian Islands.....	2-16
2.2.1-8	Typical AEGIS Cruiser.....	2-18
2.2.1-9	Typical Target Missile Hazard Areas.....	2-19
2.2.2-1	Pacific Missile Range Facility Launch Complex, Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii	2-29
2.3-1	Theater Ballistic Missile Defense In-Depth: Relationship Between Navy Theater-wide and Navy Area Defense, and Army Theater (THAAD) and Area (PAC-3/MEADS) Defense.....	2-40
2.3-2	Representative Testing Scenarios, Open Ocean.....	2-42
2.3-3	Proposed Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Support Locations, Open Ocean.....	2-43
2.3-4	Temporary Operating Area, Open Ocean.....	2-44
2.3.1-1	Representative Mobile Aerial Target System and Sea Launch Platform.....	2-49
2.3.1-2	Mobile Aerial Target Support System (MATSS), Hawaiian Islands.....	2-50
2.3.1-3	Conceptual Aerial Target Launch for Air Drop.....	2-52
2.3.1-4	Representative Impact Zones.....	2-54
2.3.4-1	Potential Sites, PMRF/Main Base, Kauai, Hawaii.....	2-63
2.3.4-2	Potential Sites, PMRF/Main Base - Kauai Test Facility, Kauai, Hawaii.....	2-64
2.3.4-3	Potential Missile Storage Buildings, Kamokala Magazines, Kauai, Hawaii....	2-65
2.3.4-4	Potential Sites, Makaha Ridge, Kauai, Hawaii.....	2-67
2.3.4-5	Potential Sites, Kokee, Kauai, Hawaii.....	2-69
2.3.4-6	Potential Sites, Niihau, Hawaii.....	2-70
2.3.4-7	Potential Sites, Tern Island (French Frigate Shoals), Hawaii.....	2-73
2.3.4-8	Approximate Dimensions of Rail Launch Pad at Site C and Conceptual Diagram of the Proposed 20K Rail Launcher (Inset), Tern Island (French Frigate Shoals), Hawaii	2-74
2.3.4-9	Potential Sites, Johnston Atoll.....	2-76
2.3.4-10	Approximate Dimensions of Stool Launch Pad at Either Site B, North Island, or Site C, East Island, Johnston Atoll.....	2-77
2.3.5-1	Pacific Missile Range Facility (Niihau)—Open Ocean Conceptual Intercept Scenarios, Open Ocean.....	2-79

2.3.5-2	Pacific Missile Range Facility (Niihau)—Tern Island Conceptual Intercept Scenarios, Tern Island, Hawaii.....	2-80
2.3.5-3	Pacific Missile Range Facility (Niihau)—Johnston Atoll Conceptual Intercept Scenarios, Johnston Atoll.....	2-81
3.1-1	Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-2
3.1-2	Pacific Missile Range Facility/Main Base, North, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-4
3.1-3	Pacific Missile Range Facility/Main Base, Central, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-5
3.1-4	Pacific Missile Range Facility/Main Base, South, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-6
3.1-5	Restrictive Easement Boundary and Ground Hazard Area Boundaries, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-7
3.1-6	Pacific Missile Range Facility/Makaha Ridge, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-8
3.1-7	Pacific Missile Range Facility/Kokee, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-9
3.1-8	Kamokala Magazines, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-10
3.1-9	Port Allen, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-11
3.1.1.1-1	Prevailing Winds, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-13
3.1.1.2-1	The Six Classes of Non-Military Airspace.....	3-15
3.1.1.2-2	Pacific Missile Range Facility Operational Areas, Open Ocean.....	3-18
3.1.1.2-3	Airspace Use Region of Influence Immediately Surrounding Pacific Missile Range Facility/Main Base, Hawaii.....	3-19
3.1.1.3-1	Ocean Zones, Open Ocean.....	3-24
3.1.1.3-2	Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary Boundary, Hawaiian Islands.....	3-28
3.1.1.6-1	Installation Restoration Program Sites on Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-52
3.1.1.7-1	Pacific Missile Range Facility Health and Safety, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-57
3.1.1.8-1	Land Use on the Mana Plain, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-64
3.1.1.8-2	State Land Use Designations on the Mana Plain, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-65
3.1.1.8-3	County Land Use Designations on the Mana Plain, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-66
3.1.1.8-4	Kauai County Special Management Areas, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-68
3.1.1.8-5	Pacific Missile Range Facility Recreational Areas, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-69
3.1.1.9-1	Comparative Sound Levels.....	3-72
3.1.1.14-1	Location of Sampling Sites, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-85
3.1.2.4-1	Restrictive Easement Soil Map, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-94
3.1.2.4-2	Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawaii Within the Region of Influence, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-95
3.1.2.7-1	Polihale State Park, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-99
3.1.2.7-2	Possible Expansion Area for Polihale State Park, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-100
3.1.2.10-1	Road Ownership within Restrictive Easement, Kauai, Hawaii.....	3-103
3.2.1-1	Niihau, Hawaii.....	3-136
3.2.1.8-1	Existing Land Use, Niihau, Hawaii.....	3-143
3.2.2-1	Kaula, Hawaii.....	3-148
3.2.3-1	Maui Space Surveillance System Tracking Facilities, Maui, Hawaii.....	3-155
3.2.3-2	Maui Space Surveillance System and Department of Energy Locations in Relation to Haleakala Observatory Complex, Maui, Hawaii.....	3-156
3.2.4-1	Pacific Missile Range Facility—Department of Energy Hawaiian Island Support Facilities, Hawaiian Islands.....	3-157

3.3.1.3-1	Generalized Breeding Cycles of Seabirds in the Northwest Hawaiian Islands.....	3-161
3.4.1-1	Airspace Managed by Oakland Oceanic Control Area Administrative Boundaries, Ocean Area.....	3-182
3.4.1-2	High Altitude Jet Routes, Northern Pacific Ocean, Ocean Area.....	3-183
3.4.2-1	Ocean Area Biological Resources Region of Influence, Ocean Area.....	3-186
3.4.2-2	Ocean Area Biological No-action Alternative Region of Influence, Hawaiian Islands.....	3-187
3.4.4-1	Composite Snapshot of Ship Locations in the Northern Pacific, Open Ocean.....	3-194
3.5.2-1	Kauai County Census Tracts, Kauai County, Hawaii.....	3-197
4.1.1.7-1	Pacific Missile Range Facility Flight Corridor Azimuth Limits, Kauai, Hawaii	4-36
4.1.1.7-2	Typical Ground and Surface Water Hazard Areas (KTF Area), Kauai, Hawaii	4-37
4.1.1.7-3	Typical Ground and Surface Water Hazard Areas (PMRF Launch Area), Kauai, Hawaii	4-38
4.1.1.9-1	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) for Area A, No-Action Alternative....	4-64
4.1.1.9-2	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) for Area B, No-Action Alternative....	4-65
4.1.1.9-3	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) for Area C, No-Action Alternative....	4-66
4.1.1.9-4	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) for PMRF Launch Area, Potential Site, Kauai, Hawaii.....	4-69
4.1.1.9-5	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) for KTF Launch Area Potential Site, Kauai, Hawaii.....	4-70
4.1.1.9-6	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) for Kokole Point Launch Area, Potential Site, Kauai, Hawaii.....	4-71
4.1.1.9-7	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) for PAC-3 Launch Area, Potential Site, Kauai, Hawaii.....	4-72
4.2.1.7-1	Proposed Ground Hazard Areas and Flight Corridor Azimuth Limits - North and South Launch Sites, Niihau, Hawaii.....	4-146
4.2.1.9-1	Maximum Launch Noise Contours (dBA) at Niihau, Potential Sites, Niihau, Hawaii	4-152
4.3.1.7-1	Potential Ground Hazard Area and Flight Corridor Azimuth Limits, Tern Island (French Frigate Shoals).....	4-180
4.3.1.9-1	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) at Tern Island, Potential Site, Tern Island.....	4-185
4.3.2.7-1	Potential Ground Hazard Area and Flight Corridor Azimuth Limits Johnston Atoll.....	4-199
4.3.2.9-1	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) at North Island, Potential Site, Johnston Atoll.....	4-203
4.3.2.9-2	Maximum Expected Noise Levels (dBA) at East Island, Potential Site, Johnston Atoll.....	4-204
4.4.1.4-1	Pacific Missile Range Facility Composite Snapshot of Ship Locations in the Northern Pacific, Open Ocean.....	4-235

4.4.2.4-1	Composite Snapshot of Ship Locations in the Temporary Operating Area, Open Ocean.....	4-246
-----------	---	-------

TABLES

1.6-1	Meeting Locations, Dates, and Times During the Scoping Process.....	1-17
1.7-1	Meeting Locations, Dates, and Times During the Draft EIS Comment Period.....	1-18
2.2.1-1	Level of Activity for Units, Weapons, and Targets.....	2-27
2.3.4-1	Activities Being Considered at Each Location.....	2-60
2.3.4-2	Proposed Action Building Modification and Construction Activities.....	2-62
2.4-1	Initially Considered Locations.....	2-88
2.5-1	Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action, Pacific Missile Range Facility.....	2-89
2.5-2	Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action, Support.....	2-96
2.5-3	Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action, Candidate Sites.....	2-103
2.5-4	Summary of Environmental Impacts for the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action, Ocean Area and Environmental Justice.....	2-106
3.1.1.2-1	Special Use Airspace in the PMRF/Main Base Airspace Use Region of Influence.....	3-20
3.1.1.3-1	Threatened and Endangered Terrestrial Species in the PMRF/Main Base Region of Influence.....	3-29
3.1.1.3-2	Summary of Marine Mammals and Sea Turtle Species within the Hawaiian Coastal Area.....	3-32
3.1.1.4-1	Known Archaeological Sites in the PMRF Installation.....	3-40
3.1.1.4-2	Architectural and Historic Resources at PMRF Facilities.....	3-43
3.1.1.6-1	CY96 Hazardous Waste Annual Report for PMRF.....	3-50
3.1.1.8-1	Availability of Beaches on PMRF.....	3-70
3.1.1.9-1	Sound Analyzer Data of September 1991 ZEST Launches and February 1993 Strategic Target System Launch.....	3-73
3.1.1.9-2	Predicted Maximum Sound Levels for Rocket Systems Launched from Kokole Point (Southern PMRF).....	3-74
3.1.1.10-1	Ethnic Origins of the Population of Kauai in 1990.....	3-75
3.1.1.10-2	Age Profile of Kauai County Residents in 1990.....	3-75
3.1.1.10-3	Employment in Kauai and Hawaii.....	3-76
3.1.1.10-4	Visitors to Kauai (1991-1995).....	3-78
3.1.1.10-5	No-action Alternative Employment and Population.....	3-78
3.1.1.14-1	Summary of Field pH and Miscellaneous Field Measurements of Water, Saturated Soil Paste, and Vegetation Wash Water Samples Taken 28 and 29 May 1991 in the Vicinity of PMRF.....	3-84
3.1.1.14-2	Chloride Levels of Water, Saturated Soil Paste, and Vegetation Wash Water Samples Taken 28 and 29 May 1991 in the Vicinity of PMRF.....	3-86
3.1.2-1	Activation of the Restrictive Easement, January 1993–February 1997.....	3-87
3.1.2.3-1	Cultural Resources Sites Located Within the Restrictive Easement Region of Influence.....	3-90
3.2.1-1	Income Earned by Niihau Ranch by Completing Tasks for PMRF.....	3-145

3.5.2-1	Census Tracts in Kauai County.....	3-198
3.5.2-2	Race by Census Tract, Kauai County.....	3-198
3.5.3-1	Meeting Locations, Dates, and Times During the Scoping Process.....	3-200
3.5.3-2	Meeting Locations, Dates, and Times During the Draft EIS Comment Period.....	3-201
4.1.1.1-1	Exhaust Products of Typical Missiles Launched from PMRF (in kilograms [pounds]).....	4-3
4.1.1.1-2	Summary of TSCREEN/PUFF Results for Hawk with Complete Combustion.....	4-5
4.1.1.1-3	Exhaust Products of Typical Proposed Action Ground-launch Missiles (in kilograms [pounds]).....	4-7
4.1.1.1-4	Exhaust Products of Typical Proposed Action Ground-launch Missiles (in kilograms [pounds]).....	4-7
4.1.1.9-1	Representative Noise Levels from Existing Launch Areas on PMRF Under the No-action Alternative.....	4-67
4.1.1.9-2	Representative Noise Levels from Existing Launch Areas on PMRF Under the Proposed Action.....	4-73
7-1	Index of Original Comment Letters and Comment Response Letters.....	7-7
9-1	Index of Original Comment Letters and Comment Response Letters.....	9-10

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

5.0 List of Preparers

Dedicated to the memory of Clay Kagawa

5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

Government Preparers

Frank DeCosta, Range Control Officer, Range Programs Division, Pacific Missile Range Facility
Area of Responsibility: EIS Range Safety and Airspace
Years of Experience: 12

Eric Dunn, Range Programs Public Affairs Officer, Pacific Missile Range Facility
B.S., 1984, Computer Science, University of Southern California
Area of Responsibility: EIS Public Affairs
Years of Experience: 3

Dennis R. Gallien, Environmental Engineer, Environmental Division, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command
B.S., 1979, Industrial Chemistry, University of North Alabama
Area of Responsibility: EIS Management
Years of Experience: 16

Rod Gibbons, Lieutenant Commander, Public Affairs Officer, Commander, Naval Base Pearl Harbor, U.S. Navy
M.A., 1997, Communications, University of Oklahoma
B.S., 1986, History, U.S. Naval Academy
Area of Responsibility: EIS Public Affairs
Year of Experience: 12

Richard Gonzalez, Program Engineer, Targets Project Office, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command
B.S., 1978, Mathematics/Chemistry, University of Texas at El Paso
Areas of Responsibility: Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives (DOPAA), Ballistic Missile Targets
Years of Experience: 20

Wayne Hammer, Dalgren Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center
B.S., 1986, Electronic Engineering Technology, University of West Florida
Area of Responsibility: DOPAA
Years of Experience: 33

Julia Hudson, Environmental Office Public Affairs, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command
M.A., 1976, Mathematics/Science Education, Michigan State University
B.A., 1971, Secondary Education, Michigan State University
Area of Responsibility: EIS Public Affairs
Years of Experience: 2

Robert Inouye, Environmental Engineer, Pacific Missile Range Facility
B.S., 1961, Chemical Engineering, Purdue University, Indiana
Area of Responsibility: EIS Environmental Technical Review
Years of Experience: 35

Jim Irwin, Environmental Security Engineer, PEO-TAD, U.S. Navy
B.S., 1980, Chemical Engineering, Virginia Polytechnical Institute and
State University
Area of Responsibility: DOPAA
Years of Experience: 15

Aubrey Kunishige, Program Analyst, Range Control, Pacific Missile Range Facility
Diploma, 1970, Electronic Engineering Technology, Electronics Institute of Hawaii
Area of Responsibility: DOPAA
Years of Experience: 26

Lieutenant Commander Thomas Van Leunen, Jr, Public Affairs Officer, Commander, Naval
Base Pearl Harbor, U.S. Navy
M.A., 1994, Journalism, University of Maryland
B.A., 1982, Speech Communications, University of Missouri, Columbia
Area of Responsibility: EIS Public Affairs
Years of Experience: 14

Duane Nelson, P.E., Program Executive Office Air and Missile Defense, U.S. Army
BME, 1969, University of Louisville
Area of Responsibility: Army TMD Systems Guidance
Years of Experience: 20

Liem Nguyen, Environmental Engineer, Environmental Division, U.S. Army Space and Missile
Defense Command
M.S., 1996, Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles
B.S., 1995, Civil Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles
Area of Responsibility: EIS Environmental Technical Review
Years of Experience: 1

Gail Sikes, Project Engineer, Targets Project Office, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense
Command
B.S., 1991, Electrical Engineering, University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH)
B.S.B.A., 1986, Management Information Systems, UAH
Areas of Responsibility: DOPAA, FMA Missile Targets
Years of Experience: 5

Averiet Soto, Assistant Program Analyst, Range Control, Pacific Missile Range Facility
A.A.S., 1978, Electronics Technology, Boise State University
Area of Responsibility: DOPAA Manager
Years of Experience: 17

Crate J. Spears, Environmental Coordinator, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization
B.S., 1976, Medical Technology, Xavier University
Area of Responsibility:
Year of Experience: 25

Leland Tottori, Public Works, Pacific Missile Range Facility
B.S., 1984, Civil Engineering, University of Hawaii, Honolulu
Area of Responsibility: EIS Facilities Technical Review
Years of Experience: 14

Contractor Preparers

Mark Bennett, Associate, EDAW, Inc.
Ph.D., 1990, Chemical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
B.S.E., 1982, Bioengineering, University of Pennsylvania
Area of Responsibility: Air Quality and Noise
Years of Experience: 5

Walter Bouley, Senior Systems Engineer, LOGICON/Syscon
M.S., Civil and Environmental Engineering, in progress,
George Washington University
B.S., 1985, Mechanical Engineering, University of Texas, Austin
Area of Responsibility: DOPAA
Years of Experience: 10

William A. Brewer, Senior Natural Resource Analyst, Pentec Environmental, Inc.
M.S., 1970, Biology (Marine Ecology), California State University at Northridge
B.A., 1966, Biology, California State University at Northridge
Area of Responsibility: Coral Reef and Fish Population Surveys
Years of Experience: 33

Mike Carstensen, Environmental Specialist, EDAW, Inc.
B.S., Chemical Engineering, in progress, University of Alabama in Huntsville
Area of Responsibility: Air Quality and Noise
Years of Experience: 1

Edward J. Cherian, TetraTech/EMI
B.A., 1986, Public Policy, Syracuse University
Area of Responsibility: Program Office Support
Years of Experience: 10

Amy Fenton, Technical Editor, EDAW, Inc.
B.S., 1988, Biology, University of Alabama in Huntsville
Area of Responsibility: Technical Editing
Years of Experience: 9

Ron W. Freeman, e²M, Inc.

B.S., 1972, Wildlife Management, Humboldt State University

Area of Responsibility: Terrestrial Wildlife Surveys

Years of Experience: 22

Quent Gillard, Independent Contractor

Ph.D., 1975, Geography, University of Chicago

M.S., 1972, Geography, Southern Illinois University

B.A., 1969, Geography, University of Nottingham, United Kingdom

Area of Responsibility: Senior Review, DOPAA, Airspace, and Ocean

Years of Experience: 25

Tirzo Gonzalez, Independent Contractor

B.A., 1976, Interdisciplinary Sciences, University of California, San Diego

Area of Responsibility: Cultural Resources

Years of Experience: 18

John Hendry, Economist, EDAW, Inc.

M.B.A., 1987, Cranfield School of Management, England

B.A., 1977, Economics, University of Sussex, England

Area of Responsibility: Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice

Years of Experience: 19

Irene Hofer, Senior Safety Engineer, High Technology Solutions, Inc.

M.S., 1977, Administrative Science, Naval Postgraduate School

B.S., 1958, Aeronautical Engineering, Purdue University, Indiana

Area of Responsibility: Safety

Years of Experience: 39

Penny Hudson, Environmental Scientist, EDAW, Inc.

B.S., 1996, Biology, University of Evansville, Indiana

B.A., 1996, Chemistry, University of Evansville, Indiana

Area of Responsibility: Technical Support

Years of Experience: 1

Vincent Izzo, Associate, EDAW, Inc.

B.A., 1985, Geography, California State University, Northridge

Area of Responsibility: Land Use, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Health and Safety

Years of Experience: 10

Jeral Jones, Graphics Artist, EDAW, Inc.

B.S.B.A., 1995, Management Information Systems, University of Alabama in Huntsville

Area of Responsibility: Graphics

Years of Experience: 1

Rachel Jordan, Associate, EDAW, Inc.
B.S., 1972, Biology, Christopher Newport College
Area of Responsibility: Biological Resources
Years of Experience: 9

Edd V. Joy, Senior Associate, EDAW, Inc.
B.A., 1974, Geography, California State University, Northridge
Area of Responsibility: EIS Manager
Years of Experience: 24

Alexander E. Lee, Environmental Planner, SciComm, Inc.
B.A., 1992, Urban Planning, University of Maryland
Area of Responsibility: Technical Review
Years of Experience: 5

Tina R. Lemmond, Environmental Specialist, EDAW, Inc.
B.S., 1995, Civil/Environmental Engineering, University of Alabama in Huntsville
Area of Responsibility: Noise
Years of Experience: 2

Alonzo Lopez, Senior Member of Technical Staff, Sandia National Laboratories
M.S., 1975, Electrical Engineering, Purdue University, Indiana
B.S., 1972, Electrical Engineering, New Mexico State University
Area of Responsibility: DOPAA
Years of Experience: 15

August C. Manguso, Vice President/General Manager, Stone Engineering Company
M.S., 1980, Industrial Engineering, University of Pittsburgh
B.S., 1972, United States Military Academy, West Point
Area of Responsibility: Public Information
Years of Experience: 26

Phil A. Meyer, President, Meyer Resources, Inc.
M.A., 1966, Resource Economics, University of California, Santa Barbara
B.A., 1962, Economics and Political Science, University of Victoria
Area of Responsibility: Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice
Years of Experience: 29

Joseph R. Mobley, Jr., Marine Mammal Research Consultants
Ph.D, 1984, University of Hawaii-Manoa
Area of Responsibility: Technical Review
Years of Experience: 17

Rickie Moon, Environmental Scientist, Teledyne Brown Engineering
M.S., 1997, Environmental Management, Samford University
B.S., 1977, Chemistry/Mathematics, Samford University
Area of Responsibility: Technical Review
Years of Experience: 13

Paul E. Nachtigall, Independent Contractor
Ph.D., 1976, Biology, University of Hawaii
M.A., 1970, Biology, University of Hawaii
B.A., 1967, Biology, San Jose State University
Area of Responsibility: Marine Mammal Research
Years of Experience: 31

Wesley S. Norris, Senior Associate, EDAW, Inc.
B.A., 1976, Geology, Northern Arizona University
Area of Responsibility: Water Resources
Years of Experience: 18

Walter Odening, Independent Contractor
Ph.D., 1971, Botany (Ecology), Duke University
M.S., 1968, Biology, San Diego State University
B.S., 1963, Biology, San Diego State University
Area of Responsibility: Biological Resources
Years of Experience: 27

Paige Peyton, Senior Archaeologist, Manager, EARTH TECH
M.A., 1990, Anthropology, California State University, San Bernardino
B.A., 1987, Anthropology, California State University, San Bernardino
Area of Responsibility: Cultural Resources
Years of Experience: 15

Steve Scott, Principal, EDAW, Inc.
B.S., 1973, Geology, California State University, San Diego
Area of Responsibility: Geology and Soils
Years of Experience: 23

Irwin D. Smith, Consultant, Stone Engineering Company
B.S., 1958, Chemical Engineering, New Mexico State University
Area of Responsibility: Liquid Propellants
Years of Experience: 40

Thomas P. Tytula, Consultant, Stone Engineering Company
Ph.D., 1978, Systems Engineering, Operations Research, Applied Statistics, University
of Alabama in Huntsville
M.S.E., 1972, Operations Research, University of Alabama in Huntsville
B.S., 1960, Aeronautical Engineering, Auburn University
Area of Responsibility: Statistical Analysis
Years of Experience: 43

James L. Unmack, P.E., C.I.H., C.S.P., Senior Engineer, Westates EHS Services, Inc.
M.S.EE, 1966, Bioengineering, Santa Clara University
B.S., 1964 Electrical Engineering, University of California
Area of Responsibility: Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste
Years of Experience: 31

Edward Vaughn, Independent Contractor
B.A., 1965, Philosophy, University of Alabama
Area of Responsibility: EIS Public Affairs
Years of Experience: 28

Ellen Vogler, Senior Associate, EDAW, Inc.
M.C.P., 1982, City Planning, Georgia Institute of Technology
B.A., 1976, Political Science, University of Delaware
Area of Responsibility: EIS Public Affairs
Years of Experience: 14

Stephen R. Woodall, President and CEO, Strategic Synthesis, Ltd.,
Consultant, Teledyne Brown Engineering,
Adjunct Professor/Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service
Ph.D., 1985, World Politics, Catholic University of America
M.A., 1984, World Politics, Catholic University of America
M.S., 1978, Operations Research, Naval Postgraduate School
M.S., 1978, Applied Mathematics, Naval Postgraduate School
B.S., 1967, Mathematics, United States Naval Academy
Area of Responsibility: Missile System Operations, Testing; Missile Range Operations;
Range Safety
Years of Experience: 31

James E. Zielinski, Environmental Planner, EDAW, Inc.
B.S., 1984, Biology, University of Alabama in Birmingham
Area of Responsibility: QA/QC
Years of Experience: 12

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

6.0 Glossary of Terms

6.0 GLOSSARY

Abyssal—sea floor region characterized by darkness and temperatures between 2 to 3° Celsius.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)—a 19-member body appointed, in part, by the President of the United States to advise the President and Congress, to coordinate the actions of Federal agencies on matters relating to historic preservation, to comment on the effects of such actions on historic and archaeological cultural resources, and to perform other duties as required by law (Public Law 89-655; 16 USC 470). The advisory council is responsible for implementing the National Historic Preservation Act.

Air Shed—a volume of air with boundaries chosen to facilitate determination of pollutant inflow and outflow. Boundaries are often chosen so that major sources of air pollution lie within the air shed.

Air Traffic Control—a service operated by appropriate authority to promote the safe, orderly, and expeditious flow of air traffic.

Airfield—usually an active and/or inactive [airfield](#), or infrequently used landing strip, with or without a hard surface, without FAA approved instrument approach procedures. An airfield has no control tower, and is usually private.

Airport—usually an active airport with hard-surface runways of 3,000 feet or more, with FAA approved instrument approach procedures regardless of runway length or composition. An airport may or may not have a control tower. Airports may be public or private.

Airspace—the space lying above the earth or above a certain land or water area (such as the [Gulf of Mexico Pacific Ocean](#)); more specifically, the space lying above a nation and coming under its jurisdiction.

Alluvium—a general term for clay, silt, sand, gravel, or similar unconsolidated material deposited during comparatively recent geologic time by a stream or other body of running water as a sorted or semi-sorted sediment in the bed of the stream or on its floodplain or delta, or as a cone or fan at the base of a maintained slope.

Altitude Reservation—altitude reservation procedures are used as authorization by the Central Altitude Reservation Function, an air traffic service facility, or appropriate air route traffic control center, under certain circumstances, for airspace utilization under prescribed conditions.

Aluminum Oxide (Al₂O₃)—a common chemical component of missile exhaust. Under natural conditions, the chemical is not a source of toxic aluminum; the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has determined that nonfibrous Al₂O₃, as found in solid rocket motor exhaust, is nontoxic.

Ambient Air Quality Standards—legal limitations on pollutant concentration levels allowed to occur in the ambient air established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or state agencies. Primary ambient air quality standards are designed to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety. Secondary ambient air quality standards are designed to protect public welfare-related values including property, materials, and plant and animal life.

Aquaculture—the cultivation of the natural produce of water, such as fish or shellfish.

Aquifer—a subsurface formation, group of formations, or part of a formation (eg., a huge, underground reservoir) that contains sufficient saturated permeable material to conduct groundwater and yield economical quantities of water to wells and springs.

Archaeology—a scientific approach to the study of human ecology, cultural history, prehistory and cultural processes, emphasizing systematic interpretation of material remains.

Archipelago—an expanse of water with many scattered islands; a group of islands.

Artifact—any thing or item that owes its shape, form, or placement to human activity. In archaeological studies, the term is applied to portable objects (e.g., tools and the by-products of their manufacture).

Atoll—a coral island consisting of a reef surrounding a lagoon.

Attainment Area—a geographic area in which the quality of the air is better than Federal air pollution standards.

A-weighted Sound Level (dBA)—a number representing the sound level which is frequency-weighted according to a prescribed frequency response established by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI S1.4-1971) and accounts for the response of the human ear.

Azimuth—a distance in angular degrees in a clockwise direction from the north point.

Basement Rock—rock generally with complex structure beneath the dominantly sedimentary rocks.

Bedrock—the solid rock that underlies the soil and other unconsolidated material or that is exposed at the surface.

Benthic Communities—of or having to do with populations of bottom-dwelling flora or fauna of oceans, seas, or the deepest parts of a large body of water.

Benthic Zone—the bottom of the sea floor.

Benthos—the sea floor.

Bioaccumulation—building up of a substance, such as PCBs, in the systems of living organisms (and thus, a food web) due to ready solubility in living tissues.

Biohazard—a biological agent or condition that constitutes a hazard to humans or the environment or the hazard posed by such an agent or condition.

Biological Diversity—the complexity and stability of an ecosystem, described in terms of species richness, species evenness, and the direct interaction between species such as competition and predation.

Biomagnify—the intensifying of bioaccumulants in the tissues of organisms, which in turn further increase in concentration as they ascend the levels of the food chain.

Brackish—slightly salty; applicable to waters whose saline content is intermediate between that of streams and sea water.

Byssal Threads—adhesive, elastic filaments secreted by mussels and certain other bivalve mollusks by which they adhere to hard substrates. Produced by a special byssal gland in the foot, they are attached to byssal retractor muscles that can pull them into the animal (to allow movement) or enable the threads to pull the mussel down close to the adhering surface. Also known as byssus or beards.

Calcareous—containing calcium carbonate.

Caprock—a natural overlying rock layer that is usually hard to penetrate.

Carbon Dioxide (CO₂)—a colorless, odorless, incombustible gas which is a product of respiration, combustion, fermentation, decomposition and other processes, and is always present in the atmosphere.

Carbon Monoxide (CO)—a colorless, odorless gas which is a by-product of the incomplete combustion of organic fuels. In small amounts, it causes headaches, dizziness, fatigue, and slow reactions; in large amounts, it can cause death.

Census Tract—a clearly defined geographical area of several square miles within which every resident is counted on the day of the census.

Cetacean—an order of aquatic, mostly marine, animals including the whales, dolphins, porpoise, and related forms with large head, fishlike nearly hairless body, and paddle-shaped forelimbs.

Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs)—a group of synthetic organic compounds composed of chlorine, fluorine, carbon, and hydrogen used primarily as industrial solvents and refrigerants (such as Freon). CFCs are stable, nontoxic, and easily liquified. CFCs undergo decomposition through the action of ultraviolet radiation, producing chlorine radicals which have been implicated in stratospheric ozone depletion.

Chronology—the science of arranging time in periods and ascertaining the dates and historical order of past events.

Coastal Zone—a region beyond the littoral zone occupying the area near the coastline in depths of water less than 50 meters (538.2 feet). The coastal zone typically extends from the high tide mark on the land to the gently sloping, relatively shallow edge of the

continental shelf. The sharp increase in water depth at the edge of the continental shelf separates the coastal zone from the offshore zone. Although comprising less than 10 percent of the ocean's area, this zone contains 90 percent of all marine species and is the site of most large commercial marine fisheries. This may differ from the way the term "coastal zone" is defined in the State Coastal Zone Management Program (HRS Chapter 205 A).

Community—an ecological collection of different plant and animal populations within a given area or zone.

Continental Rise—a gently sloping surface at the base of the continental slope consisting of deposited sediment.

Continental Shelf—a shallow submarine plain of varying width forming a border to a continent and typically ending in a steep slope to the oceanic abyss.

Continental Slope—the steep slope that starts at the shelf break about 150 to 200 meters (492 to 656 feet) and extends down to the continental rise of the deep ocean floor.

Controlled Airspace—airspace of defined dimensions within which air traffic control service is provided to Instrument Flight Rules flights and to Visual Flight Rules flights in accordance with the airspace classification. Controlled airspace is divided into five classes, dependent upon location, use, and degree of control: Class A, B, C, D, and E.

Coral Reef—a calcareous organic area composed of solid coral and coral sand.

Cosmology—a branch of metaphysics that deals with the nature, or natural order, of the universe.

Criteria Pollutants—the pollutants for which National Ambient Air Quality Standards exist.

Cultural Resource Component—a location or element within a settlement or subsistence system. Archaeological sites may contain several components that reflect the use of the locality by different groups in different time periods.

Culture—a group of people who share standards of behavior and have common ways of interpreting the circumstances of their lives.

Current—a horizontal movement of water or air.

C-weighted—utilized to determine effects of high-intensity impulsive sound on human populations, a scale providing unweighted sound levels over a frequency range of maximum human sensitivity.

Danger Zone—an offshore area to protect submerged cables that is designated in accordance with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regulations into which entry by any craft is prohibited except with the permission of the Commanding Officer, PMRF. See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 33, Parts 204 to 225a.

Decibel (dB)—the accepted standard unit of measure for sound pressure levels. Due to the extremely large range of measurable sound pressures, decibels are expressed in a logarithmic scale.

Direct Effects—immediate consequences of program activities. In economics, the initial increase in employment and income resulting from program employment and material purchases before the indirect effects of these changes are measured.

Direct Impact—effects resulting solely from program implementation.

District—National Register of Historic Places designation of a geographically defined area (urban or rural) possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, structures, or objects united by past events (theme) or aesthetically by plan of physical development.

Dune Land—hills and ridges of sand-size particles (derived predominantly from coral and seashells) drifted and piled by the wind. These dunes are actively shifting or are so recently fixed or stabilized that no soil horizons develop; their surface typically consists of loose sand.

Easement—a right of privilege (agreement) that a person or organization may have over another's property; an interest in land owned by another that entitles the holder of the easement to a specific limited use.

Ecosystem—all the living organisms in a given environment with the associated non-living factors.

Effects—a change in an attribute, which can be caused by a variety of events, including those that result from program attributes acting on the resource attribute (direct effect); those that do not result directly from the action or from the attributes of other resources acting on the attribute being studied (indirect effect); those that result from attributes of other programs or other attributes that change because of other programs (cumulative effects); and those that result from natural causes (for example, seasonal change).

Electromagnetic Radiation (EMR)—energy transfer by waves having both electric and magnetic properties.

Electronic Countermeasures (ECM)—includes both active jamming and passive techniques. Active jamming includes noise jamming to suppress hostile radars and radios, and deception jamming, intended to mislead enemy radars. Passive ECM includes the use of chaff to mask targets with multiple false echoes, as well as the reduction of radar signatures through the use of radar-absorbent materials and other stealth technologies.

En Route Airways—a low-altitude (up to, but not including 5,486.4 meters [18,000 feet] mean sea level) airway based on a center line that extends from one navigational aid or intersection to another navigational aid (or through several navigational aids and intersections) specified for that airway.

En Route Jet Routes—high altitude (above 18,000 feet mean sea level) airway based on a center line that extends from one navigational aid or intersection to another navigational aid (or through several navigational aids and intersections) specified for that airway.

Endangered Species—an organism threatened with extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

Endemic—plants or animals that are native or limited to a certain region.

Environmental Justice—fair treatment for people of all races, cultures, and incomes, regarding the development of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Concern that minority populations and/or low-income populations bear a disproportionate amount of adverse health and environmental effects led to the 1994 issuance of Executive Order 12898, focusing Federal agency attention on these issues.

Ethnography—the study and systematic recording of human cultures and/or the descriptive works produced from such research.

Exotic—not native to an area.

Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)—the process of recovering and neutralizing domestic and foreign conventional, nuclear and chemical/biological ordnance and improvised explosive devices; a procedure in Explosive Ordnance Management.

Explosive Safety Quantity-Distance (ESQD)—the amount of explosives material and distance separation relationships providing defined types of protection. These relationships are based on levels of risk considered acceptable for the stipulated exposures.

Fathom—a unit of length equal to 1.8 meters (6 feet); used to measure the depth of water.

Feature—in archaeology, a non-portable portion of an archaeological site, including such facilities as fire pits, storage pits, stone circles, or foundations.

Federal-Candidate Species—taxa for which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has on file sufficient information on biological vulnerability and threat(s) to support proposals to list them as endangered or threatened species.

Feral—having escaped from domestication and become wild.

Flight Termination—action taken in certain post-launch situations, such as a missile veering off of its predicted flight corridor; accomplished by stopping the propulsive thrust of a rocket motor via explosive charge. At this point, the missile continues along its current path, falling to earth under gravitational influence.

Free Flight—a joint initiative of the aviation industry and the Federal Aviation Administration to allow aircraft to take advantage of advanced satellite voice and data communication to provide faster and more reliable transmission to enable reductions in vertical, lateral, and longitudinal separation of aircraft, more direct flights and tracks, and

faster altitude clearance. It will allow pilots, whenever practicable, to choose their own route and file a flight plan that follows the most efficient and economical route, rather than following the published preferred instrument flight rules routes.

Freon—a trademark name for various CFCs; used as a refrigerant or aerosol propellant.

Greenhouse Effect—global atmospheric warming trend caused primarily by rising concentrations of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels.

Ground Hazard Area—the land area contained in an modified 3,048-meter (10,000-foot) maximum arc within which all debris from a terminated launch will fall. The ground hazard area is the land area within which all potentially hazardous debris resulting from a missile malfunction during the launch phase will be contained. This potentially hazardous debris includes inert debris impacting the earth with a kinetic energy equal to or greater than 11 foot-pounds. The dimensions of the ground hazard area are based on analyses that determine the bounds of potential errant trajectories, establish flight termination criteria (if applicable), and categorize debris resulting from vehicle breakup. To ensure that a violation of the ground hazard area does not occur, the winds will be measured prior to launch, and their effect on the debris evaluated. The arc for a Strategic Target System launch is described such that the radius is approximately 3,048 meters (10,000 feet) to the northeast, 2,774 meters (9,100 feet) to the east, and 2,743 meters (9,000 feet) to the south. For the Vandal launch, the arc is 1,829 meters (6,000 feet).

Gyre—a large circulation of oceanic water which often has a stagnant central area. Gyres rotate clockwise in the northern hemisphere and anticlockwise in the southern hemisphere.

Halon—a group of synthetic organic compounds composed of fluorine and other halogens (such as bromine), carbon, and hydrogen, and used primarily for fire suppression; implicated in stratospheric ozone depletion.

Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)—other pollutants, in addition to those addressed by the NAAQS, that present the threat of adverse effects to human health or to the environment as covered by Title III of the Clean Air Act. Incorporates, but is not limited to, the pollutants controlled by the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) program.

Hazardous Material (HAZMAT)—generally, a substance or mixture of substances capable of either causing or significantly contributing to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible or incapacitating reversible illness; it may pose a threat, or substantial present or potential risk to human health or the environment. HAZMAT use is regulated by the Department of Transportation, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the Emergency Right-to-Know Act.

Heiaus—the temple platforms, shrines, and enclosures that Hawaiians constructed for purposes of worship. Built on carefully fitted stones and considered sacred ground, heiaus contained assorted buildings for various religious rites practiced by the various kahuna (sacred priests and priestesses). Most heiaus were damaged in 1819 with the overthrow of the ancient religion and kapu system; however, several have been restored.

Home Lands—as required by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (passed by Congress in 1921), areas set aside for the state to lease residential, farm, and pastoral homestead lots for \$1 per year to native Hawaiians.

Hydraulic Conductivity—the rate in gallons per day water flow through a cross section of one square foot under a unit hydraulic gradient, at the prevailing temperature.

Hydrazine—a colorless, fuming, corrosive, hygroscopic (moisture-absorbing) liquid used in jet and rocket fuels.

Hydrochloric Acid (HCl)—a common chemical component of missile exhaust believed to injure plant leaves and affect wildlife.

Hydrographic Notice, Pacific (HYDROPAC)—a special notice to mariners (NOTMAR) containing information concerning the establishment, condition, or change to any components or hazards in the Maritime System which defines an urgent notice of hazards to navigation in the Pacific and Indian oceans.

Hydrology—the science dealing with the properties, distribution, and circulation of water on the face of the land (surface water) and in the soil and underlying rocks (groundwater).

Hydrophone—an instrument for listening to sound transmitted through water.

Immediately Dangerous to Life and Health (IDLH)—defined for the purpose of respirator selection, this level represents the maximum concentration from which, in the event of respirator failure, one could escape within 30 minutes without experiencing any escape-impairing or irreversible health effects.

Important Agricultural Land—as identified by the Hawaii Department of Agriculture, land other than Prime or Unique Agricultural Land that is also of statewide or local importance for agricultural use.

Incidental Taking Permit—a permit required by the Endangered Species Act if the possibility exists for a “taking” if such taking is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. Section 10 incidental taking permits are issued at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior or Secretary of Commerce, but only if the permit applicant submits a habitat conservation plan.

Indirect employment—employment resulting from the purchases of workers who are directly working on a specified program. Includes any subsequent employment arising from the increase in purchases in the area.

Indurated—rendered hard, as in dunes where surface sand is loose, but subsurface areas become increasingly compact (see lithified).

Inhibited Red Fuming Nitric Acid (IRFNA)—a liquid hypergolic propellant utilized as an oxidizer (as in the Lance). This reddish-brown acid is highly corrosive, spontaneously reacting with UDMH and certain other organic substances. It also dissolves in water, and care must be taken regarding its induced boiling effects. Its highly toxic, characteristically pungent vapors irritate skin and eyes.

Instrument Flight Rules (IFR)—rules governing the procedures for conducting instrument flight; it is a term used by pilots and controllers to indicate type of flight plan.

Interpretive Trail—a guided or self-guided nature walk, designed to attract interest and communicate an understanding of the environment in which it is located (including, where appropriate, the effects of human activity).

Isobath—the line on a marine map or chart joining points of equal depth, usually in fathoms below mean sea level.

Lamina—unit layer or sheet of a sediment in which the stratification planes are one centimeter or less apart. Laminae need not be parallel to bedding.

Leina-a-ka-uhane—as identified in traditional Hawaiian religious cosmology, a place (generally cliffs or seacoast promontories) from which the spirits of the dead plunge into eternity and are divided into one of three spiritual realms: the realm of the wandering spirits; the realm of the ancestral spirits; or the realm of the endless night.

Lithified—the conversion of a newly deposited sediment into an indurated rock.

Littoral Zone—occupies the space between high and low tide, and is often referred to as the intertidal zone; found closest to the coastal fringe and thus only occurring in shallow depths.

Loam—a loose soil composed of a mixture of clay, silt, sand, and organic matter.

Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS)—presents information, required under Occupational Safety and Health Act standards, on a chemical's physical properties, health effects, and use precautions.

Medical Evacuation (MEDIVAC)—emergency services, typically aerial, designed to remove the wounded or severely ill to medical facilities.

Migration—repeated departure and return of individuals and their offspring to and from an area.

Military Operations Area (MOA)—an airspace assignment of defined vertical and lateral dimensions established outside positive control area to separate or segregate certain military activities.

Military Training Routes—airspace of defined vertical fixes and lateral dimensions established for the conduct of military flight training at air speeds in excess of 250 knots.

Mitigation—a method or action to reduce or eliminate adverse environmental impacts. Such measures may avoid impacts by not taking a certain action or parts of an action; minimize impacts by limiting the magnitude of an action; rectify impacts by restoration measures; reduce or eliminate impacts over time by preservation or maintenance measures during the action; or compensate for impacts by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)—as set by the Environmental Protection Agency under Section 109 of the Clean Air Act, nationwide standards for limiting concentrations of certain widespread airborne pollutants to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety (primary standards) and to protect public welfare, including plant and animal life, visibility and materials (secondary standards). Currently, six pollutants are regulated by primary and secondary NAAQS: carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide (see Criteria Pollutants).

National Register Eligible Property—property that has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places listing by the Secretary of the Interior, or one that has not yet gone through the formal eligibility determination process but which meets the National Register of Historic Places criteria for section review purposes; eligible properties are treated as if they were already listed.

National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)—the Federal inventory of known historic properties worthy of preservation. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior; its listings include buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts possessing historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance. Properties listed are not limited to those of national significance; most are significant primarily at the regional, state, or local level.

National Wildlife Refuge—a part of the national network of refuges and wetlands managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in order to provide, preserve, and restore lands and waters sufficient in size, diversity and location to meet society's needs for areas where the widest possible spectrum of benefits associated with wildlife and wildlands is enhanced and made available. This includes 504 wildlife refuges nationwide encompassing 92 million acres and ranging in size from one-half acre to thousands of square miles. Dedicated to protecting wildlife and their habitat, U.S. refuges encompass numerous ecosystems and are home to a wide variety of fauna, including large numbers of migratory birds and some 215 threatened or endangered species.

Native Vegetation—often referred to as indigenous, these are plants living or growing naturally in a given region without agricultural or cultivational efforts.

Nekton—animals that can swim freely in the ocean, such as fish, squid, and marine mammals. Most nektonic animals live near the sea surface (where food is plentiful), but many live in the deep ocean areas.

Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)—gases formed primarily by fuel combustion and which contribute to the formation of acid rain. In the presence of sunlight, hydrocarbons and NO_x combine to form ozone, a major constituent of photochemical smog.

Nitrogen Tetroxide—a dark brown, fuming liquid or gas with a pungent, acrid odor, utilized in rocket fuels.

Nonpoint Source Pollution—diffuse pollution; that is, from a combination of sources; typically originates from rain and melted snow flowing over the land (runoff). As runoff contacts the land's surface, it picks up many pollutants in its path: sediment, oil and grease, road salt, fertilizers, pesticides, nutrients, toxics, and other contaminants. Runoff

also originates from irrigation water used in agriculture and on landscapes. Other types of nonpoint pollution include changes to the natural flow of water in stream channels or wetlands.

Offshore Zone—the ocean area at a depth between 50 and 200 meters (164 and 656 feet) off the land masses.

Ordnance—military supplies including weapons, ammunition, combat vehicles, and maintenance equipment.

Otto Fuel—a torpedo fuel.

Ozone (O₃)—a highly reactive form of oxygen that is the predominant component of photochemical smog and an irritating agent to the respiratory system. Ozone is not emitted directly into the atmosphere but results from a series of chemical reactions between oxidant precursors (NO_x and VOCs) in the presence of sunlight.

Ozone Layer—a naturally occurring layer of ozone 11.3 to 48.3 kilometers (7 to 30 miles) above the earth's surface (in the stratosphere) which filters out the sun's harmful ultraviolet radiation. It is not affected by photochemical smog found in the lower atmosphere, nor is there any mixing between ground level ozone and ozone in the upper atmosphere.

Paleontological Resources—fossilized organic remains from past geological periods.

Particulate Matter, Fine Respirable—finely divided solids or liquids less than 10 microns in diameter which, when inhaled, remain lodged in the lungs and contribute to adverse health effects.

Particulate Matter, Total Suspended—finely divided solids or liquids ranging from about 0.1 to 50 microns in diameter which comprise the bulk of the particulate matter mass in the atmosphere.

Payload—any non-nuclear and possibly propulsive object or objects, weighing up to 272.2 kilograms (600 pounds), which are carried above the Strategic Target System third stage.

Pelagic Zone—commonly referred to as the open ocean.

Peninsula—a portion of land nearly surrounded by water and generally connected with a larger body by an isthmus, although the isthmus is not always well defined.

pH—a measure of the acidity or alkalinity of a solution, numerically equal to 7 for neutral solutions, increasing with increasing alkalinity and decreasing with increasing acidity.

Photic Zone—marine plants and plant-like organisms can live only in the sunlit surface waters of the ocean, which extends to only about 100 meters (330 feet) below the surface.

Photochemical Reactivity—chemical reactions initiated by sunlight.

Photosynthesis—the plant process by which water and carbon dioxide are used to manufacture energy-rich organic compounds in the presence of chlorophyll and energy from sunlight.

Physiography—geography dealing with the exterior physical features and changes of the earth (also known as physical geography).

Phytoplankton—plant-like organisms that drift with the ocean currents, with little ability to move through the water on their own. Predominately one-celled, phytoplankton float in the photic zone, where they obtain sunlight and nutrients, and serve as food for zooplankton and certain larger marine animals.

Plankton—free-floating, usually minute, organisms of the sea; includes larvae of benthic species.

Pliocene—of, relating to, or being the latest epoch of the Tertiary Period or the corresponding system of rocks; following the Pleistocene and prior to the Miocene.

PM-10—a standard for measuring the amount of solid or liquid matter suspended in the atmosphere, this refers to the amount of particulate matter less than or equal to 10 micrometers in diameter. The smaller PM-10 particles penetrate to the deeper portions of the lungs, affecting sensitive population groups such as children and people with respiratory or cardiac diseases.

Population Density—the average number of individuals, organisms, or units per unit of space or area.

Potable Water—water that is safe to drink.

Potential Hazardous Debris—inert debris impacting the earth with a kinetic energy equal to or greater than 11 foot-pounds.

Power Law—a mathematical function that equals the product of a constant and a power of the independent variable. For example, an 8-hour average concentration can be estimated from a 30-minute average or a 1-hour average concentration by using the power law relationship, $X=kt^{0.20}$. The method is more reliable for shorter than for longer time periods, and for continuous than for instantaneous sources.

Prehistoric—the period of time before written records and before Europeans entered an area.

Prime Agricultural Land—as identified by the Hawaii Department of Agriculture, land that has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops economically when treated and managed according to modern farming methods.

Remediation—all necessary actions to investigate and clean up any known or suspected discharge or threatened discharge of contaminants, including without limitation: preliminary assessment, site investigations, remedial investigations, remedial alternative analyses and remedial actions.

Restricted Area—airspace of defined dimensions, identified on the surface of the earth within which the flight or aircraft, while not wholly prohibited, is subject to restriction. Activities within these areas must be confined, because of their nature, or limitations imposed upon aircraft operations that are not part of these activities, or both. Restricted Areas denote the existence of unusual, often invisible, hazards to aircraft such as artillery firing, aerial gunnery, or guided missiles.

Ruderal Vegetation—weedy and commonly introduced flora growing where natural vegetational cover has been interrupted or disturbed by man.

Runoff—the portion of precipitation on land that ultimately reaches streams, often with dissolved or suspended materials.

Safety Easement—a recorded right of use by the United States over property of the State of Hawaii to limit exposure to safety hazards.

Safety Zone—water and shore areas that are designated, in accordance with U.S. Coast Guard regulations, as a limited access area when necessary for the protection of any vessel, structure, water, and shore area from a safety hazard. See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 33, Chapter I, Subchapter P, Part 165.

Saline—consisting of or containing salt.

Sampling—the selection of a portion of a study area or population, the analysis of which is intended to permit generalization of the entire population. In archaeology, samples are often used to reduce the amount of land area covered in a survey or the number of artifacts analyzed from a site. Statistical sampling is generally preferred since it is possible to specify the bias or probability of error in the results, but judgmental or intuitive samples are sometimes used.

Seamount—a peaked, underwater mountain that rises at least 1,000 meters (3,281 feet) above the ocean floor.

Seawall—a wall or embankment to protect the shore from erosion or to act as a breakwater.

Sensitive Receptor—an organism or population of organisms sensitive to alterations of some environmental factor (such as air quality or sound waves) that undergo specific effects when exposed to such alteration.

Shield Volcano—a broad, gently sloping volcanic cone of flat domicil shape, usually several tens of hundreds of square miles in extent, built chiefly of overlapping and interfingering basaltic lava flows.

Short-Term Public Exposure Guidance Level (SPEGL)—an acceptable concentration for unpredicted, single, short-term, emergency exposure of the general public, as published by the National Research Council.

Simulators—include radar emission simulating sets designed to simulate a radar threat, and by varying the signature (frequency, pulse width, pulse repetition interval, and scan type) of radars, can simulate up to 10 or so different radars.

Site—in archaeology, any location where human beings have altered the terrain or have discarded artifacts.

Soil Permeability—the capacity of a soil horizon to transmit air or water. Terms used to describe permeability include very slow, slow, moderately slow, moderate, moderately rapid, rapid, and very rapid.

Special Use Airspace—consists of several types of airspace used by the military to meet its particular needs. Special use airspace consists of that airspace wherein activities must be confined because of their nature, or wherein limitations are imposed upon aircraft operations that are not a part of these activities, or both. Special use airspace, except for Control Firing Areas, are chartered on instrument flight rules or visual flight rules charts and include hours of operation, altitudes, and the controlling agency.

Species—a taxonomic category ranking immediately below a genus and including closely related, morphologically similar individuals which actually or potentially interbreed.

Stormwater—runoff produced during storms, generally diverted by rain spouts and stormwater sewerage systems. Stormwater has the potential to be polluted by such sources as yard trimmings and pesticides. A stormwater outfall refers to the mouth of a drain or sewer that channels this runoff.

Stratosphere—the atmosphere between altitudes of approximately 10 kilometers (6.2 miles) at the poles or 15 kilometers (9.3 miles) at the equator to a height of 50 kilometers (31 miles).

Subsistence Economy—a community, usually based on farming and/or fishing, that provides all or most of the basic goods required by its members for survival, usually without any significant surplus for sale.

Subspecies—a geographically defined grouping of local populations which differs taxonomically from similar subdivisions of species.

Substratum—the part of the soil beneath the solum, the upper part of the soil profile in which the process of soil formation are active and living roots and other plant and animal life characteristic of the soil are largely confined.

Surface Collection—systematic mapping and removal of artifacts from a site by means not involving excavation.

Taking—to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shout, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct. Taking can involve harming the habitat of an endangered species.

Theater Missile Defense—Within the Department of Defense, the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) is responsible for managing, directing, and executing the Ballistic

Missile Defense (BMD) Program. The program focuses on three areas: Theater Missile Defense (TMD), National Missile Defense (NMD), and advanced ballistic missile defense technologies. TMD is the ability of the United States to defend its armed forces deployed abroad and its friends and allies against hostile missile attack in any theater of operations. In this context, a theater is a geographical area of military operations outside the United States. A theater missile is a ballistic missile (for example, a Scud-type missile), cruise missile, or air-to-surface guided missile launched and directed against a target location within a theater of operations.

Theater Ballistic Missile Defense (TBMD) is the Navy portion of the overall TMD program and is the ability of the U.S. Navy to defend U.S. forces deployed abroad, as well as U.S. friends and allies, against hostile missile attack.

Thermocline—a thin, narrow region in a thermally stratified body of water which separates warmer, oxygen-rich surface water from cold, oxygen-poor deep water and in which temperature decreases rapidly with depth. In tropical latitudes, the thermocline is present as a permanent feature and is located 200 to 1,000 feet (61 to 305 meters) below the surface.

Threatened Species—plant and wildlife species likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future.

Threshold Limit Value-Ceiling (TLV-C)—a guideline for occupational exposure to airborne substances that is published by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists. This concentration should not be exceeded during any part of the working exposure.

Threshold Limit Value-Time-Weighted Average (TLV-TWA)—a guideline for occupational exposure to airborne substances that is published by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists. It is the time-weighted average concentration for a normal 8-hour workday and a 40-hour workweek, to which nearly all workers may be repeatedly exposed, day after day, without adverse effect.

Trade Winds—winds blowing almost constantly in one direction. Especially a wind blowing almost continually from the equator from the northeast in the belt between the northern horse latitudes and the doldrums and from the southeast in the belt between the southern horse latitudes and the doldrums.

Trench—a narrow, steep-sided underwater canyon associated with the abyssal sea floor region.

Tropopause—the region at the top of the troposphere, the lowest, densest part of the earth's atmosphere in which most weather changes occur, and which separates it from the stratosphere above.

Troposphere—the atmosphere from ground level to an altitude of 10 to 15 kilometers (6.2 to 9.3 miles) (see stratosphere).

Tsunami—a great sea wave produced by a submarine earthquake or volcanic eruption. Commonly misnamed tidal wave.

Ultraviolet (UV) Radiation—a portion of the electromagnetic spectrum with wavelengths shorter than those of visible light and longer than those of X-rays.

Uncontrolled Airspace—airspace of defined dimensions in which no air traffic control services to either instrument flight rules or visual flight rules aircraft will be provided, other than possible traffic advisories when the air traffic control workload permits and radio communications can be established.

Understory—a vegetal layer growing near the ground and beneath the canopy of a taller layer.

Unique and Sensitive Habitats—areas of special importance to regional wildlife populations or protected species that have other important biological characteristics (for example, wintering habitats, nesting areas, and wetlands).

Unsymmetrical Dimethyl Hydrazine (UDMH) —a liquid hypergolic propellant utilized as a missile fuel (as in the Lance); clear and colorless, UDMH has a sharp ammonia-like or fishy odor, is toxic when inhaled, absorbed through the skin, or taken internally. It is dissolvable in water, but not sensitive to shock or friction; however, when in contact with IRFNA, or any other oxidizing material, spontaneous ignition occurs. In addition, UDMH vapors greater than 2 percent in air can be detonated by electric spark or open flame.

Upwelling—the replenishing process of upward movement to the surface of marine often nutrient-rich lower waters (a boon to plankton growth), especially along some shores due to the offshore drift of surface water as from the action of winds and the Coriolis force.

Viewshed—Total area seen within the cone of vision from a single observer position, or vantage point; a collection of viewpoints with optimal linear paths of visibility.

Visual Flight Rules (VFR)—rules that govern the procedures for conducting flight under visual conditions; they are used by pilots and controllers to indicate type of flight plan.

Visual Sensitivity—the degree of the public interest in a visual resource and concern over adverse changes to its quality. Visual sensitivity exists in areas where views are rare, unique, or in other ways special, such as remote or pristine environments.

Volatile Organic Compound (VOC)—one of a group of chemicals that react in the atmosphere with nitrogen oxides in the presence of heat and sunlight to form ozone; it does not include methane and other compounds determined by the Environmental Protection Agency to have negligible photochemical reactivity. Examples of volatile organic compounds include gasoline fumes and oil-based paints.

Warning Area—airspace of defined dimensions that may contain hazards to non-participating aircraft in international airspace. Though the activities conducted within Warning Areas may be as hazardous as those in Restricted Areas, Warning Areas cannot be legally designated as Restricted Areas because they are over international waters.

Water Table—the highest part of the soil or underlying rock material that is wholly saturated with water.

Wetlands—lands or areas that either contain much soil moisture or are inundated by surface or groundwater with a frequency sufficient to support a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include such areas as bogs, marshes, mud and tidal flats, sloughs, river overflows, seeps, springs, or swamps.

Yearly Average Day-Night Sound Level (LDN)—utilized in evaluating long-term environmental impacts from noise, this is an annual mean of the day-night sound level.

Zooplankton—animals that drift with the ocean currents, with little ability to move through the water on their own, ranging from one-celled organisms to jellyfish up to 1.8 meters (6 feet) wide. Zooplankton live in both surface and deep waters of the ocean; crustaceans make up about 70 percent. While some float about freely throughout their lives, many spend only the early part of their lives as plankton.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

7.0 Consultation Comments and Responses (Scoping)

7.0 CONSULTATION COMMENTS AND RESPONSES (SCOPING)

The Notice of Intent to prepare the *Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Enhancing the Capability of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, HI* to conduct missile defense testing and training activities was published in *The Environmental Notice* by the Office of Environmental Quality Control and in the *Federal Register* on 23 May 1997. Publication of the *Preparation Notice (PN) for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility EIS* began the comment period for the EIS. Agencies listed below were sent a copy of the EIS PN for review. Agencies and organizations commenting on the EIS PN or scoping issues are denoted by an asterisk next to their names. Copies of letters from agencies, etc. are provided in the end portion of this chapter, in a numerical arrangement. Refer to table 7-1 for an index of comment letters and their corresponding page number.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, BMDO/D, Lt. General Lester L. Lyles
Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Army, Environmental, Safety, and Occupational Health,
Mr. Raymond Fatz
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Environmental, Safety, and Occupational Health,
Mr. Thomas W. L. McCall, Jr. (SAF/MIQ)
Environmental Protection Agency, Pacific Islands Contact Office, Manager
Federal Aviation Administration, Environmental Office (ATA-300), Air Traffic Environmental
Program Division, Mr. Bill Marx
Hawaii Representative Neil Abercrombie
Hawaii Representative Patsy Mink
Hawaii Senator Daniel Akaka
Hawaii Senator Daniel Inouye
Headquarters U.S. Army Pacific
Naval Base Pearl Harbor, Commander
President's Council on Environmental Quality
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division, Commander and Division Engineer
U.S. Army Garrison, Director of Public Works, Environmental Division, Fort Shafter
U.S. Coast Guard, 14th Coast Guard District, Commander
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources, Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, State Conservationist
U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office, Manager, Mr. Bruce Twining
U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office, Ms. Susan Lacy
U.S. Department of Energy, Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs, Mr. Victor Reis
U.S. Department of Energy, Environment, Safety, and Health, Ms. Tara O'Tool

- U.S. Department of Energy, Kirtland Area Office, Acting Area Manager, Mr. Michael Zamorski
- U.S. Department of State
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, District Chief
- * U.S. Department of the Interior, Water Resources Division, Mr. William Meyer
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of the Environmental Policy, Mr. Willie R. Taylor
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Pacific Islands Administrator
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Pacific Islands EcoRegion Manager, Mr. Robert Smith
- U.S. Department of the Navy, Judge Advocate General
- U.S. Department of the Navy, Office of Director of Installations and Facilities
- U.S. Department of the Navy, Office of the Chief of Information, PublicAffairs, RADM Kendall Pease
- * U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Island EcoRegion, Mr. Brooks Harper
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Refuges
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Endangered Species
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Area Office
- * U.S. Marine Mammal Commission, Mr. John Twiss
- United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, Regional Administrator

STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

- Governor Benjamin Cayetano
- * Hawaii Department of Accounting and General Services, Mr. GordonMatsouka
- * Hawaii Department of Agriculture, Director
- * Hawaii Department of Budget and Finance, Housing Finance and Development Corporation, Executive Director
- Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Director
- Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Energy Division
- Hawaii Department of Business and Economic Development, State Energy Office, Division Head
- * Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, State Planning Office
- Hawaii Department of Defense, Civil Defense Division
- Hawaii Department of Defense, Director
- Hawaii Department of Education, Superintendent of Education
- Hawaii Department of Finance, Real Property Assessment Division
- Hawaii Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
- Hawaii Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, Hawaiian Homes Commission, Chairman
- Hawaii Department of Health, Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste
- * Hawaii Department of Health, Environmental Health Administration
- Hawaii Department of Health, Environmental Management Division

- * Hawaii Department of Health, Office of Environmental Quality Control, Mr. Gary Gill
Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Director
- * Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Aquatic Resources
Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Forestry and Wildlife
Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Forestry and Wildlife, Mr. David G. Smith
Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of State Parks
- * Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Land Division, Mr. Dean Y. Uchida
- * Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Officer
Hawaii Department of the Attorney General, Mr. John Anderson
- * Hawaii Department of Transportation, Director
Health Department, Director
Legislative Reference Bureau
- * Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Administrator
Office of State Planning, Mr. John Nakagawa
State Archives, State Archivist
University of Hawaii, Environmental Center, Director
University of Hawaii, Water Resources Research Center, Director
University of Hawaii, Marine Option Program, Director

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

- * City and County of Honolulu, Planning Department, Mr. Patrick Onishi
City and County of Honolulu, Council Members
City and County of Honolulu, Department of General Planning, Chief Planning Officer
City and County of Honolulu, Department of Land Utilization, Director
City and County of Honolulu, Office of the Mayor, Mayor Jeremy Harris
County of Kauai, Department of Public Works
County of Kauai, Planning Department
County of Kauai, Office of Economic Development
County of Kauai, Council Members
County of Kauai, Office of the Mayor, Mayor Maryanne Kusaka
- * Kauai Economic Development Board, Mr. Gary Baldwin

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND PRIVATE CITIZENS

- Alu Like, Haunani Apoliona
Citizens Utilities, Kauai Electric Division, Kauai Electric Public and Media Relations
Earthtrust
Hawaiian Electric Company
- * Albertini, James, Center for Non-Violent Education and Action, Inc.
- * Alexander, David
- * Antolini, Denise, University of Hawaii at Manoa, William S. Richardson School of Law

- * Aoki, Jean, League of Women Voters of Hawaii
- * Ashkenazy, Janet
- * Bain, Carol
- * Beardmore, Carol
- * Bohn, Jim
- * Bostick, Carmen
- * Bottasso, Michael S
- * Brandauer, Carl
- * Burns, Gayla
- * Bushnell, Andy
- * Carlson, Ken
- * Carroll, William, DyKema Gossett Law Offices
- * Chang, Deborah
- * Chanley, Beverley
- * Cherry, Corbin
- * Coan, F M
- * Coker, Joseph
- * Conant, Sheila, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of Zoology
- * Dalton, Judy, Kauai Group of the Hawaii Chapter Sierra Club
- * Deibel, Tashi
- * DiPalma, Carl
- * Evenhuis, Neal, Bishop Museum
- * Forsyth, Mimi
- * Francis, Laurel
- * Frankel, David Kimo, Hawaii Chapter Sierra Club
- * Freeman, Elizabeth Anne
- * Freeman, Robert and Margery
- * Georgi, William
- * Gibbons, Karen
- * Goldsberry, Paula
- * Haia III, Moses K.N., Native Hawaiian Advisory Council, Inc.
- * Helela, David
- * Henriques, Eugene
- * Holzman, Greg
- * Hopman, Arius
- * Inouye, Robert
- * Jones, Michael, University of Hawaii at Manoa
- * Kaiwe, Belle
- * Kajihiro, Kyle, American Friends Service Committee, Hawaii Area Program Office
- * Kalal, K
- * Kalakapu, Elvin
- * Kelly, Marion, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Ethnic Studies Department
- * Kirby, Richard
- * Lemke, Paul
- * Libre, Rhoda
- * Licht, Andy
- * Lovell White, Emmaline

- * Lyon, Bert
- * Manini, Sr, Joseph Punilei
- * Marinelli, Suzanne
- * McClaran, Peter
- * Mills, Joyce
- * Mori, Val and Art
- * Moritsugu, Ilona
- * Moser, Steven, Hawaii Medical Association
- * Nekomoto, Doris
- * Nekomoto, Trudi
- * Noonan, Mary E
- * Odonnell, Mary Carol
- * Oliver, Kathy
- * Ota, Michelle
- Paben, Brett, National Audubon Society
- * Parks, A F, League of Women Voters
- * Peetz, Ilse
- * Pollock, Marilyn
- * Queiroz, Cely M
- * Randol, Liz
- * Santos, D K
- * Shook, Dan
- * Spangler, MD, John S, Hawaii Medical Association
- * Spencer, Sally
- * Stepath, Carl
- * Sussex, Clyde
- * Taylor, Gabriela
- * Teale, Laulani
- * Vaughn, Bradley
- * Vincenty, Melissa
- * Woodyard, E

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 7-1: Index of Original Comment Letters and Comment Response Letters

Commentor	Page
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES	
Harper, Brooks, United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service	
Letter, 19 June 1997.....	7-17
Response.....	7-18
Harper, Brooks, United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-18
Response.....	7-21
Meyer, William, U.S. Department of the Interior, Water Resources Division	
Letter, 29 May 1997.....	7-22
Response.....	7-23
Twiss, John R, Marine Mammal Commission	
Letter, 29 July 1997.....	7-23
Response.....	7-29
STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES	
Anderson, Bruce, State of Hawaii Department of Health	
Letter, 16 July 1997.....	7-32
Response.....	7-33
Devick, William, State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Aquatic Resources	
Letter, 20 June 1997.....	7-34
Response.....	7-39
Egged, Rick, State of Hawaii Department of Business Economic Development and Tourism, Office of Planning	
Letter, Date.....	7-40
Response.....	7-41
Gill, Gary, State of Hawaii, Office Environmental Quality Control	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-42
Response.....	7-43
Hayashida, Kazu, State of Hawaii Department of Transportation	
Letter, 2 June 1997.....	7-45
Response.....	7-45

Matsuoka, Gordan, State of Hawaii Department of Accounting and General Services	
Letter, 18 June 1997.....	7-46
Response.....	7-46
Nakatani, James, State of Hawaii Department of Agriculture	
Letter, 10 June 1997.....	7-47
Response.....	7-48
Oshiro, Roy S, State of Hawaii Housing, Finance and Development Corporation	
Letter, 2 June 1997.....	7-48
Response.....	7-49
Ross, Martha, State of Hawaii Office of Hawaiian Affairs	
Letter, 10 June 1997.....	7-49
Response.....	7-50
Uchida, Dean Y, State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Land Division	
Letter, 1 July 1997.....	7-51
Response.....	7-53
Wilson, Michael, State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation District	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-53
Response.....	7-54

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Baldwin, Gary, Kauai Economic Development Board	
Letter, 21 July 1997.....	7-56
Response	7-57
Onishi, Patrick T, City and County of Honolulu, Department of Planning	
Letter, 8 July 1997.....	7-58
Response.....	7-59

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND PRIVATE CITIZENS

Albertini, James, Center for Non-Violent Education and Action, Inc.	
Letter, 22 July 1997.....	7-211
Response.....	7-212
Alexander, David	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-71
Response.....	7-72

Antolini, Denise, University of Hawaii at Manoa, William S. Richardson School of Law	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-165
Response.....	7-166
Aoki, Jean, League of Women Voters of Hawaii	
Letter, 3 July 1997.....	7-192
Response.....	7-194
Apisa, Donna	
Letter, 60 June 1997.....	7-107
Response.....	7-108
Ashkenazy, Janet	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-113
Response.....	7-114
Bain, Carol	
Letter, 21 June 1997.....	7-131
Response.....	7-132
Bain, Carol	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-172
Response.....	7-173
Beardmore, Carol	
Letter, 28 July 1997.....	7-223
Response.....	7-224
Bohn, Jim	
Letter, 26 July 1997.....	7-219
Response.....	7-220
Bostick, Carmen	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-69
Response.....	7-70
Bottasso, Michael S	
Letter, 21 July 1997.....	7-208
Response.....	7-209
Brandauer, Carl	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-191
Response.....	7-191
Burns, Gayla	
Letter, No Date.....	7-187
Response.....	7-187

Bushnell, Andy	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-127
Response.....	7-127
Carlson, Ken	
Letter, 20 June 1997.....	7-174
Response.....	7-175
Carroll, William, DyKema Gossett Law Offices	
Letter, 30 May 1997.....	7-59
Response.....	7-60
Chang, Deborah	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-77
Response.....	7-78
Chanley, Beverley	
Letter, 27 May 1997.....	7-196
Response.....	7-198
Cherry, Corbin	
Letter, 27 May 1997.....	7-198
Response.....	7-200
Coan, F M	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-66
Response.....	7-67
Coker, Joseph	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-115
Response.....	7-115
Conant, Sheila, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of Zoology	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-143
Response.....	7-145
Dalton, Judy, Kauai Group of the Hawaii Chapter Sierra Club	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-161
Response.....	7-162
Deibel, Tashi	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-103
Response.....	7-103
DiPalma, Carl	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-102
Response.....	7-102

Evenhuis, Neal, Bishop Museum	
Letter, 18 June 1997.....	7-137
Response.....	7-137
Forsyth, Mimi	
Letter, 28 July 1997.....	7-216
Response.....	7-217
Francis, Laurel	
Letter, 17 June 1997.....	7-75
Response.....	7-76
Frankel, David Kimo, Hawaii Chapter Sierra Club	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-150
Response.....	7-151
Freeman, Elizabeth Anne	
Letter, 31 July 1997.....	7-226
Response.....	7-233
Freeman, Robert and Margery	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-168
Response.....	7-169
Georgi, William	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-134
Response.....	7-136
Gibbons, Karen	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-105
Response.....	7-106
Goldsberry, Paula	
Letter, 23 July 1997.....	7-213
Response.....	7-213
Haia III, Moses K.N., Native Hawaiian Advisory Council, Inc.	
Letter, 24 June 1997.....	7-181
Response.....	7-184
Helela, David	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-125
Response.....	7-126
Henriques, Eugene	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-70
Response.....	7-71

Holzman, Greg	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-171
Response.....	7-171
Hopman, Arius	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-83
Response.....	7-85
Inouye, Robert	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-80
Response.....	7-81
Jones, Michael, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of Physics and Astronomy	
Letter, 19 June 1997.....	7-138
Response.....	7-139
Jones, Michael, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of Physics and Astronomy	
Letter, 24 June 1997.....	7-188
Response.....	7-190
Jones, Michael, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of Physics and Astronomy	
Letter, 16 June 1997.....	7-110
Response.....	7-111
Kaiwe, Belle	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-93
Response.....	7-98
Kajihiro, Kyle, American Friends Service Committee, Hawaii Area Program Office	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-140
Response.....	7-141
Kalal, K	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-67
Response.....	7-68
Kalakapu, Elvin	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-88
Response.....	7-89
Kelly, Marion, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Ethnic Studies Department	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-155
Response.....	7-157

Kirby, Richard	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-195
Response.....	7-195
Lemke, Paul	
Letter, 20 June 1997.....	7-129
Response.....	7-130
Libre, Rhoda	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-73
Response.....	7-73
Licht, Andy	
Letter, 24 July 1997.....	7-222
Response.....	7-223
Lovell White, Emmaline	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-123
Response.....	7-123
Lyon, Bert	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-128
Response.....	7-128
Manini, Sr, Joseph Punilei	
Letter, 5 July 1997.....	7-177
Response.....	7-179
Marinelli, Suzanne	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-146
Response.....	7-148
McClaran, Peter	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-74
Response.....	7-74
Mills, Joyce	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-86
Response.....	7-87
Mori, Val and Art	
Letter, 4 June 1997.....	7-63
Response.....	7-64
Moritsugu, Ilona	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-99
Response.....	7-100

Moser, Steven, Hawaii Medical Association	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-179
Response.....	7-180
Nekomoto, Doris	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-79
Response.....	7-80
Nekomoto, Trudi	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-124
Response.....	7-124
Noonan, Mary E	
Letter, 30 July 1997.....	7-214
Response.....	7-215
Odonnell, Mary Carol	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-118
Response.....	7-122
Oliver, Kathy	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-104
Response.....	7-105
Ota, Michelle	
Letter, 25 July 1997.....	7-221
Response.....	7-221
Parks, A F, League of Women Voters	
Letter, 3 July 1997.....	7-206
Response.....	7-207
Peetz, Ilse	
Letter, 13 June 1997.....	7-64
Response.....	7-65
Pollock, Marilyn	
Letter, 21 June 1997.....	7-170
Response.....	7-170
Queiroz, Cely M	
Letter, 25 July 1997.....	7-218
Response.....	7-218
Randol, Liz	
Letter, 19 June 1997.....	7-91
Response.....	7-92

Randol, Liz	
Letter, 13 August 1997.....	7-235
Response.....	7-237
Santos, D K	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-163
Response.....	7-164
Shook, Dan	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-101
Response.....	7-101
Spangler, MD, John S, Hawaii Medical Association	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-204
Response.....	7-205
Spencer, Sally	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-90
Response.....	7-90
Stepath, Carl	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-108
Response.....	7-109
Sussex, Clyde	
Letter, 30 July 1997.....	7-234
Response.....	7-235
Taylor, Gabriela	
Letter, 22 July 1997.....	7-210
Response.....	7-210
Teale, Laulani	
Letter, No Date.....	7-153
Response.....	7-154
Teale, Laulani	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-159
Response.....	7-160
Vaughn, Bradley	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-81
Response.....	7-82
Vincenty, Melissa	
Letter, 23 June 1997.....	7-201
Response.....	7-202

Woodyard, E	
Letter, 30 June 1997.....	7-116
Response.....	7-117
Woodyard, E	
Letter, 19 June 1997.....	7-175
Response.....	7-176
Woodyard, E	
Letter, 2 June 1997.....	7-60
Response.....	7-62



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Pacific Islands Ecoregion
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3108
Box 50088
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

JUN 19 1997

In Reply Refer To: MEM

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, HI 96752-0128

Re: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii

Dear Ms. Mossman:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Preparation Notice (PN) for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF), Kauai, Hawaii. The EIS/PN was prepared by the PMRF for the Hawaii State Department of Land and Natural Resources. The Service offers the following comments for your consideration.

Proposed State of Hawaii actions include the continuation of existing activities at the PMRF and the upgrading of existing radar, telemetry, optics, electronic warfare, and other instrumentation and communications facilities. Construction and operation of additional target and interceptor launch sites, and sensor and instrumentation facilities that would enhance the capability of the PMRF are also included. This potentially involves the use of certain lands not currently used by the Department of Defense (DOD) and may require a revision to the existing restrictive easement granted by the State of Hawaii to the U.S. Navy for land adjacent to the PMRF. State areas being considered for the launch and/or instrumentation sites are located on Kauai, Niihau, and Kure Atoll.

The proposed State of Hawaii actions are part of a broader U.S. Navy proposal to enhance PMRF capabilities to accommodate Theater Ballistic Missile Defense system testing and training and related DOD Theater Missile Defense testing. This broader Federal proposal involves the use of other Pacific sites under U.S. jurisdiction. Environmental impacts anticipated from both the State and Federal proposed actions will be completely documented and assessed in a single Federal EIS pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Accordingly, the Service will provide comments on the proposed actions based on our review of the Federal EIS.

EIS/PN for State of Hawaii Actions
Related to Enhancing PMRF Capabilities
Kauai, Hawaii

The Service appreciates the opportunity to comment on the EIS/PN. If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact Fish and Wildlife Biologist Michael Molina by telephone at (808) 541-3441 or by facsimile transmission at (808) 541-3441.

Sincerely,

Donald B. ...
for Brooks Harper
Field Supervisor
Ecological Services

cc: NMFS-PAO, Honolulu
EPA-Region IX, San Francisco
DLNR, Hawaii
DAR, Hawaii
DOFAW, Hawaii
CZMP, Hawaii
CWB, Hawaii
OEQC, Hawaii



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0273
12 March 1998

Mr Brooks Harper
Fish and Wildlife Service
United States Department of the Interior
300 Ala Moana Blvd Room 3108 Box 50088
Honolulu, HI 96850

Dear Mr Harper:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: The Service will provide comments on the proposed actions based on our review of the Federal EIS.

The Service appreciates the opportunity to comment on the EIS/PN.

Response 1: We are submitting a separate letter to initiate the Section 7 consultation.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Pacific Islands Ecoregion
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3108
Box 50088
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

In Reply Refer To: MEM

JUN 23 1998

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, HI 96752-0128

Re: Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Enhancement of the Capability of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii, to Conduct Missile Defense Testing and Training Activities

Dear Ms. Mossman:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Enhancement of the Capability of the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF), Kauai, Hawaii, to Conduct Missile Defense Testing and Training Activities. The EIS is being prepared by the Department of the Navy in response to Senate Report 103-321 and House Report 103-747 of the 1995 Defense Appropriations Bill. This letter has been prepared under the authority of and in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 [42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*; 83 Stat. 852], as amended, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934 [16 U.S.C. 661 *et seq.*; 48 Stat. 401], as amended, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [16 USC 1531 *et seq.*; 87 Stat. 884], as amended, and other authorities mandating Department of the Interior concern for environmental values. Based on these authorities, the Service offers the following comments for your consideration.

The primary objective of the proposed action is to enhance the PMRF's capability to perform testing and training for the Navy's Theater Ballistic Missile Defense (TBMD) program and the overall Department of Defense (DoD) Theater Missile Defense (TMD) program. Based on information presented in the NOI and in the State of Hawaii EIS Preparation Notice for the proposed action, capability enhancement will include (1) upgrading existing radar, telemetry, optics, electronic warfare, and other instrumentation and communication facilities and (2) constructing and operating additional target and interceptor launch sites and sensor and instrumentation facilities at remote sites. The launch sites will include those for over-the-horizon launches of multiple targets from different directions into PMRF areas of operation. The remote instrumentation sites will include the

NOI to Prepare an EIS
Enhancement of PMRF for TBMD and TMD Activities
Hawaiian Archipelago and Central Pacific Islands

cooperative linking of shipboard, airborne, and land-based facilities. The proposed action includes the use of certain lands currently not used by the DoD, revision of and extension to the existing restrictive easement with the State of Hawaii for land adjacent to the PMRF, and revision of a lease for other State land on Kauai at Kamokala Caves. Pacific-island areas being considered for launch and/or instrumentation sites include Kauai, Niihau, Tern Island, Midway Atoll, Kure Atoll, Wake Atoll, Johnston Atoll, and U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll (USAKA).

The Service recommends that the Draft EIS address TBMD and TMD program-related impacts to fish and wildlife species and habitats associated with each area being considered for use as a launch, instrumentation, and/or training site, including those of forests, cliffs, caves, grasslands, shrublands, wetlands, streams, lakes, sand dunes, beaches, and adjacent coral reefs. The Service recommends that particular attention be given in the Draft EIS to addressing impacts on endangered and threatened species, migratory fishes and birds, and rare, native species. Specifically, the Service recommends that the Draft EIS assess the impacts from (1) site preparation and installation of infrastructure, (2) actual program testing and training operations, (3) increased numbers of personnel, and (4) increased air, land, and ship traffic.

Site preparation and construction of facilities and roadways should be assessed with respect to their potentials to damage native plants, vertebrates, and invertebrates, especially due to the use of heavy equipment or motorized vehicles. Collision hazards posed to flying birds by program-related structures should be assessed. Operations such as positioning and launching of missiles should be assessed with reference to the effects of toxic emissions, flames, and noise levels on all flora and fauna. Risk of hazardous material release on land and in water and the effects of radiation on biota from all tracking devices should be assessed. The potential for wildlife disturbance, environmental pollution, and alien species introduction as a result of increases in personnel numbers should be assessed. The effects of increased traffic should be assessed with respect to bird air-strike risk, hazards of motorized vehicles to ground-nesting species, and general biota disturbance levels, especially at seldom-visited, remote locations such as Tern Island. Damage to live corals and marine habitats from physical destruction, sedimentation, resuspension of contaminated sediments, and oil spills should be assessed.

The migratory birds that should be addressed in the Draft EIS are identified in Enclosure 1. These include 21 species of seabirds and seven species of shorebirds. In particular, the Draft EIS should address the potential impacts of the proposed action on seabird nesting colonies and identify specific measures to avoid or minimize these impacts.

Native, terrestrial and marine species of animals and plants should also be addressed in the Draft EIS. Enclosures 2 (animals) and 3 (plants) present lists of the species that are either proposed or

NOI to Prepare an EIS
Enhancement of PMRF for TBMD and TMD Activities
Hawaiian Archipelago and Central Pacific Islands

candidate for federal listing or are considered by the Service to be Species of Concern and which are known to occur at Kauai, Niihau, and Tern (French Frigate Shoals) islands and Midway and Kure atolls. These include one species of fish, six species of birds, an abundant and diverse array of invertebrate species, and 122 species of plants. The Service has not determined the presence of any Species of Concern at Wake and Johnston atolls. Enclosure 4 provides a list of the species designated as being of special concern by the U.S. Government at USAKA.

With regard to federally listed endangered and threatened species, the Service recommends that a biological assessment (BA) that (1) evaluates the impacts of the proposed action on listed species and (2) determines whether any such species are likely to be adversely affected by the proposed action be prepared in accordance with the interagency consultation regulations found at 50 CFR Part 402 (Enclosure 5). The information provided in the BA should be comprehensive enough to support any determination the Department of Defense makes regarding the effects of specific TBMD and TMD testing and training activities on threatened or endangered species. Federally listed vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant species that should be addressed in the BA for the proposed action area islands and atolls within the Hawaiian archipelago are identified in Enclosures 2 and 3. No federally listed species under Service jurisdiction are known to occur at Wake and Johnston atolls and USAKA.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) should be contacted regarding the potential for the proposed action to adversely impact federally listed species under NMFS jurisdiction. In order to facilitate early resolution of any potential conflicts between the proposed activities and endangered and threatened species, we recommend that interagency consultation with the Service and the NMFS in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act be completed prior to issuance of the Draft EIS.

A major concern of the Service with regard to the proposed action is the possible introduction of alien species into the areas being considered for use as launching, instrumentation, and/or training sites. Introduced species represent a major threat to the perpetuation of native plants and animals. The Draft EIS should include a detailed discussion of how the prevention of alien species introductions will be accomplished within each proposed testing and training area under consideration. The Service recommends that the PMRF continue to coordinate with the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources (DAR), and Hawaii Division of Forestry and Wildlife (DOFAW) regarding the prevention of alien species introductions and potential program-related impacts to all species and habitats within the State of Hawaii.

NOI to Prepare an EIS
 Enhancement of PMRF for TBMD and TMD Activities
 Hawaiian Archipelago and Central Pacific Islands

Finally, the Service is deeply concerned that the proposed action represents a serious potential threat to several of the small, fragile islands within the Hawaii and Pacific Islands National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) Complex that are densely populated with wildlife and support entire breeding populations of Federal trust species. Refuges that would be affected by the proposed action include the Hawaiian Islands NWR, Midway Atoll NWR, and Johnston Atoll NWR. Based on the limited information currently available on the proposed action, it appears unlikely that launching missiles and establishing tracking instrumentation sites within NWRs would be found compatible with the objectives of refuge maintenance under the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act of 1966, as amended.

The Service appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the NOI. If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact Fish and Wildlife Biologist Michael Molina by telephone at (808) 541-3441 or by facsimile transmission at (808) 541-3470.

Sincerely,


 for Brooks Harper
 Field Supervisor
 Ecological Services

Enclosures

cc (without enclosures):

NMFS-PAO, Honolulu
 EPA-Region IX, San Francisco
 USAKA
 DLNR, Hawaii
 DAR, Hawaii
 DOFAW, Hawaii
 CZMP, Hawaii
 CWB, Hawaii
 OEQC, Hawaii

Summary of Enclosures from Brooks Harper, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Comment S-W-0069

1. *Migratory seabirds and shorebirds within the proposed action areas for enhancing the capability of the Pacific Missile Range Facility as of June 1997.*
2. *Hawaiian Islands Animals: Updated May 19, 1997; Listed and Candidate Species, as designated under the U.S. Endangered Species Act.*
3. *Hawaiian Islands Plants: Updated May 19, 1996; Listed and Candidate Species, as designated under the U.S. Endangered Species Act*
4. *Species Protected under U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1975 within U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands*
5. *Part 402—Interagency Cooperation—Endangered Species Act of 1973, as Amended*



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Scr 00/0274
 12 March 1998

Mr Brooks Harper
 Fish and Wildlife Service
 United States Department of the Interior
 300 Ala Moana Blvd Room 3108 Box 50088
 Honolulu, HI 96850

Dear Mr Harper:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1:** The Service recommends that the Draft EIS address the TBMD and TMD program-related impacts to fish and wildlife species and habitats associated with each area being considered for use as a launch, instrumentation, and/or training site, including those of forests, cliffs, caves, grasslands, shrublands, wetlands, streams, lakes, sand dunes, beaches and adjacent coral reefs. The Service recommends that particular attention be given in the Draft EIS to addressing impacts on endangered and threatened species, migratory fishes and birds, and rare, native species. Specifically, the Service recommends that the Draft EIS assess the impacts from (1) site preparation and installation of infrastructure, (2) actual program testing and training operations, (3) increased numbers of personnel, and (4) increased air, land, and ship traffic.
- Response 1:** Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 2:** Site preparation and construction of facilities and roadways should be assessed with respect to their potentials to damage native plants, vertebrates, and invertebrates, especially due to the use of heavy equipment or motorized vehicles. Collision hazards posed to flying birds by program-related structures should be assessed. Operations such as positioning and launching of missiles should be assessed with reference to the effects of toxic emissions, flames, and noise levels on all flora and fauna. Risk of hazardous material release on land and in water and the effects of radiation on biota from all tracking devices should be assessed. The potential for wildlife disturbance, environmental pollution, and alien species introduction as a result of increases of personnel should be assessed. The effects of increased traffic should be assessed with respect to bird air-strike risk, hazards of motorized vehicles to ground-nesting species, and general biota disturbance levels, especially at seldom-visited, remote locations such as Tern Island. Damage to live corals and marine habitats from physical destruction, sedimentation, resuspension of contaminated sediments, and oil spills should be assessed. The migratory birds that should be addressed in the Draft EIS are identified in Enclosure 1. These include 21 species of seabirds and seven species of shorebirds. In particular, the Draft EIS should address the potential impacts of the proposed action on seabird nesting colonies and identify specific measures to avoid or minimize these impacts. Native, terrestrial and marine species of animals and plants should also be addressed in the Draft

EIS. Enclosures 2 (animals) and 3 (plants) present lists of the species that are either proposed or candidate for federal listing or are considered by the Service to be Species of Concern and which are known to occur at Kauai, Niihau, Tern (French Frigate Shoals) islands and Midway and Kure atolls. These include one species of fish, six species of birds, an abundant and diverse array of invertebrate species, and 122 species of plants. The Service has not determined the presence of any Species of Concern at Wake and Johnston atolls. Enclosure 4 provides a list of the species designated as being of special concern by the US Government at USAKA. With regard to federally listed endangered and threatened species, the Service recommends that a biological assessment (BA) that (1) evaluates the impacts of the proposed action on listed species and (2) determines whether any such species are likely to be adversely affected by the proposed action be prepared in accordance with the interagency consultation regulations found at 50 CFR Part 402 (Enclosure 5). The information provided in the BA should be comprehensive enough to support any determination the Department of Defense makes regarding the effects of specific TBMD and TMD testing and training activities on threatened or endangered species. Federally listed vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant species that should be addressed in the BA for the proposed action a real islands and atolls within the Hawaiian archipelago are identified in Enclosures 2 and 3. No federally listed species under Service jurisdiction are known to occur at Wake and Johnston atolls and USAKA.


- Response 2:** Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 3:** The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) should be contacted regarding the potential for the proposed action to adversely impact federally listed species under NMFS jurisdiction. In order to facilitate early resolution of any potential conflicts between the proposed activities and endangered and threatened species, we recommend that interagency consultation with the Service and the NMFS in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act be completed prior to issuance of the Draft EIS.
- Response 3:** The Navy has entered into consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service on a continuing basis in the preparation of this Draft EIS. Section 7 consultation will be initiated with transmittal of the Draft EIS.
- Comment 4:** A major concern of the Service with regard to the proposed action is the possible introduction of alien species into the areas being considered for use as launching, instrumentation, and/or training sites. Introduced species represent a major threat to the perpetuation of native plants and animals. The Draft EIS should include a detailed discussion of how the prevention of alien species introductions will be accomplished within each proposed testing and training area under Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), Hawaii Division of Aquatic Resources (DAR), and Hawaii Division of Forest and Wildlife (DOFAW) regarding the prevention of alien species introductions and potential program-related impacts to all species and habitats within the State of Hawaii.
- Response 4:** Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 5:** Finally, the Service is deeply concerned that the proposed action represents a serious threat to several of the small, fragile islands within the Hawaii and Pacific Islands National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) Complex that are densely populated with wildlife and support entire breeding populations of Federal trust species. Refuges that would be affected by the proposed action include the Hawaiian Island NWR, Midway Atoll NWR, and Johnston Atoll NWR. Based on the limited information currently available on the proposed action, it appears unlikely that launching missiles and establishing tracking instrumentation sites within NWR's would be found compatible with the objectives of refuge maintenance under the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act

of 1996, as amended.

Response 5: We believe some or all of the proposed activities would be compatible with the purposes of the refuges. However, we recognize the role of the USFWS in making a compatibility determination. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained with this EIS when it is determined that construction and operation would be required on Tern Island.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



United States Department of the Interior

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

WATER RESOURCES DIVISION
677 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 415
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

May 29, 1997

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, HI 96752-0128


Dear Ms. Mossman:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISPN)
for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities
of the Pacific Missile Range Facility

The staff of the U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, Hawaii District, has reviewed the EISPN, and we have no comments to offer at this time.

Thank you for allowing us to review the report. We are returning it for your future use.

Sincerely,


William Meyer
District Chief

Enclosure



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0240
11 March 1998

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION
4340 EAST-WEST HIGHWAY, ROOM 905
BETHESDA, MD 20814

Mr Meyer William
Water Resource Division
US Dept of the Interior
677 Ala Moana Boulevard Suite 415
Honolulu, HI 96813

29 July 1997

Dear Mr William:


Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: The staff of the U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, Hawaii District, has reviewed the EISPN, and we have no comments to offer at this time. Thank you for allowing us to review the report.

Response 1: Thank You.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waiimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Mr. Randy Gallien
Environmental Engineer
US Army Space and Strategic Defense Command
Environmental and Engineering Office
P.O. Box 1500
Huntsville, AL 35807

Dear Mr. Gallien:

The Marine Mammal Commission, in consultation with its Committee of Scientific Advisors on Marine Mammals, has reviewed the "Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Enhancement of the Capability of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, HI to Conduct Missile Defense Testing and Training Activities" and offers the following comments. The Notice, published by the U.S. Navy in the Federal Register on 23 May 1997 (62 FR 100:28451-28452), indicates that the Statement will examine environmental impacts associated with a Navy proposal to conduct a missile defense testing and training program in the North Pacific. The proposed action involves developing and operating missile launching facilities and/or tracking stations at sites possibly located on one or more atolls in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. A number of cetacean species, including the endangered humpback whale, occur in waters adjacent to potential facility sites; however, as discussed below, the marine mammal species most likely to be affected by the proposed program is the endangered Hawaiian monk seal, Monachus schauinslandi.

Hawaiian monk seals occur only in the Hawaiian Archipelago. Although some animals occur in the main Hawaiian Islands, the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands and surrounding waters provide habitat for virtually the entire monk seal population. Hawaiian monk seals are the most endangered seal in U.S. waters and one of the most endangered seals in the world. In the 1960s and 1970s, the species experienced a significant decline due at least in part to human disturbance at several of the principal breeding sites. After a brief and relatively small increase in numbers early in the 1980s, monk seals experienced a renewed decline that began in the mid-1980s and continues today. The total population presently numbers perhaps 1,300 animals. Beaches and nearshore waters out to a depth of 20 fathoms around all islands in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (with the exception of Sand Island

S-W-00107

at Midway Atoll) have been designated as critical habitat for Hawaiian monk seals. All of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, except for Kure, are owned and managed by the Fish and Wildlife Service as part of the National Wildlife Refuge System. Kure is owned and managed by the State of Hawaii.

As discussed below, it is essential that the proposed program avoid any adverse impacts on Hawaiian monk seals or their critical habitat. In this regard, the environmental impact statement must carefully examine possible associated impacts that could further imperil the species' survival or recovery. To help in this task, copies of various reports and papers on Hawaiian monk seals are enclosed, including relevant excerpts from our past annual reports. These materials include information on monk seal biology, population trends, and conservation issues that should be useful in identifying and examining potential impacts. In addition, we offer the following comments on the species' status and possible impacts of concern, and attach a list of questions that should be addressed in the environmental impact statement to fully evaluate the potential direct and indirect effects of the proposed action on Hawaiian monk seals.

The National Marine Fisheries Service has lead federal responsibility for the protection and recovery of Hawaiian monk seals under both the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Given its responsibilities under the former Act, the Marine Mammal Commission recommends that the Navy, if it has not already done so, immediately make arrangements for conducting formal consultations with the Service pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act to evaluate possible effects of the proposed action on the Hawaiian monk seal and its critical habitat. If at all possible, results of those consultations should be included in the draft environmental impact statement.

Also, the Navy should consider whether and to what extent Hawaiian monk seals might be "taken" incidental to the proposed activity. If the Navy concludes that the proposed action may affect only a small number of Hawaiian monk seals or other marine mammals, and that the impact on the affected population(s) is likely to be negligible, it should contact the Service about obtaining a "small take" authorization under section 101(a)(5) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act. In any event, the statement should discuss the applicability of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, whether the various options are expected to result in the incidental taking of marine mammals, and, if so, whether the effects are likely to be negligible.

Status and Trends of Hawaiian Monk Seals

As noted above, between 1950 and the 1970s the number of Hawaiian monk seals declined significantly. This was probably due primarily to direct human disturbance at several of the

species' principal breeding sites. After a brief and relatively small increase in numbers between the mid-1970s and mid-1980s, the overall monk seal population has experienced a renewed decline that continues today. Approximately 90% of all monk seal births occur on beaches at six major breeding sites in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands: French Frigate Shoals, Laysan Island, Lisianski Island, Pearl and Hermes Reef, the Midway Islands, and Kure Atoll. As most juvenile and adult monk seals return to the atolls of their birth to molt, breed, and rest after foraging at sea, population trends at the major breeding sites tend to be independent of one another, with each influenced by factors specific to that location. Assessment of possible impacts of the proposed action should therefore consider site specific trends and potential direct and indirect effects on local colonies.

Monk seal colonies that declined significantly concurrent with human occupation and related disturbance include French Frigate Shoals, Kure Atoll, and the Midway Islands. The two principal effects of persistent human disturbance of atoll beaches appear to include increased shark predation on pups and juveniles chased into the water, and eventual abandonment of sites by adults due to repeated harassment. Human disturbance at French Frigate Shoals occurred coincident with development and operation of an air strip on Tern Island by the Navy during World War II and its subsequent use by the Coast Guard as a LORAN Station from 1961 to 1979; at Kure disturbance was associated with a Coast Guard LORAN Station built in 1952; and at Midway, monk seals were significantly affected by development and operation of a Naval Air Station built in World II and expanded in the mid-1950s.

On Kure Atoll, monk seal beach counts declined by 50% between the 1950s and 1970s. Early in the 1980s, the Coast Guard significantly strengthened restrictions on the use of beaches by personnel at Kure Atoll. At the same time the National Marine Fisheries Service began a "headstart" program to protect pups during the first few months after weaning, and also began releasing juvenile seals that had been rescued in underweight condition at French Frigate Shoals and rehabilitated for release at Kure. These actions reversed the declining trend in monk seal numbers at Kure Atoll. In 1992, the Coast Guard closed its LORAN station on Kure leaving the atoll unoccupied. With Kure Atoll now free of permanent human occupants and related disturbances, its monk seal colony is slowly increasing.

A similar trend is apparent at Tern Island, French Frigate Shoals, and Midway Islands. Although no seal counts were made at Tern Island before the mid-1950s when the Navy constructed and used the island as a landing strip, counts during the period of Coast Guard occupation (1961 to 1979) indicate that few monk seals hauled out on Tern Island despite a several-fold increase

in seal counts elsewhere at French Frigate Shoals. Since 1979, Tern Island has been a permanent field station occupied by Fish and Wildlife Service personnel. Concerted efforts by the Service to avoid human disturbance of seals on Tern Island have resulted in a several-fold increase in the number of seals counted on the island between 1979 and 1990, and since the late 1980s, the island also has been the site of numerous births. The increase in seal use of Tern Island has occurred despite an overall decrease in recent years in seal numbers throughout the atoll.

At the Midway Islands, monk seal counts declined from about 60 seals late in the 1950s (when the first counts of seals were made) to virtually zero by the late 1960s. In recent years, concurrent with the decreased activity at the Midway Naval Air Station and increased protection of monk seals and other wildlife by the Navy and the Fish and Wildlife Service, there has been an increase in both monk seal sightings and pupping at the atoll. The Midway Islands Naval Air Facility was recently closed and the atoll was transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service for use as a National Wildlife Refuge. The opportunity to further reduce human disturbance at this site is considered an important chance to reestablish a major breeding colony at this atoll.

Other human impacts to Hawaiian monk seals have been due to direct and indirect interactions with commercial fisheries. These include entanglement in lost or discarded nets and net fragments, interactions with the fishermen and set fishing gear, and possible depletion of important monk seal prey species by fisheries and natural factors, such as large-scale climatic cycles. It also is possible that disturbance of atoll lagoons by dredging could cause blooms of zooplankton that produce biotoxins, such as ciguatera. For example, high levels of ciguatoxins have been reported at Midway that may be related to dredging activity. Although there is no evidence that seals at Midway have been affected by ciguatoxins, a die-off of at least 50 seals occurred at Laysan Island in 1978 that is believed to have been caused by a natural increase in ciguatoxin.

The extremely low population levels produced by the major direct human disturbances between the 1950s and 1970s, in combination with indirect human effects and natural causes of monk seal mortality (shark predation, serious injuries and mortality caused by male sexual aggression, cyclical declines in prey availability due to climatic cycles, and ciguatoxin), make the present day status of this species extremely precarious. The largest monk seal colonies are decreasing or at best stable at levels far below those reported in the 1950s (i.e., French Frigate Shoals, Laysan Island, and Lisianski Island), and those that are increasing slowly (i.e., Kure Atoll and Pearl and Hermes Reef) remain far below levels previously reported. Particularly alarming has been the decline in seal numbers at French Frigate Shoals. Between the 1980s and the mid-1990s over 50% of monk

seal births occurred at French Frigate Shoals. Since the mid-1980s, however, pup survival has decreased significantly due to an apparent decline in food resources and, with decreased recruitment of young seals into adult age classes, beach counts at the atoll have declined by 50%.

Monk seal beach counts at Laysan and Lisianski Islands declined by 50% or more in the 1960s and 1970s. Although the cause of these declines is uncertain, the 1978 die-off of seals at Laysan Island, possibly due to ciguatera toxins, was a contributing factor at that site. Over the past several years the sizes of seal colonies at both sites have been relatively stable at their reduced level. Serious injuries and deaths of juveniles and adult females by sexually aggressive adult male animals may be limiting recovery at both sites. Entanglement of pups and juveniles in derelict nets and line also may be a significant mortality factor, especially at Lisianski Island.

Monk seal numbers on Pearl and Hermes Reef have been increasing steadily since the early 1980s, but beach counts are still less than 50% of levels observed there late in the 1950s and early in the 1960s. The cause of the decline at Pearl and Hermes Reef in the 1950s and 1960s is uncertain.

Potential Impacts of the Proposed Action on Hawaiian Monk Seals

The proposed action could involve constructing and operating missile launch sites and/or missile tracking facilities on one or more of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands used for pupping by the Hawaiian monk seal. The greatest source of concern regarding possible impacts on monk seals from the proposed action is disturbance by activities and personnel. As indicated above, experience at Kure and the Midway Islands clearly indicates that human disturbance of seals on hauling beaches can have a significant adverse effect on local seal colonies. Similar effects occurred at Tern Island in French Frigate Shoals during operation of a Coast Guard LORAN Station from the 1950s to 1979. During the period of Coast Guard occupation, few monk seals hauled out on Tern Island. Since 1979, Tern Island has been used by Fish and Wildlife Service personnel as a permanent field station. Efforts by the Service to avoid disturbance of seals on the island's beaches have resulted in a several-fold increase in the number of seals using the island's beaches since 1979, and, since the late 1980s numerous births have been recorded.

Given the very small size of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, there are significant short-term and long-term risks associated with disturbance of hauled-out seals. Activities that could cause significant disturbance include: site preparation and construction of missile launch or tracking facilities; the movement of missiles, equipment, and supplies to, from, and around the islands; noise from launches or explosions of failed

or aborted launches; and activities and noise produced by people stationed at launch or tracking facilities. If night launches are planned, light, as well as noise, could cause monk seals to enter the water. Depending on missile trajectories, sonic booms over down-range atolls also could scare hauled-out seals into the water. Experience at Kure Atoll during the period of Coast Guard occupation suggests that monk seal pups and juveniles lack fully developed predator avoidance skills. It therefore seems likely that, if these age classes are frightened into the water by any of the above mentioned activities or disturbances, they would sustain increased levels of mortality from shark predation. Most pups are born and weaned between spring and fall; however, births have been recorded in all months. Disturbances associated with the proposed action could therefore affect at least some pups or newly weaned animals during any month of the year.

If dredging of atoll lagoons is required to improve water access for supply vessels or to prepare one or more launch sites, there also is a risk of precipitating blooms of zooplankton responsible for ciguatera. A ban on the consumption of fish taken at Midway Atoll was imposed by the Navy during its occupation of the island because of periodic ciguatera outbreaks. While the reason for persistent ciguatera problems at Midway is not clear, it may be a residual effect of extensive dredging done to create the atoll's harbor and ship channel. As noted above, ciguatera was identified as a likely cause of death for at least 50 monk seals on Laysan Island in 1978. Biotoxins also are considered a possible cause of the recent Mediterranean monk seal die-off along the northwest coast of Africa where more than two-thirds of the local monk seal colony has been lost.

Monk seals also may be affected directly or indirectly by chemical contaminants from activities or accidents associated with the proposed action. Possible contaminant sources might include exhaust from rocket engines or heavy equipment, sewage from station personnel, missiles that explode at or immediately after launch and land in adjacent lagoons, the spilling of fuel for generators or heavy equipment, and possible spills of other hazardous chemicals that may be involved. All of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands are only a few feet above sea level and are vulnerable to severe typhoons that could cause the loss of equipment, fuels, and chemicals into surrounding lagoons.

Over the long term, the likelihood of significant impacts on monk seals from the operation of missile launch facilities in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands would appear to be great and largely unavoidable. Although details of the proposed action have not yet been presented, we find it difficult to imagine how it would be possible to develop and operate one or more launch sites on any of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands that contain a major monk seal breeding colony without having a significant negative impact on the recovery of Hawaiian monk seals.

Missile tracking facilities would be less problematic for monk seals. While impacts due to construction of tracking facilities may be difficult to mitigate, possible impacts from the operation of such facilities may be manageable in a way that would be consistent with monk seal conservation needs. If missile tracking facilities are analogous to Coast Guard LORAN stations, the principal impact on monk seals is likely to involve activities of station personnel that could disturb hauled-out seals. Once appropriate beach access restrictions were put into effect for people stationed at or visiting Kure Atoll, the Coast Guard demonstrated that its personnel could carry out their duties and live on the island without undue disturbance of resident monk seals. A secondary, and as yet unassessed, impact of the Coast Guard station at Kure Atoll relates to the disposal of electrical equipment containing PCBs in an atoll landfill. This necessitated a costly clean-up when the station was closed. All such hazardous materials should be removed from the island for proper disposal elsewhere whenever it is decided to get rid of them; they should not be buried on the island. Other aspects of the presence and operation of Coast Guard LORAN stations did not appear to affect monk seals and, in some cases, may have benefitted recovery efforts (e.g., help in transporting people and supplies for monk seal research and management work at Kure). We emphasize, however, that the presence of people and facilities on any breeding island presents a risk to monk seals that should be avoided if at all possible.


In conclusion, we are concerned that construction and operation of missile launching sites in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands would cause significant and unavoidable adverse impacts on Hawaiian monk seals. One of the major impacts would be from rocket noise and the continual movement of missiles, people, and supplies. This could force monk seals, particularly pups and juveniles, into the water where they would sustain increased levels of mortality. The Environmental Impact Statement should carefully evaluate these and all other possible sources of disturbance that could scare seals into the water or cause the abandonment of available hauling beaches. Such additional effects on an endangered species that has declined significantly over the past 50 years and continues to decline at an alarming rate, could prevent population recovery in the foreseeable future and substantially increase its risk of extinction. Given the small size of atolls and unavoidable noise and disturbance from rocket launches, the Marine Mammal Commission strongly recommends that missile launching sites selected as part of the proposed action not be located in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

The construction and operation of missile tracking stations in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands would appear to be less problematic for Hawaiian monk seals, but are also a serious source of concern. If at all possible, sites outside the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands should be used for any new missile

tracking facilities. If that is not possible, monk seal protection will require great care and planning with regard to selecting facility sites, constructing tracking facilities, managing personnel, and disposing of any wastes that may be generated.

I hope these comments and the enclosed materials are helpful. If you or your staff would like to discuss the above comments, please call.

Sincerely,


John R. Twiss, Jr.
Executive Director

Enclosures

cc with enclosures: Mr. Edd V. Joy

Some of the Questions that Should Be Addressed
In the Environmental Impact Statement for the
Proposed Missile Defense Testing and Training Program

What are the locations of preferred and alternative missile launch and tracking sites? How many sites at what distances would be needed to meet basic program objectives? How often would missiles be launched? Would any launches take place at night?

What are the acoustic features (e.g., sound levels, frequency distributions, ranges, and dominant frequencies) and the sound propagation/attenuation characteristics in air and water for the types of target and interceptor missiles to be used?

What is known about the effect of environmental factors (e.g., wind speed and direction, precipitation, humidity, etc.) on sound levels and sound attenuation rates at different launch sites?

At what distance from launch sites does the Navy believe direct effects (e.g., hearing damage and disturbance-related changes in distribution or behavior) on monk seals or other potentially affected marine mammal species would be negligible and why? What steps would be taken to detect monk seals or other marine species within that zone and to delay launches if animals are detected?

What are the expected trajectories of the missiles? Are sonic booms likely to occur at or near any of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands? If so, what are the expected received sound levels at different locations in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands chain, and how often, and at what times of the year, are they likely to occur?

What are the possible and likely missile failure rates that could result in explosions or destruction of missiles during or immediately after launch? What are the acoustic features related to missile explosions and what chemical contaminants and missile debris might fall into atoll lagoons?

What chemicals are present in and produced by combustion of the rocket fuel(s)? Over what land and sea areas and at what concentrations could these chemicals be transported and deposited? Could chemicals deposited in the water directly or indirectly affect the distribution or productivity of monk seal prey species? If so, how and to what extent? Could chemicals bio-accumulate in the marine food chain and, if so, could consumption of contaminated prey affect the health or productivity of monk seals?

How far from shore could barge or ship platforms used for missile launches be placed?

What shore-based activities and number of personnel are necessary to support missile launch and tracking stations? Would personnel be stationed permanently at these sites, and if so, how many? At launch times, how many people would be at these sites and for how long? How often would missiles, personnel, and supplies need to be transported to and from launch and tracking sites? What types of equipment would be needed to move missiles and people?

What steps would be taken to limit beach access and use by workers on and off duty?

What are the principal uncertainties concerning possible effects on Hawaiian monk seals? What research and monitoring studies would be undertaken to resolve those uncertainties and to detect any possible unforeseen adverse effects before they become significant?

Summary of Enclosures from John R. Twiss, Marine Mammal Commission, comment S-W-0088

1. *Excerpt from the Annual Report of the Marine Mammal Commission, Calendar Year 1988*
2. *Recovery Plan for the Hawaiian Monk Seal, Monachus schauinslandi, March 1983*
3. *Hawaiian Monk Seal Work Plan Fiscal Years 1994-96, October 1993*
4. *Hawaiian Monk Seal Die-off Response Plan, A Workshop Report: 2 April 1980, San Diego, California, November 1987*
5. *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS, The Hawaiian Monk Seal in the Northwestern Islands, 1996*
6. *Southwest Fisheries Science Center Administrative Report H-93-00, Status of the Hawaiian Monk Seal in 1992, April 1993*
7. *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS, Diving Patterns of the Hawaiian Monk Seal, Lisianski Island, 1982, February 1984*
8. *Survival Rates for the Hawaiian Monk Seal (Monachus schauinslandi), October 1993*
9. *The Hawaiian Monk Seal on Midway Atoll, 1994, September 1994*
10. *Evaluation of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Operations on Tern Island in the Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge: Recommendations for a Long-Term Course of Action*



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KKAHIA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0261
12 March 1998

Mr John R Twiss
Marine Mammal Commission
4340 East-West Highway Room 905
Bethesda, MD 20814

Dear Mr. Twiss:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: A number of cetacean species, including the endangered humpback whale, occur in water adjacent to potential facility sites; however, as discussed below, the marine mammal species most likely to be affected by the proposed program is the endangered Hawaiian monk seal, *Monachus schauinslandi*. Hawaiian monk seals occur only in the Hawaiian Archipelago. Although some animals occur in the main Hawaiian Islands, the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands and surrounding waters provide habitat for virtually the entire monk seal population. As discussed below, it is essential that the proposed program avoid any adverse impacts on Hawaiian monk seals or their critical habitat. In this regard, the environmental impact statement must carefully examine possible associated impacts that could further imperil the species' survival or recovery.

Response 1: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 2: The National Marine Fisheries Service has lead federal responsibilities for the protection and recovery of Hawaiian monk seals under both the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammals Protection Act. Given its responsibilities under the former Act, the Marine Mammal Commission recommends that the Navy, if it has not already done so, immediately make arrangements for conducting formal consultations with the Service pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act to evaluate the possible effects of the proposed action on the Hawaiian monk seals and its critical habitat. If at all possible, results of those consultations should be included in the draft environmental impact statement.

Response 2: Extensive informal consultation began in late 1996. NMFS staff have been consulted with on many aspects of our preparation of the Draft EIS. Formal consultation will begin with the publication of the Draft EIS.

Comment 3: Also, the Navy should consider whether and to what extent Hawaiian monk seals might be "taken" incidental to the proposed activity. If the Navy concludes that the proposed action may affect only a small number of Hawaiian monk seals or other marine mammals, and that the impact on the affected population(s) is likely to be negligible, it should contact the Service about obtaining a "small take" authorization under section 101(a) (5) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act. In any event, the statement should discuss the applicability of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, whether the various options are expected to result in the incidental taking of marine mammals, and, if so, whether the effects are likely to be negligible.

Response 3: The Draft EIS describes potential effects to marine mammals in the Biological Resources section for each location in Section 4.

Comment 4: Approximately 90% of all monk seal births occur on beaches at six major breeding sites in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands: French Frigate Shoals, Laysan Island, Lisianski Island, Pearl and Hermes Reef, the Midway Islands, and Kure Atoll. As most juvenile and adult monk seals return to the atolls of their birth to molt, breed, and rest after foraging from the sea, population trends at the major breeding sites tend to be independent of one another, with each influenced by the factors specific to that location. Assessment of possible impacts of the proposed action should therefore consider site specific trends and potential direct and indirect effects on local colonies.

Response 4: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 5: Monk seal colonies that declined significantly concurrent with human occupation and related disturbance include French Frigate Shoals, Kure Atoll, and the Midway Islands.

Response 5: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 6: It is also possible that disturbance of atoll lagoons by dredging could cause blooms of zooplankton that produce biotoxins, such as ciguatera. For example, high levels of ciguatoxins have been reported at Midway that may be related to dredging activity. Although there is no evidence that seals at Midway have been affected by ciguatoxins, a die-off of at least 50 seals occurred at Laysan Island in 1978 that is believed to have been caused by a natural increase in ciguatoxin.

Response 6: Dredging may increase turbidity, leading to a potential increase in ciguatera. Because the dredging activity would be localized, the potential impact of the dredging is not expected to jeopardize the survival of the species. However, no dredging would occur until additional biological and geological studies have been completed in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service.

Comment 7: The proposed action could involve constructing and operating missile launch sites and/or missile tracking facilities on one or more of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands used for pupping by the Hawaiian monk seal. The greatest source of concern regarding possible impacts on monk seals from the proposed action is disturbance by activities and personnel.

Response 7: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

S-W-0088

S-W-0088

- Comment 8: Given the very small size of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, there are significant short-term and long-term risks associated with disturbance of hauled-out seals. Activities that could cause significant disturbance include: site preparation and construction of missile launch or tracking facilities; the movement of missiles, equipment, and supplies to, from, and around the islands; noise from launches or explosions of failed or aborted launches; and activities and noise produced by people stationed at launch or tracking facilities. If night launches are planned, light, as well as noise, could cause the monk seals to enter the water. Depending on missile trajectories, sonic booms over down-range atolls also could scare hauled-out seals into the water.
- Monk seals also maybe affected directly or indirectly by chemical contaminants from activities or accidents associated with the proposed action. Possible contaminant sources might include exhaust from rocket engines or heavy equipment, sewage from station personnel, missiles that explode at or immediately after launch and land in adjacent lagoons, the spilling of fuel for generators or heavy equipment, and possible spills of other hazardous chemicals that may be involved. All of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands are only a few feet above sea level and are vulnerable to severe typhoons that could cause the loss of equipment, fuels, and chemicals into surrounding lagoons.
- Response 8: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 9: Although details of the proposed action have not yet been presented, we find it difficult to imagine how it would be possible to develop and operate one or more launch sites on any of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands that contain a major monk seal breeding colony without having a significant negative impact on the recovery of Hawaiian monk seals.
- Response 9: While there may be some impacts to the monk seal, as documented in the Draft EIS, with the limited number of launch events at Tern Island (four) and the short-term nature of the events, the species is not expected to be jeopardized.
- Comment 10: All such hazardous materials should be removed from the island for proper disposal elsewhere whenever it is decided to get rid of them; they should not be buried on the island.
- Response 10: The PMRF hazardous materials and waste section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Table 3.1.1.6-1) provides a list of the hazardous materials disposed of by PMRF and their support facilities in 1996. This section also addresses the disposal procedures utilized by PMRF. All Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste are disposed of in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations. No hazardous waste is disposed of by PMRF on the remote locations being considered on Kauai.
- Comment 11: We emphasize, however, that the presence of people and facilities on any breeding island presents a risk to monk seals that should be avoided at all if possible.
- Response 11: The Navy proposes to restrict access by project personnel to the beach areas used by the monk seal except when necessary to perform mission-related duties. Specifics of the restrictions would be part of any access agreement.
- Comment 12: In conclusion, we are concerned that construction and operation of missile launching sites in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands would cause significant and unavoidable adverse impacts on Hawaiian monk seals.
- Response 12: While there may be some impacts to the monk seal, as documented in the Draft EIS, with the limited number of launch events at Tern Island (four) and the short-term nature of the events, the species is not expected to be jeopardized. Additionally, construction of a seawall for the location of a launch pad and as a barrier for MATSS should provide positive impacts.
- Comment 13: One of the major impacts would be from rocket noise and the continual movement of missiles, people, and supplies. This could force monk seals, particularly pups and juveniles, into the water where they sustain increased levels of mortality. The Environmental Impact Statement should carefully evaluate these and all other possible sources of disturbance that could scare seals into the water or cause the abandonment of available hauling beaches.
- Response 13: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4. Movement of missiles, people, and supplies would be intermittent and the number of personnel would be minimized.
- Comment 14: Given the small size of atolls and unavoidable noise and disturbances from rocket launches, the Marine Mammal Commission strongly recommends that missile launching sites selected as part of the proposed action not be located in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.
- Response 14: While there may be some impacts to the monk seal, as documented in the Draft EIS, with the limited number of launch events at Tern Island (four) and the short-term nature of the events, the species is not expected to be jeopardized. While air launch and mobile sea launch platforms are the preferred method to launch targets, only a limited number of evaluations for them are available. If a land launch is required, the only reasonable alternative sites include Tern Island in the northern Hawaiian Islands and Johnston Atoll.
- Comment 15: What are the locations of preferred and alternative missile launch and tracking sites? How many sites at what distances would be needed to meet basic program objectives? How often would missiles be launched? Would any launches take place at night?
- Response 15: The information you requested is contained in Chapter 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Target launches from Air and Mobile Sea Platforms are preferred. There is not a specific number of sites needed to enhance the range. The Navy's goal is to provide maximum flexibility to allow multiple launches from multiple directions. It is expected that no more than 4 target launches would occur from Tern Island per year. Launches could occur at night.
- Comment 16: What are the acoustic features (e.g., sound levels, frequency distributions, ranges, and dominant frequencies) and the sound propagation/attenuation characteristics in air and water for the types of target and interceptor missiles to be used?
- Response 16: Maximum expected noise levels associated with a target launch at Tern would be expected to be 140 dBA at 48 meters, 115 dBA at 763 meters, 92 dBA at 1,705 meters, and 82 dBA at 6,175 meters.
- Comment 17: What is known about the effect of environmental factors (e.g., wind speed and direction, precipitation, humidity, etc.) on sound levels and sound attenuation rates at different launch sites?
- Response 17: Experience shows that sound pressure levels in the far field can increase in some areas on the order of 20 dB because of atmospheric refraction effects. Acoustic focusing is not modeled in the EIS because the ever-changing meteorological conditions with respect to time and space make it impossible to predict the effects of acoustic focusing without knowing atmospheric conditions at time of flight.
- Comment 18: At what distance from launch sites does the Navy believe direct effects (e.g., hearing damage and disturbance-related changes in distribution or behavior) on monk seals or other potentially affected marine mammal species would be negligible and why? What steps would be taken to detect monk seals or other marine species within that zone and to delay launches if animals are detected?

Response 18: As described in Section 4.3.1.3.2, there is currently no data regarding the levels at which airborne sound will damage monk seal hearing. However, a recent study (Thorson et al., 1998) on Harbor Seals developed a data point of A-weighted measurement of 96 dBA and unweighted measurement of 126 dB with no detectable hearing effect. This study describes how a harbor seal-weighting as opposed to A-weighting for humans has been developed. However, there has not been a systematic peer-review of this method. The harbor seal weighted sound levels for the Titan IV launch noise were 40 dB lower than that of A-weighted sound levels. While the data collected for harbor seals during Titan launches may not directly apply to smaller missiles of higher noise frequency and monk seals, this methodology may be used to collect and interpret similar data for monk seals. Even so, launch noise could impact monk seals by startling them and causing them to flee into the water. This could injure pups, and put adults, pups and juveniles at risk to shark predation. These effects could result in high impacts to the monk seal. However, with limited number of launch events (four per year) and the short-term nature of the events, the species is not expected to be jeopardized and no permanent hearing loss should occur.

Comment 19: What are the expected trajectories of the missiles?

Response 19: Trajectories and range would vary greatly depending on the testing scenario. Representative trajectories are presented in Section 2.3 of the Draft EIS.

Comment 20: Are sonic booms likely to occur at or near any of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands? If so, what are the expected received sounds levels at different locations in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands chain, and how often, and at what times of the year, are they likely to occur?

Response 20: Sonic booms could affect monk seals hauled out on islands downrange (that is, not at the launch site). Sonic booms could startle monk seals and cause them to flee into the water. This could injure pups and put adults, pups, and juveniles at risk to shark predation. Because of the limited number of launch events (4 per year), this effect is not expected to jeopardize the species.

Comment 21: What are the possible and likely missile failure rates that could result in explosions or destruction of missiles during or immediately after launch?

Response 21: The missile systems proposed for use are current systems used by the Department of Defense. PMRF will establish safety areas from which non-essential personnel will be excluded and where all debris from a flight termination would fall; therefore, there would be no public health and safety issues associated from an early flight termination caused by a missile malfunction. Because targets being considered for use at Tern Island are rail launched, the hazard area for termination is primarily down range. Therefore, there is a low probability debris would impact on Tern Island as a result of flight termination. Therefore, there is a much lower probability that any marine mammal could be impacted from debris.

Specific risk analysis have not been conducted for each vehicle proposed to be launched as part of the Proposed Action. However, since Kauai Test Facility (KTF) first started operations in 1962, approximately 360 rocket systems have been launched from the KTF. During this period, there have been no ground or airborne failures that have caused injury, loss of life, damage or destruction of any facilities or the environment. Early in KTF history(1964), assembly procedural errors resulted in the premature ignition of the second stage on the launch pad coincident with booster ignition, resulting in a ground fire that spread to the brush adjacent to the facility. As a result, system-specific Safe Operating Procedures (SOPs) were modified, and their use in conjunction with safety checklists has prevented a recurrence. In 1974, in an effort to increase performance of the Strypi Rocket System, a system using a Castor II rocket motor was designed as the first stage versus the original Castor I. Two flight tests were conducted at KTF, with the first one ejecting a nozzle liner at ignition. The system landed within the ground hazard area and caused no injury or damage.

S-W-0088

The other system experienced burn-through in the casing and landed in the broad ocean area within the cleared hazard area. This system was not developed further and has not flown since.

The Navy expects to continue this excellent safety record in implementing the No-Action or Proposed Action Alternative.

Comment 22: What are the acoustic features related to missile explosions?

Response 22: Noise levels from a flight termination or explosion of the missile system would be greater than that of a normal launch; however, the potential for such a mishap would be low and only last a few seconds. Potential noise impacts at each location are described in the Noise sections of Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

Comment 23: . . . and what chemical contaminants and missile debris might fall into atoll lagoons?

Response 23: The potential biological resource and water quality impacts to the water in Johnston Atoll's lagoon are addressed in Sections 4.3.2.3 and 4.3.2.13 of the Draft EIS. Tern Island impacts are addressed in Sections 4.3.1.3 and 4.3.1.13.

Comment 24: What chemicals are present in and produced by combustion of the rocket fuel(s)? Over what land and sea areas and at what concentrations could these chemicals be transported and deposited?

Response 24: Exhaust products of missiles are described in tables in Sections 4.1.1.1.1 and 4.1.1.1.2. Maximum concentrations of exhaust products and distance from the launch site are listed in Table 4.1.1.1.-2. No liquid propellants will be used on Tern Island.

Comment 25: Could chemical contaminants deposited in the water directly or indirectly affect the distribution or productivity of monk seal prey species? If so, how and to what extent? Could chemicals bio-accumulate in the marine food chain, and if so, could consumption of contaminated prey affect the health or productivity of monk seals?

Response 25: Potential impacts of solid and liquid fuels following a missile mishap are expected to be negligible. Unburned solid fuels result in release of ammonia, chlorine and aluminum at non-toxic levels. Section 4.1.1.1 addresses the combustion products and transportation of these contaminants.

Comment 26: How far from shore could barge or ship platforms used for missile launches be placed?

Response 26: The Mobile Aerial Target Support System (MATSS) can be used anywhere in the ocean. To protect monk seals and their habitats, the Navy proposes to use the MATSS only where the water depth is greater than 20 fathoms.

Comment 27: What shore-based activities and number of personnel are necessary to support missile launch and tracking stations? Would personnel be stationed permanently at these sites, and if so, how many? At launch times, how many people would be at these sites and for how long? How often would missiles, personnel, and supplies need to be transported to and from launch and tracking sites? What types of equipment would be needed to move missiles and people?

Response 27: Total personnel involved in a typical target flight test launch would be approximately 30 with the potential for 25 to leave the MATSS during the typical 2-3 week period. For each proposed launch site selected, a launch complex would be constructed consisting of a 46- by 46-meter concrete pad, an environmental shelter, and a launch control facility (protected van shelter).

Additional portable electric generators would be placed on Tern Island. Dredging from the west end of the island to the existing channel would be required, along with the construction

S-W-0088

of docking facilities to bring supplies and equipment to the island and docking facilities for MATSS.

- Comment 28: What steps would be taken to limit beach access and use by workers on and off duty?
- Response 28: All workers will be briefed prior to initiation of construction and operation to avoid sensitive marine mammal areas. Additionally access to the island would be only as necessary with personnel remaining on the MATSS as much as possible.
- Comment 29: What are the principal uncertainties concerning possible effects on Hawaiian monk seals? What research and monitoring studies would be undertaken to resolve those uncertainties and to detect any possible unforeseen adverse effects before they become significant?
- Response 29: At this time there are no major uncertainties with regard to impacts on monk seals. Specifics of any necessary studies would be part of formal consultation with NMFS, which is expected to begin with the publication of the Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0088

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANG
 GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



STATE OF HAWAII
 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
 P.O. BOX 3378
 HONOLULU, HAWAII 96801

July 16, 1997

S-W-104

LAWRENCE MIKE
 DIRECTOR OF HEALTH

In reply, please refer to

97-111/epo

Ms. Vida Mossman
 Pacific Missile Range Facility
 P.O. Box 128
 Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Subject: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE
 (EISPN) FOR STATE OF HAWAII ACTIONS RELATED TO
 ENHANCING THE CAPABILITIES OF THE PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE
 FACILITY, KAUAI, HAWAII

Thank you for allowing us to review and comment on the subject project. We have the following comments to offer:

Wastewater Branch

Makaha Ridge, Kauai is serviced by two cesspools and one septic tank/leaching field system which provide wastewater treatment and disposal.

Kokee is serviced by cesspools and/or septic tank/leaching fields. All existing buildings at Parcel A rely on individual cesspool systems for sewage disposal. Cesspools servicing Parcel A are located west of the Telemetry and Control Building. These systems were installed prior to the adoption of State of Hawaii Department of Health (DOH) regulations for wastewater treatment works and individual wastewater systems.

On Niihau, each household is supported by individual wastewater systems of an unknown nature. We do have a concern regarding this site, as access to the island is restricted and wastewater inspections are impossible to make.

We will allow the continued use of the existing wastewater systems at the above mentioned sites as long as wastewater generation will not increase or change in characteristics. However, should a suggested site lack a wastewater treatment and disposal system, or should the wastewater generation increase or change in character, we will require the installation of a

Ms. Vida Mossman
July 16, 1997
Page 2

97-111/epo



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO
5090
Ser 00/0258
12 March 1998

treatment individual wastewater system (IWS), such as a septic tank system.

All wastewater plans must conform to applicable provisions of the Department of Health's Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-62, "Wastewater Systems." We reserve the right to review the detailed wastewater plans for conformance to applicable rules.

Should you have any questions on these comments, please contact Ms. Lori Kajiwara of the Wastewater Branch at telephone 586-4294.

We would also be interested in reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement when it becomes available.

Sincerely,

BRUCE S. ANDERSON, Ph.D.
Deputy Director for Environmental Health

c: WWB

Dr Bruce Anderson
Deputy Director for Environmental Health
State of Hawaii Department of Health
PO Box 3378
Honolulu, HI 96801

Dear Dr Anderson:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability *Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Kōkee is served by cesspools and/or septic tank/leaching fields. All existing buildings at Parcel A rely on individual cesspool systems for sewage disposal. Cesspools servicing Parcel A are located west of the Telemetry and Control Building. These systems were installed prior to the adoption of State of Hawaii Department of Health (DOH) regulations for wastewater treatment works and individual wastewater systems.

Response 1: We have considered this in the analysis of impacts on Kōkee. (Section 4.1.4.11)

Comment 2: On Niihau, each household is supported by individual wastewater systems of an unknown nature. We do have a concern regarding this site, as access to the island is restricted and wastewater inspections are impossible to make.

Response 2: No increases in wastewater production or discharge would result from the Proposed Action. Any wastewater plans would conform to applicable provisions of the Department of Health's Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-62, "Wastewater Systems."

Comment 3: We will allow the continued use of the existing wastewater systems at the above mentioned sites as long as wastewater generation will not increase or change in characteristics. However, should a suggested site lack a wastewater treatment and disposal system, or should the wastewater generation increase or change in character, we will require the installation of a treatment individual wastewater system (IWS), such as a septic tank system.

Response 3: We will factor this requirement into decisions on these criteria.

Comment 4: All wastewater plans must conform to applicable provisions of the Department of Health's Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-62, "Wastewater Systems." We reserve the right to review the detailed wastewater plans for conformance to applicable rules.

Response 4: All wastewater plans would conform to applicable provisions of the Department of Health's Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-62, "Wastewater Systems."

S-W-0104

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF AQUATIC RESOURCES
1151 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

June 20, 1997

MICHAEL D. WILSON
CHAIRMAN
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
GILBERT B. COLOMBA-AGEPAM

AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
CONSERVATION AND
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
CONSERVATION AND
RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
CONVEYANCES
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM
LAND MANAGEMENT
STATE PARKS
WATER AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

S-W-057

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Preparation Notice for a modification of an existing restrictive easement granted by the State of Hawaii to the Navy regarding lands adjacent to the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) at Mana, Kauai, to expand the types of missile launches and extend the easement through December 2030. In addition, the expansion of the current leased area at Kamakala Caves (also at Mana) and the consideration of Niihau (privately-owned land) and Kure Atoll in the Northwestern Hawaiian chain as potential launch and/or instrumentation sites are proposed.

We recommend the draft EIS address specific impacts on fishing (trolling, bottomfishing, shoreline, etc.), diving (SCUBA and snorkel), and other ocean-related activity. Also, specific impacts on endangered marine life (i.e. noise and lights at night on sea turtles) need to be addressed. The selection of Kure Atoll as a potential site should be reconsidered because the marine resources are probably just beginning to recover to a pristine state after many years of use by the U.S. Coast Guard.

We have attached our previous comments concerning PMRF for your consideration.

Yours truly,

William S. Devick

WILLIAM S. DEVICK
Acting Administrator

S.W.0104

COPY FOR YOUR
INFORMATION

State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
DIVISION OF AQUATIC RESOURCES

Date: November 23, 1993

TO: Paul Kawamoto, Program Manager, Aquatic Resources & Environmental Protection
THROUGH: Richard Sixberry, Aquatic Biologist
FROM: Donald Heacock/Brian Kanenaka, Aquatic Biologists *DKL*
SUBJECT: Comments on Final EIS, File No. 94-296

Comment Requested by Roger Evans, Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs Date of Request 11/04/93 Date Rec'd. 11/04/93

Summary of Proposed Project

Title: Pacific Missile Range Easement over State Land for Safety and Ground Hazard Areas for STARS and Navy Vandal Missile Launches

Project by: U.S. Army Space and Strategic Defense Command

Location: Barking Sands, Kauai

Brief Description:

The applicant proposes to acquire a restrictive easement on approximately 2,110 acres of State and Kekaha Sugar Company land adjacent to the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) at Barking Sands, Kauai, to provide protection of all person and private property during missile launches. The applicant is requesting the restrictive easement for a nine-year period beginning on January 1, 1994.

Comments:

Although only a portion of the Final EIS was received, it states that the proposed action has not changed as described in earlier documentation. Therefore, previous comments (dated April 3 & 27, 1992 and June 22, 1992) remain applicable.

However, the applicant still offers no explicit explanation of the methodology used to assure that the cumulative impacts of the proposed action and existing actions (e.g. increased noise levels, chemical "fall-out" from spent rocket boosters, vehicular traffic up and down the beach) will not negatively impact endangered and threatened sea turtles, monk seals and humpback whales. Sea turtles have been documented to nest on the beach at PMRF and the whale population in the nearshore waters adjacent to PMRF are reported to be some of the highest in the State during its season.

Interestingly, with the exception of a monk seal pup which was born on Polihale beach in the 1960's, there have been no reports of monk seals hauling out at Barking Sands beach over the last few years. In contrast, seals have reportedly hauled out at most other beaches around Kauai, including: Miloii, Nualolo Kai, Hanakapiai, Haena, Kilauea, Anini, Anahola, Mahalepu, Poipu, Nomilu Fishpond, Salt Pond, etc. Either seals are not using the beach at Barking Sands or the seals that haul out there are not being reported.

Memo to Paul Kawamoto
Page 2
November 23, 1993

The vehicular traffic on Barking Sands beach (security, other operations) may be the reason that monk seals are not hauling out there. The Final EIS (p.3-10) states that "off-road vehicle use threaten this ecologically sensitive (dune plant community) area." It fails to say that the beach is also a nesting area for sea turtles.

In addition, in order to assess impacts from the proposed project on nearby marine resources, baseline information on the present state of these resources needed to be documented.

State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
DIVISION OF AQUATIC RESOURCES

COPY FOR YOUR
INFORMATION

Date: June 22, 1992

TO: Paul Kawamoto, Program Manager, Aquatic Resources & Environmental Protection
THROUGH: Richard Sixberry, Aquatic Biologist
Brian Kanenaka, Aquatic Biologist *PKC*
FROM: Donald Heacock, Aquatic Biologist
SUBJECT: Comments on FEIS, File No. 92-727

Comment Requested by Roger Evans, Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs Date of Request 05/22/92 Date Rec'd. 05/26/92

Summary of Proposed Project

Title: Final EIS for the Strategic Target System
Project by: U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command
Location: Barking Sands (Kauai Test Facility), Kauai

Brief Description:

The applicant is proposing to launch Strategic Target System vehicles from the Kauai Test Facility to establish land use controls over certain lands and waters adjacent to the launch site. *and*

Comments:

Previous comments on related activities proposed at the Kauai Test Facility remain applicable (see attachments dated April 2, 1992, September 20, 1990, and April 27, 1992).

In addition, the U.S. Army has admitted that there are significant ecological risks involved with the proposed missile launching program (note: up to 146 missiles per year including Polaris). Additionally, public access will be prohibited to some of the finest recreational fishing and ocean recreational areas in the State - ie. Polihale State Park - for up to 146 days per year. The social and economic impacts of this blockage of public access to public fishery resources by recreational and commercial fishermen is inadequately addressed in the FEIS.

The FEIS inadequately addresses the following issues:

1) The potential negative impacts of increased noise and other activities associated with all aspects of the proposed STARS program on protected marine species which are relatively abundant in the nearshore Barking Sands waters. Humpback whales which have shown an increase in population density in this general area over the last 10 years, indicate that this area is a "preferred habitat", and that the area is relatively free from disturbances caused by human activity. The FEIS does not demonstrate that the cumulative impacts of the proposed STARS program related activities, plus all existing PMRF activities, will not have a significant negative impact on these endangered humpback whales, or on other protected species such as sea turtles or monk seals.

Memo to Paul K. Kawamoto
Page 2
June 22, 1992

Re: Comments on STARS FEIS

2) The potential negative impacts of impeding public access to public fishery resources by commercial and recreational fishermen, by native Hawaiian subsistence fishers, and including commercial charter vessels which take visitors from Port Allen Harbor, past PMRF, on tours of the Na Pali Coast.

3) The potential negative impacts associated with the proposed activity may have on recreational fishing, snorkelling and SCUBA diving, charter recreational fishing vessels, tour boats and the "fishing industry".

4) The specific observational methods that will be used prior to launch to reasonably assure that no endangered or threatened species are negatively impacted within the ground hazard area and within the first stage impact zone (which extends 67 miles offshore). Too much noise and disturbance caused by monitoring of protected species (i.e. helicopter aerial surveys/monitoring), may cause as much damage and disturbance to endangered species as the proposed project itself. Therefore, the proposed project must assure that threatened or endangered species are not unduly disturbed by inappropriate levels of surveying and monitoring.

Specific Comments

Page 2-3, although it states that various alternative transportation routes for nitrogen tetroxide have been considered, it does not state which route will be used. Also, although an emergency response team has been recommended by the Office of State Planning (OSP) to be on-hand during the transportation of liquid propellents and an "emergency action plan" is reportedly in place in case these liquid propellents are spilled into estuaries (ie. Port Allen or Nawiliwili) or streams and rivers (eg. Huleiea, Hanapepe, Waimea Rivers or Waikomo, Lawai, Nawiliwili, Puuli Streams) that bisect the highway, there is no mention of biological databases that have been collected or are available on these estuarine or riverine ecosystems before this project is approved so that environmental impacts can be determined during and after a fuel spillage.

P. 2-4, does not explain association between the 1,200 foot Explosive Safety Quantity Distance (ESQD-cited in DEIS) and the 10,000 foot Ground Hazard Area shown in Figure 2-13. Does this area defined by a 10,000 foot radius represent a marine environment that could be negatively impacted during accidental or intentional termination (explosion) of missiles. Additionally, this figure gives an incomplete picture of the potential hazard to persons located in the nearshore waters in boats, kayaks, on surfboards, etc., since the "sea level hazard zone" continues offshore and includes both the nearshore waters and the first stage impact zone which extends 67 miles offshore. Furthermore, there is no mention of possible risk to Niihau residents and fishermen since they may be within the trajectory of the first stage impact zone, particularly in case of accidental or intentional termination of missile flight plan.

P. 2-5, states that "prior to launch operation..." there will be great effort to assure that no persons are within the ground hazard area (we assume this includes the nearshore waters and the first stage impact zone which extends 67 miles offshore), but there is no detailed mention of specific observational methods used in pre-launch surveys

Memo to Paul K. Kawamoto
Page 3
June 22, 1992

Re: Comments on STARS FEIS

that will be included in searching these areas (ie. ground hazard area and first stage impact zone) for endangered or threatened species (ie. will sonar be used to detect presence of humpback whales, will helicopters be used to assess presence of monk seals or sea turtles on adjacent beaches, etc.). This is particularly important considering that humpback whales are relatively abundant in the nearshore waters off Barking Sands for almost 6 months of the year, and sea turtles are common year round.

Furthermore, although OSP has recommended (p. 4-19 of FEIS) that "a trainer/observer under the supervision of the Environmental Office and in coordination with the NMFS will conduct daily surveys for green turtles during the nesting season (May-August)", there is no mention of requiring daily surveys for humpback whales during their breeding season (Dec.-June) or during the "pupping season" for Hawaiian monk seals which peaks in summer months but can occur year-round. Daily surveys for these species during their "spawning" season should also be required.

Also, OSP recommended (cited above) that "prior to launch the waters and beach areas of the launch safety zone and launch hazard area shall be surveyed for the presence of humpback whales and monk seals". Unfortunately, the FEIS does not adequately describe the appropriate survey methods (scientifically/statistically valid) that will be used to assess the presence, population size estimation, and distribution of protected marine animals. Such biological baseline/monitoring data on protected species is essential in order to assess the potential negative effects of the proposed STARS missile launching program on humpback whale, Hawaiian monk seal, and sea turtle populations.

P. 2-5, mentions restricting public access to the ground hazard area (which includes blocking public access to Polihale State Park. The increase in the time (from 30% to 58%) that parts of the Pacific Missile Range Facility recreational areas are closed to public access (including recreational fishing) appears to be significant. Also, what are the economic impacts of the safety zone/area closure in the nearshore waters on commercial and recreational fishing from boats, on commercial tour vessels that run to the Na Pali Coast from Port Allen, on shoreline fishermen, and on having to evacuate visitors and residents previously authorized to recreate in Polihale State Park (a popular fishing destination)?

P. 2-6, under the no action alternative the potential impacts of the GPALS program on aquatic resources adjacent to PMRF cannot be ascertained since the GPALS program is not explained.

P. 2-12, states that pH measurements as low as 0.1 have been measured in areas downwind from missile launch areas due to the acidification effects of the solid-fuel booster exhaust, and that short-term depression of surface water pH and kills of small fishes in nearby shallow water areas has occurred. Because ambient water pH below 6.0 generally cause stress or are toxic to fish, how will the acidification of the nearshore marine (intertidal and shallow subtidal) waters effect the rich intertidal biota, particularly intertidal seaweeds which sea turtles greatly are dependent upon for food? Although the FEIS claims that no significant impacts are expected, it will be impossible to ascertain actual impacts on the intertidal and shallow subtidal biota unless a detailed database/biological assessment is conducted by monitoring biological communities before,

Memo to Paul K. Kawamoto
Page 4
June 22, 1992

Re: Comments on STARS FEIS

during, and after proposed launches.

P. 2-14, although the "region of biological influence" is finally described, there is no mention of what types of scientific survey methods will be used to collect baseline biological data, and to establish meaningful monitoring programs, on endangered and threatened marine species, and on living aquatic resources upon which they are dependent upon for food, before, during and after the proposed activity.

P. 2-17 and 2-18 (Fig. 4-1A), it is impossible to tell from the figure if the U.S. Army considered our earlier (26 March 1992) comments suggesting that the new proposed EDX launch pad be located further to the N-E (away from the ocean), thereby significantly reducing potential negative impacts on living aquatic resources and on water quality.

attach.

State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
DIVISION OF AQUATIC RESOURCES

Date: April 27, 1992

TO: Paul Kawamoto, Program Manager, Aquatic Resources & Environmental Protection
THRU: Richard Sixberry, Aquatic Biologist
FROM: Brian Kanenaka, Aquatic Biologist
SUBJECT: Comments on EA, File No. 92-632

Comment Requested by Roger Evans, Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs Date of Request 04/14/92 Date Rec'd. 04/14/92

Summary of Proposed Project

Title: EA for Kauai Test Facility
Project by: Sandia National Laboratories, Dept. of Energy
Location: Mana (Kauai Test Facility), Kauai

Brief Description:

The applicant is proposing to continue launching rockets with experimental payloads from the Sandia National Laboratories' Kauai Test Facility (KTF) at Mana, Kauai. The applicant also plans to construct new roadways, fencing, fuel handling, and launch pad facilities; test vertical-launch (including, but not limited to the Strategic Target Systems and Exoatmospheric Discrimination Experiment) as well as rail-launch vehicles; and transport solid rocket fuels.

Comments:

Previous comments on related activities proposed at the Kauai Test Facility remain applicable (see attachments dated April 2, 1992 and September 20, 1990).

In addition, potential adverse impacts on aquatic resources can be minimized if precautions are taken to prevent construction debris, petroleum products, and other contaminants from entering the nearby coastal waters.

attach.

State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
DIVISION OF AQUATIC RESOURCES

Date: April 2, 1992

TO: Paul Kawamoto, Program Manager, Aquatic Resources & Environmental Protection
THROUGH: Richard Sixberry, Aquatic Biologist
FROM: Donald Heacock, Aquatic Biologist, Aquatic Biologist
SUBJECT: Comments on Draft EIS, File No. 92-529

Comment Requested by Roger Evans, Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs Date of Request 03/06/92 Date Rec'd. 03/06/92

Summary of Proposed Project

Title: Draft EIS for the Strategic Target System
Project by: U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command
Location: Mana (Pacific Missile Range), Kauai

Brief Description:

The applicant proposes to launch nonnuclear payloads (experiments and test objects) from the Kauai Test Facility at the Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, through near space on a suborbital trajectory.

Comments:

Previous comments on the environmental assessment for the Strategic Target Systems remain applicable (see attachment dated September 20, 1990).

We note in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) a 1,250-foot Explosive Safety Quality Distance (ESQD) arc from around the launch pad testing area is required. We note further that the newly proposed (Exoatmospheric Discrimination Experiment (EDX) launch pad location increases the amount of surface area of the nearshore marine environment placed within the ESQD by two to three times (Figure 4-1 in the DEIS) which could potentially increase the adverse impact to nearshore water quality and the biota if an accident or explosion occurs. Relocation of the proposed EDX launch pad to the northeast side of the existing launch pad could reduce potential negative impacts to marine resources, but an accident or explosion at the northeast location could negatively impact the freshwater and estuarine biota and water quality of Nohili Stream which discharges into the ocean at Nohili Point. However, relocation of the proposed EDX launch pad would also eliminate the need to close an additional 28% of the beach to public access for 48-90 days/year for three years.

The DEIS for the proposed Strategic Target Systems inadequately addresses the potential impacts the program may have on nearshore marine ecosystems, particularly endangered and threatened species around Kauai and Niihau. Although the DEIS states (p. 4-30) that any whale or sensitive species observed in the launch area will cause any ongoing launching to be delayed, it does not state how the "observations" would be made to assure that these animals are not negatively impacted.

We suggest the foregoing at least be considered during the preparation of the final document.

attach.

State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
DIVISION OF AQUATIC RESOURCES

Date: September 20, 1990

TO: Paul Kawamoto, Program Manager, Aquatic Resources & Environmental Protection
FROM: Richard Sixberry, Aquatic Biologist
SUBJECT: Comments on Environmental Assessment, File #91-36 & #91-49

Comment Requested by Roger Evans, Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs
Date of Request 08/13/90
Date Rec'd. 08/13/90

Summary of Proposed Project

Title: Strategic Target Systems - Exoatmospheric Discrimination Experiment & Strategic Target Systems

Project by: Department of the Army

Location: Barking Sands, Kauai

Brief Description:

The Department of the Army (DOA) has initiated an extensive research program to determine the feasibility of developing an effect ballistic missile defense system at Barking Sands, Kauai. The proposed activities would consist of design, booster motor refurbishment and testing, fabrication/assembly/testing, flight preparation, launch/flight/data collection and data analysis.

Comments:

The following comments are late because of the difficulty obtaining the EA and other necessary material, from any source, for review. Our biologist on Kauai, after considerable effort, finally obtained a copy of the EA from the Army.

Our Kauai biologist recommends that a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be prepared that would address the potential impacts to aquatic resource values, especially the effects of construction and operational activities on the aquatic environment, resources, and fisheries values known to exist near the facility.

Additionally, mitigation measures for possible accidents (fuel spillage, fires, etc. and possible increased use of the ocean waters for security and testing, and other impacts which could adversely affect the fishing activities, aquatic resource and/or the offshore environment should be fully described in the EIS.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KLEKANA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO
5090
Ser 00/0215
11 March 1998

Mr William Devick
Division of Aquatic Resources
State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources
1151 Punchbowl St
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr Devick:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: We recommend the draft EIS address specific impacts on fishing (trolling, bottomfishing, shoreline, etc.), diving (SCUBA and snorkel), and other ocean-related activity.

Response 1: The Land Use sections of the enclosed Draft EIS address impacts to shore fishing and other recreational activities that occur along the coast for each location. The Socioeconomic sections of the EIS address impacts to commercial fishing. No adverse impacts to recreation or commercial fishing would be expected under the No-Action Alternative or Proposed Action.


Comment 2: Also, specific impacts on endangered marine life (i.e. noise and lights at night on sea turtles) need to be addressed. The selection of Kure Atoll as a potential site should be reconsidered because the marine resources are probably just beginning to recover to a pristine state after many years of use by the US Coast Guard.

Response 2: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4. Kure Atoll is no longer being considered as a candidate support site for the Proposed Action.

S-W-0057

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS,
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & TOURISM

OFFICE OF PLANNING

235 South Beretania Street, 6th Flr., Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 2359, Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Ref. No. P-6748

June 18, 1997

S-W-076

BENJAMIN J. CAYETAN
GOVERNOR
SERJEANT
AT ARMS
DIRECTOR
BRADLEY J. MOSSMAN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
RICK EGGER
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PLANNING

Tel: (808) 587-28
Fax: (808) 587-28

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice for Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii

This responds to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Preparation Notice (PN) for Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii.

Coastal Zone Management Federal Consistency

The broader Federal proposed action described in the EIS PN, including use of Federal, State and private land, and ocean areas, triggers the Federal consistency requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act, Section 307(c), and the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 15, Part 930. In accordance with the Federal regulations, we are notifying you that the Navy and/or the Department of Defense will need to submit a CZM consistency determination to the Office of Planning for our concurrence. The following information will be needed for the consistency review.

1. We prefer that the Final EIS be submitted with the CZM consistency determination to ensure that the information necessary for the CZM review is complete and so that a thorough review can be conducted. The EIS should include an evaluation of the proposed action's consistency with Hawaii's CZM Program.
2. As required by 15 CFR 930, the Navy and/or the Department of Defense must provide a statement indicating whether or not the proposed activity will be undertaken in a manner consistent to the maximum extent practicable with Hawaii's Coastal Zone Management Program.
3. The consistency statement must be based upon an evaluation of the relevant provisions of Hawaii's Coastal Zone Management Program contained in Section 205A-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, which is enclosed. The CZM consistency determination should provide information about the proposed action's effects on public recreation and access; effects on endangered, threatened, or native plants and animals; effects on scenic and open space resources; effects on historic, cultural and archaeological resources; effects on coastal ecosystems; and potential coastal hazards

Ms. Vida Mossman
Page 2
June 18, 1997



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0231
11 March 1998

such as wave inundation and shore erosion. Proposed mitigation measures should also be discussed.

4. If the project has received approvals or clearances from State and Federal resource agencies, such as the State Historic Preservation Division and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, these should be included with the CZM consistency determination.

If you have any questions, please call John Nakagawa of our CZM Program at (808) 587-2878. Please note that the Hawaii CZM Program is now within the Office of Planning, Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, and our new mailing address is P.O. Box 2359, Honolulu, Hawaii 96804.

Sincerely,

Rick Egged,
Director
Office of Planning

cc: Planning Department, County of Kauai
Mr. Dennis R. Gallien, U.S. Army Space
and Strategic Defense Command

Mr Rick Egged
Office of Planning
Dept of Business Economic Development and Tourism
235 South Beretania Street 6th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr Egged:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: We prefer that the Final EIS be submitted with the CZM consistency determination to ensure that the information necessary for the CZM review is complete and so that a thorough review can be conducted. The EIS should include an evaluation of the proposed action's consistency with the Hawaii's CZM program.

As required by the 15 CFR 930, the Navy and/or Department of Defense must provide a statement indicating whether or not the proposed activity will be undertaken in a manner consistent to the maximum extent practicable with Hawaii's Coastal Zone Management Program. The consistency statement must be based upon an evaluation of the relevant provisions of Hawaii's Coastal Zone Management Program contained in Section 205A-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, which is enclosed. The CZM consistency determination should provide information about the proposed action's effects on public recreation and access; effects on endangered, threatened or native plants and animals; effects on scenic and open space resources; effects on historic, cultural and archeological resources; effects on coastal ecosystems; and potential coastal hazards.

Response 1: In coordination with your staff, we will initiate CZM consistency determination with the Draft EIS and complete it after the Final EIS.

Comment 2: If the project has received approvals or clearances from State and Federal resource agencies, such as the State Historic Preservation Division and the US Fish and Wildlife Service, these should be included with the CZM consistency determination.

Response 2: We thank you for your interest and your response. The results of other agency consultation will be forwarded to your office when received and made a part of the Final EIS.

S-W-0076

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimoa on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL

276 SOUTH BERETANIA STREET
SUITE 702
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
TELEPHONE (808) 588-4186
FACSIMILE (808) 588-4186

S-W-061

GARY GILL
DIRECTOR

June 23, 1997

Mr. Michael Wilson, Chair
Department of Land and Natural Resources
P.O. Box 621
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice for
Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the
Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai

This is in response to the review of the subject document. We have
the following questions and comments.

1. Please describe the types and characteristics of missiles that will be launched from the various sites. What are the failure rates of the missiles? Will the new missiles require changes to the size of the Ground Hazard Area?
2. Please consider the cumulative impacts of this project when added to the STARS and VANDAL missile launching operations.
3. What is the frequency and length of time in which the easement area will be closed to conduct missile launching activities?
4. The project proposes to use the restricted easement until the year 2030. What is the likelihood of the existing sugar cane operations shutting down? Should the sugar operations cease, how would the restricted easement preclude future beneficial uses of the state lands?
5. Please disclose any lease, easement and/or use of ceded lands for this project.
6. Please evaluate whether traditional and customary gathering right of native Hawaiians will be impacted by the project.

S-W-0076



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0223
11 March 1998

Mr. Wilson
June 23, 1997
Page 2

7. Please consider the alternative of moving the launch site at PMRF southward to reduce impacts on Polihale Beach Park.
8. Should a missile fail after launching, what would be the likely contents of the falling debris? For materials that are hazardous, please state how they may impact public health and/or the surrounding environment.
9. Many threatened and endangered species of flora and fauna occur in the restrictive easement and the surrounding area. What are the mitigation measures to protect the rare plants and animals from mishaps such as brush fires?
10. The project proposes to build additional communication towers in Kokee. The views to and from the Kokee area are valuable resources. Please illustrate the visual impacts of the proposed structures from public places such as roads and lookouts. Photos of existing conditions taken from public view points are helpful in evaluating visual impacts. Renderings of future structures superimposed on photos of existing views should be provided.
11. The project proposes to upgrade the runway at Kure Atoll. Please describe in detail the scope of work, impacts and mitigation measures relating to the runway improvements.
12. Please include in the DEIS a review of the social impacts the proposed additional military activity will have on the people of Niihau. In specific, please include an analysis of the intactness of the island's native culture and how contact with military operations may modify the unique lifestyle of its residents. Also, please analyze and quantify the economic impact the proposed operations may have on the island's economy and people.

Should you have any questions, please call Jeyan Thirugnanam at 586-4185.

Sincerely,

Gary Gill
Director

c: PMRF

Mr Gary Gill
Office of Environmental Quality Control
State of Hawaii
236 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr Gill:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: Please describe the types and characteristics of missiles that will be launched from the various sites. What are the failure rates of the missiles? Will the new missiles require changes to the size of the Ground Hazard Area?
- Response 1: The types and characteristics of the missiles that are currently being launched, as well as the missiles that would be launched under the Proposed Action, are identified in Appendix A of the enclosed Draft EIS. Potential early termination events are described and analyzed in Section 3.1.1.7. The Ground Hazard Areas for the proposed missiles are identified in Chapter 2 of the EIS.
- Comment 2: Please consider the cumulative impacts of this project when added to the STARS and VANDAL missile launching operations.
- Response 2: The enclosed Draft EIS does consider the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed action. Potential cumulative impacts, if any, are described in each appropriate section of Section 4.
- Comment 3: What is the frequency and length of time in which the easement area will be closed to conduct missile launching activities?
- Response 3: The frequency and length of time in which the restrictive easement will be used under the Proposed Action will not change from current conditions. The restrictive easement can be used up to 30 times per year. Impacts of the closure of the restrictive easement area are described in Section 4.1.2 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 4: The project proposes to use the restricted easement until the year 2030. What is the likelihood of the existing sugar cane operations shutting down? Should the sugar operations cease, how would the restrictive easement preclude future beneficial uses of the state lands?
- Response 4: The restrictive easement would allow continued agriculture use of the land within the easement boundary. This continued agriculture use is consistent with the State and County agriculture land use zoning of the area.
- Comment 5: Please disclose any lease, easement and/or use of ceded lands for this project.

5-W-0061

- Response 5: The Land Title Appendix in the Draft EIS addresses ownership and lease agreements involving PMRF and Department of Energy activities in the Hawaiian Islands. The Land Use sections in the Draft EIS address the use of ceded lands where applicable.
- Comment 6: Please evaluate whether traditional and customary gathering right of native Hawaiians will be impacted by the project.
- Response 6: The Draft EIS incorporates information from a recent analysis of material and cultural circumstances on Niihau, developed by an independent expert working with the people of the island. That report has been translated into Hawaiian by residents of Niihau to facilitate groundtruthing.
- The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources.
- Comment 7: Please consider the alternative of moving the launch site at PMRF southward to reduce impacts on Polihale Beach Park.
- Response 7: Moving the launch location would not meet the operational needs of the Navy's TBMD program.
- Comment 8: Should a missile fail after launching, what would be the likely contents of the falling debris? For materials that are hazardous, please state how they may impact public health and/or the surrounding environment.
- Response 8: The Health and Safety sections of the Draft EIS address the potential for a missile mishap. All debris from a missile mishap would fall within an area that is cleared of all non-participants. All hazardous debris from such a mishap would be removed and treated as hazardous waste, if required. If a fire should occur the Navy would have fire equipment on standby to quickly manage the hazardous condition. Since the Navy would remediate any hazards from the area shortly after the missile mishap, no long-term impacts would be anticipated.
- Comment 9: Many threatened and endangered species of flora and fauna occur in the restrictive easement and the surrounding area. What are the mitigation measures to protect the rare plants and animals from mishaps such as brush fires?
- Response 9: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 10: The project proposes to build additional communication towers in Kokee. The views to and from the Kokee area are valuable resources. Please illustrate the visual impacts of the proposed structures from public places such as roads and lookouts. Photos of existing conditions taken from public view points are helpful in evaluating visual impacts. Renderings of future structures superimposed on photos of existing views should be provided.
- Response 10: None of the proposed additions to the Kokee site would extend higher than the vegetation around the site, and therefore, would not be visible to the public. Sections 3.1.4.12 and 4.1.4.12 analyze visual impacts at Kokee.
- Comment 11: The project proposes to upgrade the runway at Kure Atoll. Please describe in detail the scope of work, impacts and mitigation measures related to the runway improvements.
- Response 11: Kure Atoll is no longer under consideration as a potential location for the Navy's Area TBMD program, and consequently is not covered by this EIS.
- Comment 12: Please include in the DEIS a review of the social impacts the proposed additional military activity

will have on the people of Niihau. In specific, please include an analysis of the intactness of the island's native culture and how contact with military operations may modify the unique lifestyle of its residents. Also, please analyze and quantify the economic impact the proposed operations may have on the island's economy and people.

- Response 12: The Draft EIS incorporates information from a recent analysis of material and cultural circumstances on Niihau, developed by an independent expert working with the people of the island. That report has been translated into Hawaiian by the residents of Niihau to facilitate groundtruthing.

The Draft EIS includes a review of the social and economic impacts of the Proposed Action on the residents of Niihau. Site preparation would, where possible, be carried out by Niihau ranch employees, with minimal contact being made with non-islanders. Military operations would fall under the terms of the current non-contact protocol. The use of the Island's transport facilities and other amenities would be strictly controlled, while providing economic benefits to the islanders.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

June 2, 1997

S-W-002

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR

DEPUTY DIRECTORS
JERRY M. MATSUDA
GLENN M. OKIMOTO

IN REPLY REFER TO:

STP 8.7957



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0168
11 March 1998

Mr Kazu Hayashida
State of Hawaii Dept of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-5097

Dear Mr Hayashida:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: The EIS should identify traffic impacts and mitigation measures attributable to the proposed action.

Response 1: The Transportation section for each location in Section 4 describes the traffic impacts and any necessary mitigation measures for both the No-action and Proposed Action alternatives.

Comment 2: Plans for construction work within the State Highway right-of-way must be submitted for our review and approval.

Response 2: Any construction work within the State Highway right-of-way would be submitted for review and approval to the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice
(EISPN)
State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the
Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility

Thank you for your transmittal of May 7, 1997, requesting our review on the subject EISPN.

Our comments are as follows:

1. The EIS should identify traffic impacts and mitigation measures attributable to the proposed action.
2. Plans for construction work within the State Highway right-of-way must be submitted for our review and approval.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments.

Very truly yours,

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES
P. O. BOX 119, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810

S-W-084

SAM CALLEJO
COMPTROLLER

MARY PATRICIA WATERHOUSE
DEPUTY COMPTROLLER

(P) 1412.7

LETTER NO.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0237
11 March 1998

JUN 18 1997

Mr Gordon Matsuoka
State of Hawaii
Dept of Accounting and General Services
PO Box 119
Honolulu, HI 96810

Dear Mr Matsuoka:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document. We have no comments to offer.

Response 1: Thank You.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P. O. Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISPN) for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document. We have no comments to offer.

If there are any questions, please have your staff contact Mr. Ronald Ching of the Planning Branch at 586-0490.

Sincerely,

Gordon Matsuoka
GORDON MATSUOKA
State Public Works Engineer

RC: jy

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
Governor



State of Hawaii
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
1428 So. King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814 2512

June 10, 1997

JAMES J. NAKATANI
Chairperson, Board of Agriculture

LETITIA N. UYEHARA
Deputy to the Chairperson

Mailing Address:
P. O. Box 22159
Honolulu, Hawaii 96823-2159

FAX: (808) 973-9613

Ms. Vida Mossman
June 10, 1997
Page -2-

The draft EIS should identify any adverse impact(s) upon any affected agricultural activities that may arise from the extension of and any alteration to the restrictive easement area and easement covenants.

Should you have any questions, please call Earl Yamamoto at 973-9466.

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P. O. Box 128
Kekaha Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice
Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Kokee, Kauai
Area: approximately 2,039 acres

The Department of Agriculture has reviewed the subject document and offers the following comments.

The Navy seeks to extend their existing restrictive easement through December 31, 2030 to conduct missile testing. The current easement was established in 1993 and ends in 2002. This easement gives the Navy the authority to restrict access to the land within the restrictive easement prior to, during, and shortly after a launch.

The restrictive easement allows agricultural use of the lands mauka of the Kaunualii Highway and the PMRF. Construction of any buildings must be approved by the Navy. AMFAC Sugar-Kauai (formerly Kekaha Sugar Company) cultivates sugarcane within the restrictive easement. Pioneer Hi-Bred International has about 60 acres of seed corn within the restrictive easement.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. NAKATANI
Chairperson, Board of Agriculture

pmf.eis





DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0210
11 March 1998

Mr James Nakatani
Department of Agriculture

State of Hawaii

1428 So King Street
Honolulu, HI 96814-2512

Dear Mr Nakatani:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: AMFAC Sugar-Kauai (formerly Kekaha Sugar Company) cultivates sugarcane within the restrictive easement. Pioneer Hi-Bred International has about 60 acres of seed corn within the restrictive easement. The draft EIS should identify any adverse impact(s) upon any affected agricultural activities that may arise from the extension of and any alteration to the restrictive easement area and easement covenants.

Response 1: Section 4.1.2.7, Restrictive Easement Land Use, addresses the use of agricultural areas within the Mana Plain. Conditions of the restrictive easement under the Proposed Action would be the same as current conditions except it would allow for the launch of different types of missile systems.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0045

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
HOUSING FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
877 OHALEA STREET, SUITE 300
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
FAX (808) 587-0600

S-W-086

ROY S. OSHIRO
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

IN REPLY REFER TO:

97:PPE/2023

June 2, 1997

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Re: Preparation Notice for State of Hawaii Actions Related to
Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range
Facility

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject EISPN.

We have no housing related comments to offer at this time.

Sincerely,



Roy S. Oshiro
Executive Director





DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0239
 11 March 1998

Mr Roy S Oshiro
 State of Hawaii
 Housing Finance and Development Corp
 677 Queen Street Suite 300
 Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr Oshiro:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject EISPN. We have no housing related comments to offer at this time.

Response 1: Thank You.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S.W-0086

PHONE (808) 594-1888



STATE OF HAWAII
 OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
 711 KAPOLANI BOULEVARD, SUITE 500
 HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

FAX (808) 594-1865

S-W-021

June 10, 1997

Ms. Vida Mossman
 Pacific Missile Range Facility
 P.O. Box 128
 Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Preparation Notice for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Island of Kauai.

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Preparation Notice for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Island of Kauai.

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) intends to thoroughly review the EIS once the document is available for public comment. OHA's major concerns are potential adverse impacts on air and water quality, flora and fauna, cultural resources, geology and soils, land use, socio-economics, and scenic resources. OHA expects major sections of the EIS addressing key issues such as (i) the use of ceded lands, (ii) public safety and health protection, (iii) preservation and conservation of wildlife habitats, (iv) protection and preservation of cultural resources, (v) handling of hazardous materials and hazardous waste, and (vi) Native Hawaiian rights, (rights to the land base and associated resources and access rights for traditional and customary practices).

In addition, OHA is deeply concerned with the proposal to launch missiles from the Island of Niihau. OHA expects the EIS to thoroughly address the special impacts of this proposal on the Native Hawaiian community on Niihau. These impacts should not be limited to discussions of economics but should include a full and frank discussion of the effect of bringing modern military operations to an isolated and culturally traditional island community.

Letter to Ms. Mossman
Page two

Please contact Lynn Lee, Acting Officer of the Land and Natural Resources Division, or Luis Manrique, should you have any questions on this matter.

Sincerely yours,



Martha Ross
Deputy Administrator

LM:lm

cc Trustee Clayton Hee, Board Chair
Trustee Abraham Aiona, Board Vice-Chair
Trustee Rowena Akana, Land & Sovereignty Chair
Trustee Haunani Apoliona
Trustee Billie Beamer
Trustee Frenchy DeSoto
Trustee Moses Keale
Trustee Colette Machado
Trustee Hannah Springer
Sesmita Moepono, Acting Administrator
CAC, Island of Kauai



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0196
11 March 1998

Ms Martha Ross
State of Hawaii Office of Hawaiian Affairs
711 Kapiolani Blvd Suite 500
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Ms Ross:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: OHA expects major sections of the EIS addressing key issues such as 1) the use of ceded lands

Response 1: The Land Use sections in the EIS address the use of ceded lands where applicable. Specifically, Section 4.1.5.7 describes the area required for the proposed ordnance storage magazines, encompassing ceded lands.

Comment 2: 2) public safety and health protection

Response 2: The EIS addresses public safety and health protection for each location evaluated. Sections 4.1.1.7 and 4.2.1.7 describe potential impacts to human health and safety.

Comment 3: 3) preservation and conservation of wildlife habitats

Response 3: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 4: 4) protection and preservation of cultural resources

Response 4: The Navy will comply with the NHPA Section 106 review and comment process and the ACHP's regulations implementing Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800). PMRF would consult with the island's proprietors, the community of Ni'ihau, the Hawaii SHPO, and the ACHP, to establish and/or implement measures to ensure mitigation of any impacts to potential cultural resources that could result from PMRF's proposed actions on Ni'ihau. Sections addressing cultural resources are provided for each candidate site and support area in Section 3, Affected Environment, and Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

Comment 5: 5) handling of hazardous materials and hazardous waste

Response 5: The Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste sections of Section 3 and Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS address the use and disposal of these materials at each location evaluated.

Comment 6: 6) Native Hawaiian rights, (rights to the land base and associated resources and access rights for traditional and customary practices).

Response 6: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues

were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources.


Comment 7: In addition, OHA is deeply concerned with the proposal to launch missiles from the Island of Niihau. OHA expects the EIS to thoroughly address the special impacts of this proposal on the Native Hawaiian community on Niihau. These impacts should not be limited to discussions of economics but should include a full and frank discussion of the effect of bringing modern military operations to an isolated and culturally traditional island community.

Response 7: The socioeconomic sections of the enclosed Draft EIS (Sections 4.2.1.10 and 4.5.2.9) examine the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on the economy and culture of Niihau. In addition, Section 4.5, Environmental Justice, describes potential impacts to Native Hawaiians on Kauai and Niihau.

This Draft EIS has depended significantly on independent work that was already underway on Niihau prior to beginning this EIS process. That work has been groundtruthed by the people of Niihau, including its translation into Hawaiian by persons on the island. Relying on that work, and other available information, it is concluded that the Proposed Action would provide significant economic benefits to the people of the island and Niihau infrastructure, and that an existing Niihau Protection Protocol, appropriately strengthened, will minimize contact between military personnel and Niihau residents and protect Niihau's cultural circumstances.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,



J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
LAND DIVISION
P.O. BOX 821
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM
AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND DEER RECREATION
CONSERVATION AND
RESEARCH ENFORCEMENT
CORPUSCULES
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
LAND DIVISION
STATE PARKS
WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

S-W-083

1997

Ref: LD-GM

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Subject: OEQC Questions and Comments - Environmental Impact
Statement Preparation Notice Regarding PMRF
Enhanced Capabilities, Barking Sands, Kauai


Enclosed is Gary Gill's, Director, Office of Environmental
Quality Control, June 23, 1997 letter addressed to our Chairperson
with his questions and comments in connection with the above
referenced subject.

Please have an appropriate response prepared.

Should you have any questions, please call Gary Martin at 1-
808-587-0421.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,



DEAN Y. UCHIDA
Administrator

Enclosure

c: Kauai Land Board Member
Kauai District Land Office

S-W-0021

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
GOVERNOR17 JUN 23 10 04 AM '97
STATE OF HAWAII

JUN 25 4 04 AM '97

GARY GILL
DIRECTOR

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL

236 SOUTH PIKETANIA STREET
STATE 702
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
PHONE (808) 586-4185
FACSIMILE (808) 586-4188

June 23, 1997

Mr. Michael Wilson, Chair
Department of Land and Natural Resources
P.O. Box 621
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice for
Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the
Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai

This is in response to the review of the subject document. We have
the following questions and comments.

1. Please describe the types and characteristics of missiles that will be launched from the various sites. What are the failure rates of the missiles? Will the new missiles require changes to the size of the Ground Hazard Area?
2. Please consider the cumulative impacts of this project when added to the STARS and VANDAL missile launching operations.
3. What is the frequency and length of time in which the easement area will be closed to conduct missile launching activities?
4. The project proposes to use the restricted easement until the year 2030. What is the likelihood of the existing sugar cane operations shutting down? Should the sugar operations cease, how would the restricted easement preclude future beneficial uses of the state lands?
5. Please disclose any lease, easement and/or use of ceded lands for this project.
6. Please evaluate whether traditional and customary gathering right of native Hawaiians will be impacted by the project.

Mr. Wilson
June 23, 1997
Page 2

7. Please consider the alternative of moving the launch site at PMRF southward to reduce impacts on Polihale Beach Park.
8. Should a missile fail after launching, what would be the likely contents of the falling debris? For materials that are hazardous, please state how they may impact public health and/or the surrounding environment.
9. Many threatened and endangered species of flora and fauna occur in the restrictive easement and the surrounding area. What are the mitigation measures to protect the rare plants and animals from mishaps such as brush fires?
10. The project proposes to build additional communication towers in Kokee. The views to and from the Kokee area are valuable resources. Please illustrate the visual impacts of the proposed structures from public places such as roads and lookouts. Photos of existing conditions taken from public view points are helpful in evaluating visual impacts. Renderings of future structures superimposed on photos of existing views should be provided.
11. The project proposes to upgrade the runway at Kure Atoll. Please describe in detail the scope of work, impacts and mitigation measures relating to the runway improvements.
12. Please include in the DEIS a review of the social impacts the proposed additional military activity will have on the people of Niihau. In specific, please include an analysis of the intactness of the island's native culture and how contact with military operations may modify the unique lifestyle of its residents. Also, please analyze and quantify the economic impact the proposed operations may have on the island's economy and people.

Should you have any questions, please call Jeyan Thirugnanam at 586-4185.

Sincerely,


Gary Gill
Director

cc: PMRF



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0236
 11 March 1998

Mr Dean Y Uchida
 State of Hawaii
 Dept of Land and Natural Resources
 PO Box 621
 Honolulu, HI 96809

Dear Mr Uchida:


Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Enclosed is Gary Gill's, Director, Office of Environmental Quality Control, June 23, 1997 letter addressed to our Chairperson with his questions and comments in connection with the above referenced subject. Please have an appropriate response prepared.

Response 1: Thank you for forwarding the letter. A copy of our response can be found after Gary Gill's letter in the Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0083

BEAUAIRD F. CAYLEFANO
 GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



STATE OF HAWAII
 DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
 STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION
 33 SOUTH KING STREET, 6TH FLOOR
 HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

REF: HP-EIS

JUL - 8 1997

Vida Mossman
 Department of the Navy
 Pacific Missile Range Facility
 P.O. Box 128
 Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

SUBJECT: Historic Preservation Review -- Preparation Notice for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
 Barking Sands, Waimea, Kauai


Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. All of the proposed projects will require National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 Compliance. Since these projects are all federal undertakings, even those on private lands (Niihau) and local public lands (State of Hawaii) will require compliance with this Federal law and its regulations.

In general, this notice was very weak on the background material covering historic properties -- review of prior archaeological work and of historic information on settlement patterns. While we agree it is only a preparation notice, our staff spent considerable time with the consultant covering such background material, and this notice lacks most of this information.

We have specific comments on many of the sections. See attachment.

If you have any questions, please call Nancy McMahon, our Kauai Island Archaeologist, at 742-7033.

Aloha,


 Michael D. Wilson, Chairperson and
 State Historic Preservation Officer

S-W-077

MICHAEL B. WILSON, CHAIRPERSON
 BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

DEPUTY
 Gilbert Coloma-Agaran

AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
 AQUATIC RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
 CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT CONVEYANCES
 FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
 HISTORIC PRESERVATION
 OPEN SPACE
 LAND MANAGEMENT
 STATE PARKS
 WATER AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

LOG: 19556 ✓
 DOC: 9706NM121

ATTACHMENT

COMMENTS ON EIS PREPARATION NOTICE:

p. 3-2 Cultural Resources: This section is very generic and should be more specific to PMRF and the type of sites likely to be found in your projects areas. This section really does not have much substance. What are the areas of concern. We disagree that the resources are described in detail in the rest of the notice.

p. 3-11, section 3.1.1.3 Cultural Resources for the Restrictive Easement Area. List appropriate reports and resources as your references. The cultural and archaeological reports should be referenced. Have you checked with State Parks on their survey work of Polihale? We believe that there are historic sites and you need to document this.

p. 3-24, section 3.1.2.3 Kamokala Caves. No section 106 Compliance was ever done for the use of these caves. Documentation of the caves should be conducted, to determine if there is cultural significance for the sites. We agree that the cane land are not likely have significant historic sites due to the subsurface disturbance, but all other areas that will be impacted should be surveyed and documented.

p. 3-25, section 3.1.3 Makaha Ridge. There is no section on the Cultural Resources. A statement should be included on this area. Several surveys have taken place here. This information is then used to confirm that no sites exist.

p. 3-28, section 3.1.4 Kokee. Again no section on cultural resources could be found. Background references and a statement should be included in order to conclude that there is no effect.

p. 3-35, section 3.2.1 Niihau. Section 106 compliance will be required on all of the activities to be conducted here. The old Coast Guard buildings should be evaluated for significance. The 1987 Kikuchi report that was referenced has never been reviewed or accepted by the SHPD. It is a limited survey in the northeastern portions of the island, so the generalizations are limited to this area of the island only. This report needs to be updated to meet standards for acceptability. The areas to be impacted by this project will need to be surveyed to address Section 106 concerns. Oral histories should also be conducted.

p. 3-43, section 3.2.2.3 Kure. This section is fine. Background be should included on Kure's use as a World War II battlefield.

p. 4-2, section 4.0 Environmental Mitigation, Cultural Resources. We concur that Section 106 needs to be completed for all Federal actions on the 13 resource areas. We are glad your included a paleontological interest.

p. 4-4, Visuals Impacts. We received comments from the community that there will be visual impacts to NaPali Coast. Since this is a tourist destination, the visual impacts need to be addressed.

p. 4-4, section 4.1, No-Action Alternative. Only at PMRF were cultural resources addressed for potentially significant environmental issues. All sections, easement, caves, Makaha Ridge and Niihau have impacts that need to be addressed.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO
5090
Ser 00/0279
12 March 1998

Dr Michael Wilson
State Historic Preservation Division
State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural
Resources
33 South King Street 6th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Dr Wilson:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. All of the proposed projects will require National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 Compliance. Since these projects are all federal undertakings, even those on private lands (Niihau) and local public lands (State of Hawaii) will require compliance with this Federal law and its regulations.

Response 1: The Navy will comply with the NHPA Section 106 review and comment process and the ACHP's regulations implementing Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800). PMRF would consult with the island's proprietors, the community of Niihau, the Hawaii SHPO, and the ACHP, to establish and/or implement measures to ensure mitigation of any impacts to potential cultural resources that could result from PMRF's proposed actions on Niihau. Sections addressing cultural resources are provided for each candidate site and support area in Section 3, Affected Environment, and Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

Comment 2: In general, this notice was very weak on the background material covering historic properties -- review of prior archaeological work and of historic information on settlement patterns. While we agree it is only a preparation notice, our staff spent considerable time with the consultant covering such background material, and this notice lacks most of this information.

Response 2: The background information and analysis contained in the Preparation Notice has been updated, expanded and improved in the Draft EIS. Cultural resources and potential impacts to those resources are provided in the Cultural Resources sections for each geographic area in Sections 3 and 4 of the Draft EIS.

Comment 3: p. 3.2 Cultural Resources: This section is very generic and should be more specific to PMRF and the type of sites likely to be found in your projects areas. This section really does not have much substance. What are the areas of concern. We disagree that the resources are described in detail in the rest of the notice.

Response 3: Potential impacts to cultural resources are described in the Cultural Resources section for each candidate location and support site in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 4: p.3-11, section 3.1.1.3 Cultural Resources for the Restrictive Easement Area. List appropriate reports and resources as your references. The cultural and archaeological reports should be

S-W-0077

referenced. Have you checked with State Parks on their work of Polihale? We believe that there are historic sites and you need to document this.

- Response 4: A listing of all sites currently known to exist in the Restrictive Easement region of influence is presented in Table 3.1.2.3.1. The reports, surveys and studies used are cited in Section 3.1.2.3.2.
- Comment 5: p 3-24, section 3.1.2.3 Kamokala Magazines. No section 106 Compliance was ever done for the use of these caves. Documentation of the caves should be conducted, to determine if there is cultural significance for the sites. We agree that the cave land are not likely have significant historic sites due to the subsurface disturbance, but all other areas that will be impacted should be surveyed and documented.
- Response 5: Cultural resources at Kamokala Magazines are addressed in Sections 3.1.5.3 and 4.1.5.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 6: p.3-25, section 3.1.3 Makaha Ridge. There is no section on the Cultural Resources. A statement should be included on this area. Several surveys have taken place here. This information is then used to confirm that no sites exist.
- Response 6: Cultural resources at Makaha Ridge are described in Section 3.1.3.4 and Section 4.1.3.4 in the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 7: p. 3-28, section 3.1.4 Kokee. Again no section on cultural resources could be found. Background references and a statement should be included in order to conclude that there is no effect.
- Response 7: Cultural resources at Kokee are described in Section 3.1.4.4 and Section 4.1.4.4 in the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 8: p. 3-35, section 3.2.1 Niihau. Section 106 compliance will be required on all the activities to be conducted here. The old Coast Guard buildings should be evaluated for significance. The 1987 Kikuchi report that was referenced has never been reviewed or accepted by the SHPD. It is a limited survey in the northeastern portions of the island, so the generalizations are limited to this area of the island only. This report needs to be impacted by this project will need to be surveyed to address Section 106 concerns. Oral histories should also be conducted.
- Response 8: Section 3.2.1.4 of the enclosed Draft EIS describes existing cultural resources at Niihau, and Section 4.2.1.3 addresses potential impacts to cultural resources on Niihau. Section 106 consultation will be conducted for the entire proposed action.
- Comment 9: p. 3-43, section 3.2.2.3 Kure. This section is fine. Background should be included on Kure's use as a World War II battlefield.
- Response 9: The Kure location is no longer a consideration, and therefore, is not applicable to this EIS.
- Comment 10: p. 4.2, section 4.0 Environmental Mitigation, Cultural Resources. We concur that Section 106 needs to be completed for all Federal actions on the 13 resource areas. We are glad you included a paleontological interest.
- Response 10: Your comments have been considered and your letter has been included in the Draft EIS. We intend to comply fully with Section 106 of the NHPA for all activities covered by the Act.
- Comment 11: p. 4.4, Visual Impacts, We received comments from the community that there will be visual impacts to NaPali Coast. Since this is a tourist destination, the visual impacts need to be addressed.
- Response 11: The existing Makaha Ridge facility can be viewed by water craft traveling the ocean approximately 445 meters (1,460 feet) below the facility. The addition of facilities would be consistent with the already developed nature of the site. The addition of facilities under the Proposed Action would not change the overall public visual environment.
- Comment 12: p. 4-4, section 4.1, No-Action Alternative. Only at PMRF were cultural resources addressed for

potentially significant environmental issues. All sections, easement, caves, Mahaka Ridge and Niihau have impacts that need to be addressed.

Response 12: Potential impacts to cultural resources are described in the Cultural Resources section for each candidate location and support site in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waiimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



July 21, 1997

Ms. Vida Mossman
Public Affairs Officer
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Re: Testimony for PMRF Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Ms. Mossman:

The Pacific Missile Range Facility's (PMRF) impact to our economy is in excess of \$115 million annually, with 924 jobs of which 113 are military personnel. Its contribution to Kauai transcends all elements of our community from agricultural operations to the visitor industry, as well as the backbone of our island - small business. Statistically, PMRF's economic impact include:

• Wages and Salaries	\$ 45.0 million
• Construction	\$ 8.3 million
• Contracts	\$ 41.5 million
• Purchasing	\$ 11.7 million
• Utilities	\$ 3.1 million
• Tourist Industry	\$ 7.5 million

Kauai's economic condition is critical. The anticipated recovery from Hurricane Iniki is prolonged due to continued hotel closures and the downsizing of sugar operations. Business failures are increasing at record rates. Throughout this downturn the area that continues to shine is PMRF. NELHA and the astronomy community on the Big Island and the Super Computer on Maui are visibly important to each island's diversification. However, primarily because of population base, PMRF's contribution to Kauai is magnified.

Vida Mossman
July 22, 1997
Page Two

In addition, PMRF is a community leader. From their Toys for Tots campaign to their cooperative education programs with Kauai Community College (KCC) they help foster the "Good Neighbor" policy as well as train Kauai's people for enhanced job opportunities.

PMRF is a national asset primarily for two reasons:

- Lack of encroachment
- Natural Littoral environment

In the FY '95 Appropriations Act, Congress inserted the following language:

"PMRF is the primary test range for completion of lower tier and upper tier missile flight tests."

PMRF is the largest instrumented multi-environmental testing, evaluation and training range in the world and, with Congressional direction to provide a highly effective Theater Missile Defense program, PMRF must enhance its capability to demonstrate, test and evaluate a number of systems to include defensive interceptor technologies such as:

- Ballistic Missile Defense Systems
- Cruise Missile Defense Systems
- Cooperative Engagement Capabilities

PMRF's infrastructure upgrades have been funded by the testing and evaluation customers, but benefit training users as well. In the past four years, \$235 million of improvements have been provided to enhance PMRF's testing and evaluation capabilities. The testing and evaluation portion of PMRF's business is not only its shining star but also continues to increase with ultimate peaks in FY '98 - FY 2000.

Significantly, the testing and evaluation area represents the multitude of "spin-off" opportunities and the creation of sustainable economic development on Kauai.

Programs such as NASA's Pathfinder not only bring sensor technologies to the civilian sector with aerial mappings of the Alakai Swamp or the proposed Kula Road on Maui, but also through cooperative programs with KCC, allows our students an insight into technological advancements not available through the University of Hawaii (UH) system.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0242
 11 March 1998

Vida Mossman
 July 22, 1997
 Page Three

Initiatives in telemedicine will ultimately use PMRF's developed capabilities and AKAMAI funding to link PMRF, Kauai Veteran's Memorial Hospital and Wilcox Hospital to Tripler Hospital on Oahu, the Super Computer and through UH's PEACESAT programs to the entire Pacific Rim and the Mainland.

Textron Systems Division of Textron Inc. established an office on Kauai in July of 1997 to expand their business development activities at PMRF and to continue their exemplary record of community service that their 40 employees on Maui have produced.

Oceanit Laboratories, a Honolulu-based company, has also announced plans to expand their activities on Kauai.

With the completion of the Waimea Techno Tourism Center next year, the Kauai Economic Development Board (KEDB) has received letters of interest and/or intent from Textron, SAIC, Oceanit, Baker Support Services, ITT Federal Services, High Technology Solutions, Northrup Grumman, Lockheed Martin and Loral Space and Communications to open offices and/or expand their mission on Kauai.

The Visitor Center has also received possible feedback, through the efforts of Kauai Councilman Jimmy Tokioka, from Yahoo and Microsoft for exhibits and the Kauai Institute for Communications Media (KICM), through the efforts of Judy Drosd and Sue Kanoho, hope to bring the film industry initiatives to the Center.

The enhancement of PMRF's testing and evaluation capabilities will bring about diversified economic benefits that are built on the basic precepts of sustainability as well as supply and demand equating to job growth.

PMRF has been a good neighbor, an exemplary corporate citizen. Let's all work together to bring about an enhancement of their capabilities which will result in sustainable economic development.

Sincerely,

Gary Baldwin, Chair
 KAUAI ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Mr Gary Baldwin
 Chair
 Kauai Economic Development Board
 PO Box 1702
 Lihue, Kauai, HI 96766

Dear Mr Baldwin:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: (PMRF's) contribution to Kauai transcends all elements of our community from agricultural operations to the visitor industry, as well as the backbone of our island - small business. Statistically, PMRF's economic impact include:

Wages and Salaries	\$45.0 million
Construction	\$ 8.3 million
Contracts	\$41.5 million
Purchasing	\$11.7 million
Utilities	\$ 3.1 million
Tourist Industry	\$ 7.5 million

Kauai's economic condition is critical. The anticipated recovery from Hurricane Iniki is prolonged due to continued hotel closures and the downsizing of sugar operations. Business failures are increasing at record rates. Throughout this downturn the area that continues to shine is PMRF. NELHA and the astronomy community on the Big Island and the Super Computer on Maui are visibly important to each island's diversification. However, primarily because of the population base, PMRF's contribution is magnified. In addition, PMRF is a community leader. From their Toys for Tots campaign to their cooperative education programs with Kauai Community College (KCC) they help foster the "Good Neighbor" policy as well as train Kauai's people for enhanced job opportunities.

PMRF is a national asset primarily for two reasons:

- Lack of encroachment
- Natural Littoral environment

PMRF's infrastructure upgrades have been funded by the testing and evaluation customers, but benefit training users as well. In the past four years, \$235 million of improvements have been provided to enhance PMRF's testing and evaluation capabilities. The testing and evaluation portion of PMRF's business is not only its shining star but also continues to increase with ultimate peaks in FY '98 - FY 2000.

S-W 0091

Significantly, the testing and evaluation area represent the multitude of "spin-off" opportunities and the creation of sustainable economic development on Kauai.

The enhancement of PMRF's testing and evaluation capabilities will bring about diversified economic benefits that are built on the basic precepts of sustainability as well as supply and demand equating to job growth.


PMRF has been a good neighbor, an exemplary corporate citizen. Let's all work together to bring about an enhancement of their capabilities which will result in sustainable economic development.

Response 1: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

S-W-0091

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

850 SOUTH KING STREET, 8TH FLOOR • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-3017
PHONE (808) 521-4111 • FAX (808) 521-4850



JEREMY HARRIS
MAYOR

S-W-085

PATRICK T. ONISHI
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
DONAL HANAIKE
DEPUTY CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER

MH 5/97-1162

July 8, 1997

Ms. Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice
(EISPN) for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing
the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility

In response to receiving the subject EISPN on May 27, 1997, we have reviewed the document and have no comments to offer at this time. Should you have any questions, please contact Matthew Higashida of our staff at 527-6056.

Yours very truly,


PATRICK T. ONISHI
Chief Planning Officer

PTO:js



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0238
 11 March 1998

Mr Patrick T Onishi
 Dept of Planning
 City and County of Honolulu
 650 South Keing Street 8th Floor
 Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr Onishi:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: In response to receiving the subject EISPN on May 27, 1997, we have reviewed the document and have no comments to offer at this time.

Response 1: Thank You.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waiimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

LAW OFFICES
 DYKEMA GOSSETT
 PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

FRANKLIN SQUARE
 SUITE 300 WEST
 1300 I STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3300

TELEPHONE (202) 522-8600

FAX (202) 522-8669

S-W-001

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICHIGAN
 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

William H. Carroll

DETROIT, MICHIGAN
 GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
 LANSING, MICHIGAN

Direct Dial
 (202) 522-8608

May 30, 1997

Ms. Vida Mossman
 Pacific Missile Range Facility
 P.O. Box 128
 Kekaha, Kauai, Hawaii 96752-0128


Dear Vida,

Reading the Federal Register announcement for the Capability Enhancement EIS scoping meetings stirred up memories of the tumult surrounding the STARS program starting with all the work that went into preparing and defending the EA. My current practice is quite different from former responsibilities as BMDO General Counsel, but I still follow ballistic missile defense issues closely.

Hopefully, there'll be less controversy over these upgrades for Navy TBMD testing. In any case, the process will benefit by your superb public relations skills and unfailing ability to stay calm, no matter the storm. Good Luck.

Sincerely,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC


 William H. Carroll

WHC/cmh
 406C

S-W-0085



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0179
11 March 1998

Mr William Carroll
Dykema Gosssett Law Offices
1300 I Street N.W. Suite 300 West
Washington, DC 20005-3308


Dear Mr Carroll:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Good Luck with the EIS.

Response 1: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

June 2, 1997

Capt. Thomas Daniels
PMRF Commander
via: Public Affairs Office
P.O. 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

The following comments and concerns are being sent to you in response to the request for input from the community published in the Kauai Times, May 24, 1997 in regards to the EIS to be developed for the proposed "enhanced capability" to handle testing of the Navy's Theater Missile Defense (TMD) program at Pacific Missile Range Facility.

Enhanced dangers of being a target.

A number of the proposed sites are already involved in activities related to military interests. Any site that is engaged in something to do with weapons becomes a target for enemies. Any EIS that is developed needs to address the issue of the site being destroyed by the enemy. What will the impact be on the site and its surroundings? Are the proposed sites being selected because they are islands with few inhabitants? This does not take into account that there are some inhabitants as well as protected wildlife in some areas. The EIS needs to have the worst scenario, meaning destruction of the site and its surroundings, for each of the areas being considered.

What about Guam?

The Navy already has a number of bases and capabilities for military actions based in Guam. There is Naval Station, Naval Communications Station, Naval Magazine, Naval Air Station. Guam is also in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. Why was Guam not considered to be included in the EIS?

Costs

All of the sites mentioned as being considered require shipment of equipment and personnel long distances. What are the comparative costs involved of the different locations of not only building the sites but maintaining and operating the sites? They will probably require numerous flights carrying cargo and personnel over extended periods of time. Most of the sites do not have commercial airlines flying into them so that means special Navy flights. What is it going to cost me as a taxpayer? The EIS

should address a comparison of costs of everything at the various sites including operations for the duration of the site's existence. There is no doubt that sites closer to the continental United States would be a lot cheaper to build and maintain than areas outside of the continental United States. As a taxpayer, I am very concerned that the Senate Committee may not even have available or consider cost comparisons or EISs when making their reports. Their reports are merely statements of findings, which may be based on limited facts. The Senate Committee report does not give direction as to how a finding should be implemented. From what I read in the newspaper and hear on television, some people in Florida are upset because the Everglades are being considered for missile sites. The Everglades certainly are closer to the continental United States and it would cost less to practice firing missiles there. I am not sure the United States needs missile sites both in Florida and the Pacific. When proposing what should be included in an EIS it seems some alternative sites should be presented which cost less. On the face of it, building a site and or launching missiles from the continental land mass is going to cost less than building a site and launching missiles in the middle of the Pacific, thousands of miles from anywhere.

Jobs/Economy

The creation of new jobs or help to the economy are non-issues. If we, through our government, wanted to create new jobs this certainly could be done without building missile launching sites. There is no doubt that money could be spent to create jobs anywhere doing any number of things. The issue is what kinds of jobs and for whose benefit do we spend our tax money? I would rather see my taxes spent on local needs rather than on a missile system. For instance, our county or state government could be given the money that it takes to build and operate these sites and these local governments could create innumerable jobs for the citizens that reside in the county and the state. We have all kinds of local projects that could use extra manpower. Some of these projects include repair of Rice St., our main thoroughfare in downtown Lihue, replacing one lane dangerous bridges in the Wailua Homesteads area with two lane bridges, building a shelter for the homeless, taking better care of Kokee State Forest and other state parks and beaches, and giving our non-profit service agencies increased funding to provided needed human services. These are just some of the suggestions of ways to spend the money being used to build these missile sites and conduct missile firing tests. These alternative ways of spending the money would also create jobs and in addition improve the quality of life in Hawaii and Kauai. Expenditures for local needs also helps the local economy. An EIS should address alternative ways of spending the money if economy or jobs is mentioned as a factort in the EIS.

Wildlife

When the Senate Appropriations Committee reported that PMRF's "air, surface and subsurface ranges and associated test and exercise infrastructure provide the unique capability to conduct virtually unrestricted test and evaluation in ideal conditons..." the committee may not have meant that wildlife areas were to be part of the areas to be considered for the test area. It is questionable if the committee even knew there were wildlife areas included in the area to be considered for TMD. How many of the committee members ever visited any of the areas under consideration? The committee could just as easily have said Wyoming, Arizona, and California are great areas for tests, but that does not mean missile sites would have been put in Yellowstone National Park, Grand Canyon National Park, or Yosemite National Park. It seems that when an area is designated as a National Wildlife Refuge, the intent is to keep it as such. If we built military installations in our national parks what is the point in having areas designated as national parks? The same goes for wildlife refuges, why designate them for wildlife if there is no intention of leaving them as refuges? To launch missiles in a refuge is the same as launching a missile in one of our national parks. It certainly wouldn't make any sense. An EIS should address the issue of comparing a site not in a refuge with one in a refuge. Parts of Arizona might be better to use than the Grand Canyon, the same is true for our island seabird refuges, areas not designated as refuges should take priority over areas designated as refuges, and refuges should not even be considered.

I would like to summarize my concerns and views concerning the enhanced capability of PMRF.

As a taxpayer I am very concerned that more and more expensive weaponry continues to be developed and we are asked to continue to pay for it without questioning whether in fact there is duplication of effort, whether it could be done cheaper, and whether it will be obsolete after we have spent a fortune on it. I believe all these military expenditures will eventually bankrupt the country. Therefore, I would like some reassurance through an EIS that alternatives have been thoroughly considered in regards to cost.

As well, I am very concerned about living in an area that will become of more interest as a target for the enemy. Needless to say, Pearl Harbor was a target and Kauai is not that far away from Oahu.

The construction of a missile facility in a wildlife refuge is, of course, ridiculous.

Submitted by E. Woodyard, Ph.D. 
P.O. 1986
Kapaa, HI 96746

pg 4

cc Senator Inouye
 Congresswoman Patsy Mink
 Senator Akaka
 Congressman Abercrombie



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P O BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96757-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0180
 11 March 1998

Dr E Woodyard
 PO Box 1986
 Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Dr Woodyard:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Any site that is engaged in something to do with weapons becomes a target for enemies. Any EIS that is developed needs to address the issue of the site being destroyed by the enemy. What will the impact be on the site and its surroundings? Are the proposed sites being selected because they are islands with few inhabitants? The EIS needs to have the worst scenario, meaning destruction of the site and its surroundings, for each of the areas being considered.

Response 1: The potential for health and safety impacts of the proposed action is addressed in detail in Section 4.1.1.7 of the enclosed Draft EIS. The TBMD program would be similar to current testing and training activities occurring at PMRF.

Comment 2: Why was Guam not considered to be included in the EIS?

Response 2: Guam is too far from PMRF to be used in the Navy Area TMBD testing program.

Comment 3: What are the comparative costs involved of the different locations of not only building the sites but maintaining and operating the sites? There is no doubt that sites built closer to the continental United States would be a lot cheaper to build and maintain than areas outside of the continental United States. I am not sure the United States needs missile sites both in Florida and the Pacific. When proposing what should be included in an EIS it seems some alternative sites should be presented which cost less.

Response 3: The comparative costs associated with the different locations are not part of the scope of the Draft EIS, which addresses the environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed Action, enhancing PMRF capabilities. Factors such as cost and minimum requirements are considered in all decisions relative to such testing, along with environmental consideration. This EIS provides environmental analysis for consideration in these decisions on enhancement of PMRF for these and other activities.

Comment 4: If we, through our government, wanted to create new jobs this certainly could be done without building missile launch sites. There is no doubt that money could be spent to create jobs anywhere doing any number of things. The issue is what kinds of jobs and for whose benefit do we spend our tax money? I would rather see my taxes spent on local needs than on a missile system. For instance, our county or state government could be given the money that it takes to build and operate these sites and these local governments could create innumerable jobs for the citizens that reside in the county and the state. We have all kinds of local projects that could use extra manpower. An EIS should address alternative ways of spending the money if economy or

S-W-0003

jobs is mentioned as a factor in the EIS.

Response 4: Congress has directed that TBMD development be given priority for our nations' defense. This EIS evaluates the potential for impacts, including socioeconomic impacts, which would result if PMRF capabilities are enhanced to support this and other Department of Defense Testing and Evaluation missions. Alternate uses of tax money is a political issue that is not within the scope of an environmental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Comment 5: To launch missiles in a refuge is the same as launching a missile in one of our national parks. It certainly wouldn't make any sense. An EIS should address the issue of comparing a site not in a refuge with one in a refuge. The construction of a missile facility in a wildlife refuge is, of course, ridiculous.

Response 5: Section 4.3.1.8 describes potential land use compatibility impacts on Tern Island. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities taking place, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained within this EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required on Tern Island.

Comment 6: The EIS needs to have the worst scenario, meaning destruction of the site and its surroundings, for each of the areas being considered.


Response 6: The enclosed Draft EIS considers reasonable mishap situations associated with the testing and evaluation to support TBMD and other Department of Defense programs. These analyses may be found in Section 3.1.1.7.

Comment 7: An EIS should address alternative ways of spending the money if economy or jobs is mentioned as a factor in the EIS.

Response 7: See response 4.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,



J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

4 June 1997

Pacific Missile Range Facility Public Affairs Officer
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128


Dear Sir:

We recently had the opportunity to visit Midway Island. It was truly a moving experience. We took great pride in the fact that our government was acting so responsibly with respect to the environmental issues on Midway and the other Northwest Islands in the Hawaiian chain.

It is inconceivable that another agency of the federal government should even propose to use these islands as anything but nature preserves. The PMRF referred to these islands as "uninhabited" in their presentation to the Kaua'i County Council (17 January 1997). How can you discount the millions of birds and the endangered seals and turtles for whom these islands are home?

We exhort you to abandon any plans of increasing human intrusion on these islands. Allow the Fish and Wildlife Service to finish the job they have so admirably begun.

Yours truly,



Val and Art Mori
571 Hao St.
Honolulu, HI 96821
(808) 373-4386



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0181
11 March 1998

Rev. Ilse N. Peetz
P.O.Box 298
Kekaha, HI 96752
Tel. 337-1464

Mr. & Mrs. Val and Art Mori
571 Hao St
Honolulu, HI 96821

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Mori:


Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: It is inconceivable that another agency of the federal government should even propose to use these islands as anything but nature preserves. The PMRF referred to these islands as "uninhabited" in their presentation to the Kauai County Council (17 January 1997). How can you discount the millions of birds and the endangered seals and turtles for whom these islands are home? We exhort you to abandon any plans of increasing human intrusion on these islands. Allow the Fish and Wildlife Service to finish the job they have so admirably begun.

Response 1: Section 4.3.1.8 describes potential land use compatibility impacts on Tern Island. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities taking place, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will continue consultation with USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service and request a determination based on the analysis contained within this Draft EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required on Tern Island.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0004

June 13, 1997

Mrs. Vida Mossman
PMRF
P.O.Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752

Dear Mrs. Mossman,

I am writing today in concern about PMRF's plan to install missile bases on the natural preservation islands north of Kauai. Please, convey my concerns to the appropriate person. Thank you.

I am pastor of the West Kauai United Methodist Church. The 1996 BOOK OF DISCIPLINE of the United Methodist Church states in its Social Principles:

We affirm the natural world as God's handiwork and dedicate ourselves to its preservation, enhancement, and faithful use by humankind. (p.105)


I know that PMRF is careful about the impact on the natural environment of missile launches. To put multiple missile bases on natural preservation islands, seems very contrary to that care. I hope that the EIS will be honest and PMRF will abide strictly by its recommendations.

My second concern about on expansion of missile capability of the USA is an invitation to arms race. As our missiles get better, other nations feel obliged to use more of their resources to develop increased missile abilities. While the employment of missile bases on the islands north and west of Kauai promises employment for Kauai and Niihau residents, increased arms race may well rob developing nations of their resources which give basic sustenance to their people.

My third concern is this: In light of welfare reform and the need to provide training and employment for people on welfare in order to move them off welfare, has PMRF designated certain areas of employment that could give people on welfare necessary job skills to become meaningfully employed? In other words, is PMRF consciously providing a number of training and employment positions for suitable persons presently on welfare?

Thank you for considering my concerns of environmental impact of the missile launches, the danger of global job displacements caused by competition in missile improvement, the need to set aside skills improvement opportunities for welfare recipients.

Sincerely,


Rev. Ilse N. Peetz



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0182
11 March 1998

Rev Ilse Peetz
PO Box 298
Kekaha, HI 96752


Dear Rev Peetz:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: I know that PMRF is careful about the impact on the natural environment of missile launches. To put multiple missile bases on natural preservation islands, seems very contrary to that care. I hope that the EIS will be honest and PMRF will abide strictly by its recommendations.
- Response 1: Potential impacts to the human and natural environments for each potential location, including Nihoa, Tern, and Johnston Atoll, are described in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS. The Navy will abide by all mitigations developed and adopted as part of the EIS process, including consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Services, and selected in the record of decision.
- Comment 2: As our missiles get better, other nations feel obliged to use more of their resources to develop increased missile abilities. While the employment of missile bases on the islands north and west of Kauai promises employment for Kauai and Nihoa residents, increased arms race may well rob developing nations of their resources which give basic sustenance to their people.
- Response 2: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.
- Comment 3: In light of welfare reform and the need to provide training and employment for people on welfare in order to move them off welfare, has PMRF designated certain areas of employment that could give people on welfare necessary job skills to become meaningfully employed? In other words, is PMRF consciously providing a number of training and employment positions for suitable persons presently on welfare?
- Response 3: PMRF has non-discriminatory hiring practices designed to fairly consider all qualified applicants. We cannot predict who will be qualified for specific jobs requiring specific skills. There is no plan for a Kauai training program at this time, but opportunities which benefit both the Navy's mission and the community are always considered.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BAWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0005

S-W-0005

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

EIS SHOULD INCLUDE SOME COMMENTS ON THE
INCREASING POPULATION OF THE EARTH IN TOTAL.
FOR THIS REASON SOME CONSIDERATION SHOULD
BE PLACED ON THE NEED FOR RESEARCH ON
LARGE SCALE CHANGES IN THE EARTH'S OCEANS
AND AIR CONDITIONS, AS MAY BE FORTHCOMING
FROM THE SOLAR, UNMANNED AIRCRAFT PROJECT,
AND FROM SATELLITE DATA FROM POLAR ORBITING
VEHICLES, EXPANSION OF THE PMR FACILITIES
CAN BE A MAJOR CONTRIBUTOR IN THIS DIRECTION,
LONG RANGE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE PREDICTIONS
CAN SAVE MANY LIVES IN THE FUTURE, AND THE
FUTURE IS WHERE WE ARE GOING, THE PAST IS ONLY

Please place form in the drop
box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

MEMORIES, NOSTALGIA, AND HISTORY,

Commenter Name	<u>F. M. COAN</u>
Street Address	<u>PO BOX 368</u>
City	<u>LAWAI, HI 96765</u>
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

MANY PEOPLE THINK OF THE ENVIRONMENT
IN TERMS OF RECOLLECTIONS OF THEIR PAST
AND FOND MEMORIES OF THE WAY THINGS USED
TO BE. ACTUALLY THE ENVIRONMENT IS
CONSTANTLY CHANGING, AND ALWAYS WILL
CHANGE DUE TO FACTORS BEYOND OUR CONTROL.

MATTER IS COMING TO THE EARTH FROM
THE SPACE IN WHICH WE ORBIT THE SUN AND
EVENTUALLY ORBIT THE BLACK HOLE AT THE
CENTER OF OUR GALAXY. THIS MATTER INEVITABLY
AFFECTS THE EARTH IN SUBTLE WAYS.

HUMANITY MUST STUDY THE CHANGES IN ORDER
TO RESPONSIBLY PLAN HIS SURVIVAL ON A LONG
TERM BASIS. THE PMR EXPANSION IS A
STEP IN THIS DIRECTION.

OVER



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96757-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0183
11 March 1998

Mr F M Coan
PO Box 268
Lawai, HI 96765

Dear Mr Coan:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: EIS should include some comments on the increasing population of the earth in toto. For this reason some consideration should be placed on the need for research on large scale changes in the earth's oceans and air conditions, as may be forth coming from the solar, unmanned aircraft project, and from satellite data from polar orbiting vehicles. Expansion of the PMR Facilities can be a major contributor in this direction. Long range environmental change predictions can save many lives in the future, and the future is where we are going. The past is only memories, nostalgia, and history.

Response 1: Consideration of the increasing population of the earth as a whole, or large-scale changes in the Earth's ocean and air conditions is beyond the scope of this EIS, and is unrelated to the specific areas that would be affected by the alternatives under consideration. The scope of the EIS is limited to the immediate area around PMRF and the Open Ocean area that could be affected by the specific No-action and Proposed Action alternatives under consideration.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,
J.A. BOWLIN
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S.W-0006

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

Regarding the cultural assessment for Ni'ihau & Kauai - I am very interested in being a part of this process and also know of others who are.

Please contact me to let me know how to get involved.
Muhalo!

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Kala'i, K.
Street Address	3541 Puakenikeni
City	Kalaha, HI
State/ZIP	96741

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

The people of Niihau and Kauai need to be consulted on how they feel about PMRF's plans and whether they want this in their homeland. They need to have enough time and space to absorb the information and provide comment - opposition or any thoughts they care to share. Respect for ^{our} the people and our culture need to be a primary concern.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Kala'i
Street Address	3541 Puakenikeni
City	Kalaheo HI
State/ZIP	96741

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0184
11 March 1998

Ms K Kalai
3541 Puakenikeni St
Kalaheo, HI 96741

Dear Ms Kalai:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.


Comment 1: Regarding the cultural assessment for Niihau and Kauai, I am very interested in being a part of this process and also know others who are. Please contact me to let me know how to get involved.

Response 1: Your comments have been considered and your letter has been included in the Draft EIS. The Navy has conducted cultural resource assessments for PMRF and Niihau through contractors and the assistance of the Niihau elders. A list of personnel involved in the preparation of the EIS is provided in Section 5. We look forward to your comments on the Draft EIS and will consider them in our final analysis.

Comment 2: The people of Niihau and Kauai need to be consulted on how they feel about PMRF's plans and whether they want this in their homeland. They need to have enough time and space to absorb the information and provide comment - opposition or any thoughts they care to share. Respect for our people and our culture need to be a primary concern.

Response 2: A public information meeting prior to the start of this EIS was held on Niihau to receive input from the island residents on the proposed activities to be held on the island. The Draft EIS also uses information from a recent analysis of circumstances and needs on Niihau, developed by an independent expert working with the people on the island. A meeting will also be held on the island requesting any comments the island residents may have on the results of the analysis conducted in this EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
 for the
 Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
 Enhanced Capability
 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

I am very happy and appreciative that something like this afternoon is happening here in Waimea! As a local person (female) I feel that we need this program for the island and also for our children's future. The information given this afternoon were all great.
 Mahalo - hope to see you again for more up dated information! I do care!

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
 PMRF Public Affairs Office
 P.O. Box 128
 Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Carmen M. Bostick
Street Address	P.O. Box 245
City	Eleele, Kauai
State/ZIP	96765

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

S-W-0007



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0185
11 March 1998

Ms Carmen Bostick
PO Box 245
Eleele, HI 96705

Dear Ms Bostick:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I am very happy and appreciative that something like this afternoon is happening here in Waimea! As a local person (female) I feel that we need this program for the island and also for our children's future. The information given this afternoon were all great. Mahalo - hope to see you again soon for more updated information! I do care!

Response 1: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S.W.0008

S-W-009

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

I COMPLETELY SUPPORT YOUR EFFORTS
TO DEVELOP & TEST TMD & TBMD SYSTEMS
TO PROTECT OUR FORWARD DEPLOYED TROOPS,
SAILORS & AIRMEN, AS WELL AS OUR CITIZENS,
AND ALLIES. I ALSO APPLAUD YOUR SUPERB
CHOICE OF THE PMRF AS THE LEAD RANGE
FOR THESE TESTS. OUR SECURE FUTURE
COULD NOT BE PLACED IN MORE CAPABLE
AND DEDICATED HANDS

Please place form in the drop
box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<u>EUGENE HENRIQUES</u>
Street Address	<u>P.O. BOX 712</u>
City	<u>KEKAHA HI</u>
State/ZIP	<u>96752</u>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0186
 11 March 1998

Mr Eugene Henriques
 PO Box 712
 Kekaha, HI 96752


Dear Mr Henriques:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I completely support your efforts to develop and test TMD and TBMD systems to protect our forward deployed troops, sailors, and airmen, as well as our citizens, and allies. I also applaud your superb choice of the PMRF as the lead range for these tests. Our secure future could not be placed in more capable and dedicated hands.

Response 1: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0009

Comment Sheet

S-W-010

for the
 Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
 Enhanced Capability
 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

3 Big Questions that cannot be answered rationally from all the information I can gather.

1) Why is my tax money going to the tax spot on Niihau for \$270,000.00 a year? That's way too expensive in any intelligent person's reasoning.

2) If the expansion of PMRF to the pristine Islands Northwest of here was not necessary during the entire Cold War, how can that expansion be justified now, especially when budgets should be cut, not expanded.

3) Where will all the debris from shot down targets go if not into the ecosystem of the islands Northwest of here? Can't the military learn about environmental cost after the clean up bill on Koolawae Island?

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
 PMRF Public Affairs Office
 P.O. Box 128
 Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter	
Name	David W. Alexander
Street Address	P.O. Box 1041
City	Waimea, HI 96796
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS. Save the money



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0187
 11 March 1998

Mr. David Alexander
 PO Box 1041
 Waimea, HI 96796

Dear Mr. Alexander:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: Why is my tax money going to the tiny spot on Niihau for \$270,000.00 a year? That's way too expensive in any intelligent person's reasoning.
- Response 1: This area is discussed in Section 3.2.1.10 Socioeconomics--Niihau and in Table 3.2.1-1. The U.S. Navy has a contract with Niihau Ranch and funds provided to Niihau Ranch are strictly for services rendered at a negotiated price, as with any other contractor. Earned income for Niihau Ranch varies depending on tasking required by PMRF.
- Comment 2: If the expansion of PMRF to the pristine Islands Northwest of here was not necessary during the entire Cold War, how can that expansion be justified now, especially when budgets should be cut, not expanded.
- Response 2: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development. These systems require testing against targets from longer distances than in the past. The land masses available include the northern Hawaiian chain and Johnston Atoll and are being evaluated along with air-launch and mobile sea launch targets which are preferred.
- Comment 3: Where will the debris from shot down targets go if not into the ecosystem of the islands Northwest of here?
- Response 3: Debris will fall in predetermined areas of the ocean, as described in several sections of the enclosed Draft EIS. Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 describe launch requirements and how impact areas are defined. The Health and Safety and Biological Resources sections in Section 3 and Section 4 describe the potential impacts of debris on humans and wildlife.
- Comment 4: Can't the military learn about environmental costs after the clean-up bill on Koolalawae Island?
- Response 4: The purpose of the enclosed Draft EIS is to determine the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

S-W-0010

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0010

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-011



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0188
11 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

1) WILL THE REAL CONTROVERSY OF HIGHER CRIME RATES
NEAR AND ABOUT MILITARY CONTROLLED FACILITIES,
WHAT WILL PROTECT OUR FRAGILE LIFESTYLE AND LOCAL
PEOPLE FROM THIS SITUATION (RAPES, MURDERS, DRUNKENNESS...)?
2) WHAT WILL BE THE RATIO OF HAWAIIANS TO MILITARY ON
THE ISLAND FOR HOW LONG A PERIOD?

~~3)~~

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<u>RHODA LIBRE</u>
Street Address	<u>PO BOX 246</u>
City	<u>KAUMAKANI KAUAI HI 96747</u>
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

Ms Rhoda Libre
PO Box 246
Kaumakani Kauai, HI 96747

Dear Ms Libre:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: With all the real controversy of higher crime rates near and about military controlled facilities, what will protect our fragile lifestyle and local people from this situation (rapes, murderers, drunkenness)?

Response 1: Military contact with the culture of Niihau is strictly controlled by a protocol between the Robinson family and PMRF. There would be some job related contact during construction and testing activities; however, there would be no social contact between military personnel and Niihau residents. Potential impacts to the health and safety of Niihau residents are described in Sections 4.2.1.7 and 4.5.2.6 of the Draft EIS.

Comment 2: What will be the ratio of Hawaiians to military on the island for how long a period?

Response 2: To the extent possible, work on Niihau will be performed by island residents. We cannot predict the ratio of Hawaiians to non-Hawaiians qualified for specific jobs requiring specific skills. The established protocol, Appendix G, precludes visitors from residential areas on Niihau as well as forbidding overnight stays unless escorted.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-011

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-012



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
S090
Ser 00/0189
11 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

Please Emphasize the positive impact that PMRF has on the community and the importance of this program to its continued viability. Also, the use of the areas for T+E has a very minimal impact on the natural environment. Please ensure that beach access is preserved & that it positively benefits the Niihau community.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Peter McClaran</i>
Street Address	<i>4895 Kikala Rd</i>
City	<i>Kalaheo HI</i>
State/ZIP	<i>96741</i>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

Mr Peter McClaran
4895 Kikala Rd
Kalaheo, HI 96741

Dear Mr McClaran:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: Please emphasize the positive impact that PMRF has on the community and the importance of this program to its continued viability.
- Response 1: Information about the economic impact of existing and proposed activities on Kauai is provided in Section 4.1.1.10 in the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 2: Also, the use of the areas for T and E has a very minimal impact on the natural environment.
- Response 2: A description of specific potential impacts on the natural environment is provided in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 3: Please ensure that beach access is preserved.
- Response 3: The conditions of access to PMRF beaches will be similar to current conditions under the No-Action alternative. Conditions of closure of Polihale State Park would not change from current conditions. Potential impacts to access and recreation are described in Sections 4.1.1.8 and 4.1.2.7.
- Comment 4: (Please ensure) that it positively benefits the Niihau community.
- Response 4: The socioeconomic sections of the enclosed Draft EIS (Sections 4.2.1.10 and 4.5.2.9) examine the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on the economy and culture of Niihau. In addition, Section 4.5, Environmental Justice, describes potential impacts to Native Hawaiians on Kauai and Niihau.

This Draft EIS has depended significantly on independent work that was already underway on Niihau prior to beginning this EIS process. That work has been groundtruthed by the people of Niihau, including its translation into Hawaiian by persons on the island. Relying on that work, and other available information, it is concluded that the Proposed Action would provide significant economic benefits to the people of the island and Niihau infrastructure, and that an existing Niihau Protection Protocol, appropriately strengthened, will minimize contact between military personnel and Niihau residents and protect Niihau's cultural circumstances.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

S-W-013

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Scoping meeting 17 Jun 97
Taped transcript

Comment 1:

I am looking around me and I am thinking you have really done a good job in presenting what you said you were going to present, which is your views of what this impact is going to do to our environment. I think a lot of us are disappointed because we thought that perhaps there was going to be a public forum and maybe people would be able to speak, and yet maybe that is the way you represented it but that is the feeling I had.

I look at video and I just hurt and I am ready to cry, because I have been in and through different work in the area I just came back from Seas pilgrimage. I know that armaments are not the answer it really isn't. Every armament that has been developed has been used like the tank they were sure when it was developed that it would never be used because it was too horrible a weapon and it's been used. And this escalation is getting more and more sophisticated and what is the meaning. Where is it taking us? You know there really isn't any easy answers and I understand where you are coming from, I understand this need to have this enemy and to think that if we take care of this enemy its going to be all right. We can protect ourselves. Who am I? Protect me! You know we are all human beings. We're all in this together. In this world we are so interconnected. I can't hurt anything without hurting the world. Why do we want to send these missiles up? And we develop these missiles, so these other countries have these missiles. If we hadn't developed them in the first place then there wouldn't be this proliferation. We just create these weapons and then they get into other peoples hands and then we have to create another weapon and where's the end? Really I can be in a bit of despair about that. I know the military is doing its job. I came to Hawaii to tend to my own garden, to sensor myself and come to peace with myself. So perhaps my peaceful self can bring peace to other people. So I move into this quiet little place and I was there a year ago, and there were these big maneuvers, there is no escaping. There is no escaping this military presence, this idea of fighting, an enemy, this image of an enemy, got to have someone to blame for our troubles, it's never me, it's the other guy, we have to protect ourselves from the other guy, its an illusion. So I will just pray and meditate and may we all resolve this together, may we somehow find some kind of resolution so we can quit pouring money and all this wonderful intelligence into destructiveness. I just really don't believe in it.

Laurel Francis
Kekaha

S-W-0012



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0190
11 March 1998

Ms Laurel Francis
PO Box 70
Kekaha, HI 96752

Dear Ms Francis:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I am looking around me and I am thinking you have really done a good job in presenting what you said you were going to present, which is your views of what this impact is going to do with our environment. I think a lot of us are disappointed because we thought that perhaps there was going to be a public forum and maybe people would be able to speak, and yet maybe that is the way you represented it but that is the feeling I had.

Response 1: While not an open forum with the opportunity for public speaking, at each scoping meeting the public was encouraged to view the exhibit area which was staffed by technical personnel. The layout of the exhibit area was designed to facilitate an open and relaxed atmosphere for communication between the public and the technical representatives. Attendees were invited to make oral statements, which were recorded by a tape recorder at each meeting. Pre-formatted comment sheets were also available so attendees could either turn in a written comment during the meeting or mail the comment to the address printed on the form. Letters written in advance were also accepted.


A total of 47 comments (42 written and 5 oral) were received during the scoping meetings held at Waimea, Kilauea, Lihue, and Honolulu. The information meeting format at Niihau respected traditions of group communication.

Comment 2: I know that armaments are not the answer it really isn't. Every armament that has been developed has been used like the tank they were sure when it was developed that it would never be used because it was too horrible a weapon and it's been used. And this escalation is getting more and more sophisticated and what is the meaning. Where is it taking us? Why do we want to send these missiles up? And we develop these missiles, so these other countries have these missiles. If we hadn't developed them in the first place then there wouldn't be this proliferation. We just create these weapons and then they get into other peoples hands and then we have to create another weapon and where's the end?

Response 2: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

5-0-0013

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

5 0 0013

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

1. Draft EIS should include a complete list of munitions used as well as definitions of what these activities are or otherwise - eg. TBTID (toxic Pollution Hazardous substance) defined above.

2. Draft EIS should address the concern that the proposed increased/enhancements of Navy (and Army) missile testing/training might increase Hawaii's vulnerability as a military target of enemies of the U.S.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Deborah L. Phana
Street Address	P.O. Box 2226
City	Lihue
State/ZIP	Hawaii 96766-6226

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

Comment Sheet
for the

Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

- Once a lease with the State of Hawaii expires, will the land need to be cleaned/abandoned/unused/contaminated and/or other hazardous materials. Who will be responsible for clean up?

- Draft EIS should include consideration of a shorter lease period with the State of Hawaii with the possibility of a lease extension after a period of evaluation. Navy should have to show that an extension is needed. EIS should justify need for an extension to occur.

- What is the US Navy prepared to offer the State in return for use of ceded lands?

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Deborah L. Phana
Street Address	P.O. Box 2226
City	Lihue
State/ZIP	Hawaii 96766-6226

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

- Will there be evaluation/monitoring of environmental impacts once the expanded operations commence? (by an independent evaluator) E.g. how much unexpended, insoluble solid fuel is in the impact area and are marine animals mistaking it for fuel?

- Would operations be suspended if damaging impacts are discovered and need to be addressed?



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0191
11 March 1998

Ms Deborah Chang
PO Box 3226
Lihue, HI 96766-6226

Dear Ms Chang:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Draft EIS should include a complete list of acronyms used as well as definitions of what these entities are in a glossary - e.g. TBMD (Theater Ballistic Missile Defense) defined also.

Response 1: The enclosed Draft EIS does include a list of acronyms and abbreviations, as well as a glossary.

Comment 2: Draft EIS should address the concern that the proposed increases/enhancements of Navy (and Army) missile testing/training might increase Hawaii's vulnerability as a military target of enemies of the U.S.

Response 2: The TBMD program would be similar to current testing activities at PMRF. Potential impacts to health and safety are described for each location in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

Comment 3: Once a lease with the state of Hawaii expires, will the island need to be cleaned/cleared of unexploded ordnance and/or other hazardous materials? Who will be responsible for clean-up?

Response 3: PMRF would continue to follow appropriate hazardous materials and hazardous waste management plans which minimize the potential for a mishap to occur. The Navy would be responsible for any required clean-up resulting from any hazardous material release from PMRF activities.

Comment 4: Draft EIS should include consideration of a shorter lease period with the State of Hawaii with the possibility of a lease extension after a period of evaluation. Navy should have to show that an extension is needed. EIS should justify need for an extension to 2030.

Response 4: The extension to 2030 is proposed to match the duration of the PMRF leases of State lands and to achieve efficiency by ensuring use of lands through anticipated long-term missile launch activities from PMRF. Potential impacts of extending the time period of the restrictive easement are described in Section 4.1.2 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 5: What is the US navy prepared to offer Hawaiians in return for use of ceded lands?

Response 5: The Land Use sections in the EIS address the use of ceded lands where applicable. Specifically, Section 4.1.5.7 describes the area required for the proposed ordnance storage magazines, encompassing ceded lands.

Comment 6: Will there be evaluation/monitoring of environmental impacts (by an independent evaluator) once the expanded operations commence?

Response 6: Potential mitigation measures, if necessary, are described in each section of Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Mitigations committed by the Navy would be specified in the Record of Decision, a public document, and would be monitored to ensure their implementation. If unanticipated impacts are discovered once the expanded operations commence with implementation of the Proposed Action, the program would coordinate with the appropriate State and/or Federal agencies to determine appropriate actions.

Comment 7: E.g. how much unexpended, insoluble solid fuel is in the impact area and are marine animals mistaking it for fuel?


Response 7: Potential impacts of solid fuel on marine mammals are addressed in the Biological Resources sections of Section 4.4, Ocean Area.

Comment 8: Would operations be suspended if damaging impacts are discovered and need to be addressed?

Response 8: If unanticipated impacts are discovered with implementation of the Proposed Action, the program would coordinate with the appropriate State and/or Federal agencies to determine appropriate actions.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J. A. BOWLJIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-015

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

There seems to be differences in perceptions among the Hawaiians as to what is being planned by PMRF. Those who live on the island need to be educated about what is really going to affect them (if anything actually will) they need to know that PMRF will "mossman the area" of Nihoa - a place they love & feel close to. If they are for the plan, no one can argue with them or the Robinsons - its a united front. The Hawaiians that do not live on Nihoa (from other islands & those who live on Kauai) may have loyalty to other Hawaiian "causes" & will see this as an opportunity for media coverage & advancement of their diverse causes.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<u>DORIS NEKOMOTO</u>
Street Address	<u>3411 HAILUM RD</u>
City	<u>LAWAI HI 96765</u>
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

S-W-0014



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0192
11 March 1998

Ms Doris Nekomoto
3411 Hailima Rd
Lawai, HI 96765

Dear Ms Nekomoto:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: There seems to be difference in "perception" among the Hawaiians as to what is being planned by PMRF. Those who live on the island need to be educated about what is really going to affect them (if anything actually will). They need to know that PMRF will "Malama the aina" of Niihau - a place they love and feel close, too. If they are for the plan, no one can argue with them or the Robinsons - it's a united front. The Hawaiians that do not live on Niihau (from other islands and those who live on Kauai) may have loyalty to other Hawaiian "causes" and will see this as an opportunity for media coverage and announcement of their diverse causes.

Response 1: A meeting, prior to the start of this EIS, was held on Niihau to receive input from the island residents on the proposed activities to be held on the island. The Draft EIS also uses information from a recent analysis, "Niihau, Present Circumstances and Future Requirements in an Evolving Hawaiian Community", developed by an independent expert working with the people on the island. A meeting will also be held on the island requesting any comments the island residents may have on the results of the analysis conducted in this Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet

S-W-016

for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

the impact on
I am certain that biological resources
will be covered in the EIS.
I strongly feel that the Enhanced
Capabilities will have a very positive
socioeconomic impact to the economy
of Kauai & Hawaii

Please place form in the drop
box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Robert Inouye</i>
Street Address	<i>2639 Alaekele</i>
City	<i>Lihue</i>
State/ZIP	<i>HI 96766</i>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0193
 11 March 1998

Mr Robert Inouye
 2639 Alaekeo
 Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Mr Inouye:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I am certain that the impact on biological resources will be covered on the EIS.

Response 1: Potential impacts on biological resources are addressed in the Biological Resources sections for each candidate area, including the Ocean Area, in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 2: I strongly feel that the enhanced capabilities will have a very positive socioeconomic impact on the economy of Kauai and Hawaii.

Response 2: Information about the economic impact of existing and proposed activities on Kauai is provided in Section 4.1.1.10 in the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet

S-W-017

for the
 Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
 Enhanced Capability
 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

What are the negative health + social impacts on the Native Hawaiians of Nihoa? What diseases could be introduced by outsiders to the last native speaking village of Hawaiians who have been isolated + might not having any resistance? How many fishing days will be lost by Kani fishermen? What's the impact of rocket fuel on the surrounding marine reef? Does it make Kani more of a military target? Will the jobs be for local people or specialists which means outside labor moving in? How many jobs will be lost because dive companies + fishermen will be restricted from waters surrounding Nihoa? Do we want to put military on Nihoa when native Hawaiians just got Koolawe back? Haven't they been cutting back military budgets + closing bases around the US.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
 PMRF Public Affairs Office
 P.O. Box 128
 Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>BRUCE S. URBAN</i>
Street Address	<i>P.O. B. 658</i>
City	<i>Waimea, HI 96796</i>
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

S-W-0016



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0260
12 March 1998

Mr Bradley Vaughn
PO Box 658
Waimea, HI 96796

Dear Mr Vaughn:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: What are the negative health and social impacts on the native Hawaiians of Niihau? What diseases could be introduced by outsiders to the last native speaking village of Hawaiians who have been isolated and might not having any resistance?
- Response 1: Military contact with the culture of Niihau is strictly controlled by a protocol between the Robinson family and PMRF. There would be some job-related contact during construction activities and during testing. The Protection Protocol would be strengthened if and where that is required. Potential impacts to the health and safety of Niihau residents are described in Sections 4.2.1.7 and 4.5.2.6 of the Draft EIS.
- Comment 2: How many fishing days will be lost by Kauai fishermen?
- Response 2: It is estimated that clearance of the launch hazard area in the waters surrounding PMRF/KTF would exclude fishermen for up to four hours per target missile launch. With up to 30 closures per year, fishermen would be affected for up to 120 hours per year. This is the same number of closures permitted under the current easement. These impacts are described in Section 4.1.1.8 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 3: What's the impact of rocket fuel on the surrounding pristine reef?
- Response 3: Potential impacts on surrounding reefs are addressed in Section 4.1.1.3, PMRF Biological Resources.
- Comment 4: Does it make Kauai more of a military target?
- Response 4: The TBMD program would be similar to current testing activities at PMRF, we do not believe that there will be any increase in PMRF's vulnerability as an enemy target. Potential impacts to health and safety are described for each location in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.
- Comment 5: Will the jobs be for local people or specialized which means outside labor moving in? How many jobs will be lost because dive companys and fishermen will be restricted from waters surrounding Niihau?
- Response 5: This is a difficult question to provide an accurate response to as we cannot predict who will be qualified for specific jobs requiring specific skills. Consideration will be given to the local workforce as appropriate. Potential socioeconomic impacts at Niihau are described in Section 4.2.1.10 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

S-W-0017

Comment 6: Do we want to put military on Niihau when native Hawaiians just got Kahoolawe back?

Response 6: The socioeconomic sections of the enclosed Draft EIS (Sections 4.2.1.10 and 4.5.2.9) examine the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on the economy and culture of Niihau. In addition, Section 4.5, Environmental Justice, describes potential impacts to Native Hawaiians on Kauai and Niihau.


This Draft EIS has depended significantly on independent work that was already underway on Niihau prior to beginning this EIS process. That work has been groundtruthed by the people of Niihau, including its translation into Hawaiian by persons on the island. Relying on that work, and other available information, it is concluded that the Proposed Action would provide significant economic benefits to the people of the island and Niihau infrastructure, and that an existing Niihau Protection Protocol, appropriately strengthened, will minimize contact between military personnel and Niihau residents and protect Niihau's cultural circumstances.

Comment 7: Haven't they been cutting back military budgets and closing bases around the US?

Response 7: Congress has closed excess and surplus military bases around the U.S. under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510, Title XXIX). However, the Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

1. Coral sandstone cliffs? Yes! In Hawaii; only on Kauai. This unique geology also supports a unique and in-tact ecology.

2. Pristine beaches attract local residents, fishermen and adventure-loving tourists alike. Yet even in this remote corner a new house was built in 1996, disturbing the wild atmosphere.

this is the age of mega-transnational corporations, and information highways with every conceivable "secret" available to anyone for the asking. If there were any serious terrorists out there, this would be their perfect environment. With a super-armored front, anyone can simply walk in the back door.

The real present threats to national security are ^{emotional immaturity:} ignorance, prejudice, greed, hatred, fear, apathy and denial in our own, ~~over-protected~~ society.

In an era of win-win, it is inappropriate and counterproductive to carry a big stick to political negotiations, where one wants to encourage an honest and fair exchange of ideas. Intimidation can never create an atmosphere of trust.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1.) Any further development of any kind is better done on areas that have already been environmentally damaged: That should not be too hard: there is over 80% of the earth to choose from.

2) An Environmental Impact Statement is not enough. To make a responsible choice we have to study the SOCIAL impact of such a major proposed development as well... not just for the USA, but for other countries as well. Stress is called the #1 ailment in the US today. Does arms escalation lower or raise national stress?



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0169
 11 March 1998

Arius Hopman
 PO Box 1032
 Hanapepe, HI 96716

Dear Arius Hopman:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: We are in a global ecological crisis that is unprecedented in history and that is deteriorating exponentially. After two billion years of evolution, we are now witnessing the extinction of entire species daily. Scientific sources report the loss of 50% of topsoil worldwide, deforestation, desertification, environmental pollution with millions of tons of toxins, acid rain, radioactive wastes, an expanding ozone hole, a population bomb and an endless stream of garbage with nowhere to put it. Our house is on fire. Meanwhile, nations are squabbling about who owns the furniture.

It is estimated that only 10% to 15% of the world's ecosystems are still intact. Often what it takes to save a species is an intact ecosystem. There are very few intact tropical island ecosystems in the northern hemisphere, and they are very vulnerable to invasive viruses, fungi, germs, and other alien species, just like the Hawaiian islands were vulnerable. It would be ecologically sounder to expand PMRF on Kauai than venture onto a new island but do we really need to expand at all?

Response 1: This Draft EIS is limited to addressing the environmental consequences of the alternatives under consideration. The EIS does, however, address the potential for biological resource and human health and safety impacts to Kauai, Niihau, Tern Island, and Johnston Atoll, as well as potential effects to the global commons.

Comment 2: It saddens me deeply that the navy would even consider using a National Wildlife Reserve as an expanded launch site. Considering that 80% of the American population consistently votes, in national polls, in favor of environmental protection, one has to wonder which side the navy is actually on?

The military just gave Kaho'olawe Island back to the people of Hawaii, after hammering it for decades with bombing raids. It can never be restored. Can they seriously consider taking a new, virgin island for their expansion?

Response 2: Section 4.3.1.8 describes potential land use compatibility impacts on Tern Island. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities taking place, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis

S-W-0018

contained within this EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required on Tern Island.

Comment 3: The basic question is: do we need arms escalation at all? After the cold war, after the collapse of the USSR, after the Gulf War, there are no serious contenders out there. The USA has already established supremacy far and beyond the next likely contender. In fact, the real threat is no longer "out there." The real present threats to national security are ignorance, prejudice, greed, hatred, fear, apathy and denial in our own over protected, emotional immaturity society. In an era of win-win, it is inappropriate and counterproductive to carry a big stick to political negotiations, where no one wants to encourage an honest and fair exchange of ideas. Intimidation can never create an atmosphere of trust.

Response 3: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

Comment 4: 1.) Any further development of any kind is better done on areas that have already been environmentally damaged: That should not be too hard: there is over 80% of the earth to choose from.

Response 4: As noted in Chapter 2 of the EIS, the Proposed Action would utilize existing facilities and equipment on land already used for similar purposes, and to the extent practicable would build new facilities on land previously disturbed.

Comment 5: 2.) An Environmental Impact Statement is not enough. To make a responsible choice we have to study the social impact of such a major proposed development as well not just for the USA, but for other countries as well. Stress is called the #1 ailment in the US today. Does arms escalation lower or raise national stress?

Response 5: Socioeconomic impacts are described for each location in Section 4. Issues related to other social issues, are outside the scope of analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Comment 6: Niihau, also known as the last truly Hawaiian island, is considered as a potential launching site. Has the Hawaiian population been asked? Wouldn't the development there be another case of cultural genocide? Isn't this proposal rather insensitive to Hawaiians, right in the wake of President Clinton's Apology bill to the Hawaiian people? Isn't this just another disrespectful invasion of an endangered traditional culture?

Response 6: The enclosed Draft EIS incorporates recent work of an independent expert working with and on behalf of the residents of Niihau. That work has been groundtruthed by the people of the island, including translation into Hawaiian. Our earlier public scoping process included an information meeting on Niihau, and the residents of Niihau attended public meetings on Kauai. A Hawaiian Language interpreter was available at all scoping meetings to facilitate comments provided in the Hawaiian Language. We envision a similar outreach process to discuss this DEIS.

S-W-0018

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,
J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-019

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

My comments are simple & direct -
I am against any military involvement
on the island of Nihoa or any other
sacred Hawaiian lands. Enough has
been destroyed & taken in the name
of progress, peace, or job promises -
I have been involved for over a decade
with Native American people on the
mainland regarding false promises &
the slow erosion of the people's ^{STRENGTH} strength
& say over their own lands. This is
~~appalling~~ ^{silent} to me as a U.S. citizen - I have
already seen Kahoalawe - it is not a pretty sight.
The issue is not the promise of jobs. The issue
is already settled. Jobs can be
Please place form in the drop
box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

S-W-0018

Commenter Name	<u>Dr. Joyce Mills</u>
Street Address	<u>PO Box 1030</u>
City	<u>Kekaha Kauai HI</u>
State/ZIP	<u>96752</u>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

*created in more positive way -
is clear & direct.*

X

*This action also involves physical danger
to our children & families -*



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
3090
Ser 00/0194
11 March 1998

Dr Joyce Mills
PO Box 1030
Kekaha, HI 96752

Dear Dr Mills:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: My comments are simple and direct - I am against any military involvement on the island of Niihau or any other sacred Hawaiian lands. Enough has been destroyed and taken in the name of progress, peace, or job promises to have been involved for over a decade with native American people on the mainland regarding false promises and the slow erosion of the people's strength and say over their own lands. This is sickening to me as a US citizen and I have already seen Kahoolawe - it is not a pretty sight. The issue is not the promise of jobs. The issue is already control. Jobs can be created in more positive ways. My voice is alone and denied.

Response 1: A meeting, prior to the start of this EIS, was held on Niihau to receive input from the island residents on the proposed activities to be held on the island. The Draft EIS also uses information from a recent analysis, "Niihau, Present Circumstances and Future Requirements in an Evolving Hawaiian Community", developed by an independent expert working with the people on the island. A meeting will also be held on the island requesting any comments the island residents may have on the results of the analysis conducted in this Draft EIS.

Comment 2: This action also involves physical danger to our children and families.

Response 2: The potential for health and safety impacts is addressed in detail in Section 4.1.1.7 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Because the TBMD program would be similar to current testing activities at PMRF, we do not believe that there will be any increase in PMRF's vulnerability as an enemy target.

LEGAL NOTICE

PUBLIC NOTICE
From The
KINGDOM OF HAWAII

WHEREAS, By the Grace of God, and under the laws of the Kingdom of Hawaii, along with the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between the United States Republic of America and His Majesty, the King of the Hawaiian Islands, I, Kamehameha VI, as heir to the throne, publicly announces the following notice to all those living and or doing business in Hawaii at this time:

WHEREBY, claims on all of the Crown, Government and Chief/Konohiki Lands held in Allodial/Allodium for the Successor and Heirs by birth and Consanguinity have been completed and documented by KAMEHAMEHA VI and the HOUSE OF NOBLES (Konohiki Council of Chiefs), and placed in Trust for every living Kanaka Maoli-regardless of blood quantum and those yet unborn.

WHEREBY, the recent publication of the Kingdom of Hawaii being restored; including the Declaration, Proclamation, and Royal Decree by Kamehameha VI that placed the crown that represents sovereignty on every Kanaka Maoli, removes any and all question of jurisdiction by all foreign entities, including the fictitious State of Hawaii.

WHEREBY, the arrogance of the citizens of the United States and other foreign entities that are now operating illegally in concert with the United States and its constituent agencies against the Kingdom of Hawaii and it's Citizens as owners of these lands must cease.

NOW THEREFORE, Let this Notice be a warning that any and all Land transactions; Sales, Purchases, Foreclosures, Developments, Civil and Criminal actions against the Kanaka Maoli through the judicial process as it deals with their rights to these lands, are hereby declared illegal and will be handled accordingly during the transitional period from the "State of Hawaii" into it's correct status as THE KINGDOM OF HAWAII.

THEREFORE, I, KAMEHAMEHA VI, BY ROYAL DECREE; By Treaties with Twenty Six Nations of the World, Notify those foreign Heads of State, that they will be called to carryout the mandate of those treaties; to aid, assist and enforce all judicial judgements made by this Kingdom, and remove their citizens from operating illegally under and with the State of Hawaii, to stop the gross injustice and their occupation of all lands belonging to the Kingdom of Hawaii.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have caused the Seal and Hand to this Royal Decree as a Public Notice in the Kingdom of Hawaii, this 12th day of August, in the Year of Our Lord, Nineteen Hundred and Ninety Two.

KAMEHAMEHA VI

By The King,
KALAIMOKU HERBERT HOLT KAUAI
PRESIDENT

(Hon 5 B Aug 12 1992)

(514 5080)



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0195
11 March 1998

Mr Elvin Kalakapu
PO Box 87
hanapepe, HI 96716

Dear Mr Kalakapu:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Now, therefore, let this notice be a warning that any and all land transactions; sales, purchases, foreclosures, developments, civil and criminal actions against the Kanaka Maoli through the judicial process as it deals with their rights to these lands, are hereby declared illegal and will be handled accordingly during the transactional period from the State of Hawaii, into it's correct status as the Kingdom of Hawaii. Therefore, I, Kamehameha VI, by royal decree, by treaties with twenty six nations of the world, notify those foreign Heads of State, that they will be called to carry out the mandate of those treaties; to aid, assist, and enforce all judicial judgements made by this Kingdom, and remove their citizens from operating illegally under and with the State of Hawaii, to stop the gross injustice and their occupation of all lands belonging to the Kingdom of Hawaii.

Response 1: Your comments raise issues outside the scope of the Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Wainaea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-022

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

What will be the method used to clean up the environment more, after the increase in rubbish entering the ocean? Even if its small pieces of metal its still a pollution problem. Will there be additional Coast Guard added to the area of expansion?

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Sally Spencer</i>
Street Address	<i>PO Box 911</i>
City	<i>KILAUEA, HI 96754</i>
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0197
11 March 1998

Ms Sally Spencer
PO Box 911
Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Ms Spencer:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: What will be the method used to clean up the environment more, after the increase in rubbish entering the ocean? Even if it's small pieces of metal, it's still a pollution problem.

Response 1: Potential impacts to the ocean are discussed in Section 4.4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 2: Will there be additional Coast Guard added to the area of expansion?

Response 2: No additional Coast Guard presence would be necessary.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J. A. Bowlin
J. A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0263
12 March 1998

Ms Liz Randol
PO Box 685
Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Ms Randol:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.


Comment 1: Kauai is a beautiful, unspoiled part of the planet. One of the few places where nature is still so alive you can feel it talking to you when you are out hiking towards a waterfall, or surfing a wave with the dolphins. If you have ears to listen, that is. Of course, if you are so numbed out by thinking nature and the world in general are enemies to be overcome, vanquished, conquered, then you might not be able to hear anything worth hearing, anymore. Nature doesn't shout at you. It speaks in a low quiet voice. If you could attempt to be quiet and to listen to what nature has to say, the dolphins would tell you - we don't need rockets and bombs and nuclear subs here. Kauai doesn't want to be ground zero in a nuclear attack - that may or may not be a figment of some war-obsessed Pentagon flunky's imagination.

We don't want to be ground zero. We don't want your money or your desecration of our sacred places. In fact, you should leave Polihale - the sooner the better. We may be going through a temporary downsizing in our economy - so you may think this is a good time to approach us, when we're down. Well, we're not so down that we're desperate enough to grasp at this particular straw. Our island's future lies in eco-tourism, and learning to feed ourselves with low-impact agriculture. This spot with it's unique beauty is not available for the greedy and heavy feet of the military to trample. You've trampled so many beautiful spots all over the world. It's time for you to stop this madness now. If you feel you must plant your war toys in some part of this sacred earth, perhaps you should revisit some area you've already despoiled, rather than destroy our home.

Response 1: PMRF has taken its stewardship of natural resources on and around PMRF seriously and has striven to protect and preserve the natural amenities you describe. However, its national security mission is mandated by Congress, and debate over this mission is not within the scope of this EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

1.b.

Genealogy of the Koakanu Family

Kamehameha-nui married Manu-hai-apo and had Ka-lani-moku
 Kalani-moku (k) married Ku-ali'i (w) and had Lo'ea
 Lo'ea (w) married Koa-kanu and had Liliha (w)
 Liliha (w) married Kalani-ulu-moku (sic) and had Lo'ea, Lanihau, Koakanu II
 and Maheha

Liliha (w) married Ha'alo'u-o-Kiliwehi and had Pale-ka-luhi

Koa-kanu II married Beke and had Lanihau II and Maheha II

Maheha mated with Kamehameha V and had Ke-ano-lani (w)

The chiefs mentioned above were of a family of albinos.

Kalani-ulu-moku (Ka-lani-ulu-moku above) was also known as Ha-malle.


1.a.

Koakanu Genealogy

Unf-hulu-maka-o-ka-lani (w) to Kau-ka-wohi (k) had
 1. Ku-a-'Uni
 2. Ka-unhi-a-la'a-ivi-lani
 3. Kane-mai-ka-mana

Kau-a-Uni to Ka-unhi-a-la'a-ivi-lani, had Mano-i-hele-au
 Mano-i-hele-au to Ke-'olohaka, had Keawe-a-'(olohaka (k)
 Keawe-a-Olohaka to Ke-ku'i-ape-iwa, (w) had Koakanu
 Koakanu (k) to Lo'ea (w) had Liliha (w)
 Liliha (w) to Ka-lani-ulu-moku (k), had
 1. Jang Lo'ea
 2. Lanihau
 3. Koa-kanu II
 4. Maheha

Liliha (w) to Ha'alo'u-o-Kiliwehi, and had Pale-ka-luhi (k)



85.1

entment, subject always to the rights of tenants. And the Minister of the Interior and his successors in office and dispose of said lands, as provided in the Act to Departments, done and passed at the Council House in of April, A. D., 1845: Provided, however, that the Minister in Privy Council, to dispose of the government upon such other terms and conditions as to him may seem best for the promotion of the Hawaiian Kingdom:

AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED that, the following land, viz:

Waikakalana	Ahupuaa	Waikale
Waikane	Ahupuaa	Koolauloa
Waikapohi	Ii in Kaneohe	Koolaupoko
Waikale	Ii in Waialeale	Ewa
Waimeazuku	Ii in Kailua	Koolaupoko
Waimea (1/2)	Ahupuaa	Koolauloa
Waiohaka	Ii in Kaneohe	Koolaupoko
Watono	Ahupuaa	Koolauloa
Waiohiki	Ii in Kailua	Koolaupoko
Waipuaiki	Ii in Kailua	Koolaupoko
Waipahu	Ii in Waialeale	Ewa

KAUAI

Aliomanu	Ahupuaa	Koolau
Hanakapi'ai	Ahupuaa	Napali
Homakawaa	Ahupuaa	Koolau
Horokoa (1/2)	Ahupuaa	Napali
Honopu	Ahupuaa	Napali
Kalalau	Ahupuaa	Kona
Kikaaola	Ii in Waimea	Kona
Kilauea	Ahupuaa	Koolau
Koula (1/2)	Ii in Hanapepe	Puna
Makaweli	Ahupuaa—na i i me na meo a me na loi no 'koa	Puna
Molokaa	Ahupuaa	Koolau
Olohena (1/2)	Ahupuaa	Puna
Paikahawai	Ii in Kapaa	Koolau
Papaa	Ahupuaa	Koolau
Papaa, one side	Ahupuaa	Koolau
Pohakuae	Ahupuaa	Napali
Punalau (1/2)	Ii in Hanapepe	Kona
Puukapete	Ii in Waimea	Kona
Uiaikiu	Ii in Kapaa	Puna
Waikawa	Ahupuaa	Kona
Waikalua East	Ahupuaa	Koolau
Waioi	Ahupuaa	Ha'alea
Weliweli	Ahupuaa	Kona

NIIHAU

Kaluaohou	Ahupuaa
Niihau	Ishud
Panahala	Ahupuaa
Pokueoa	Ahupuaa

FORT I

Names of Lands	Ahupuaa
OAHU	
Aala	Ii in Honolulu
Alewa	Ii in Honolulu
Apowale	Ii in Honolulu
Anaukai	Ii in Waikiki
Halelona	Ii in Waikiki
Haole	Ii in Waikiki
Hapuna	Ii in Honolulu
Hauhaikoi	Ii in Honolulu
Kaalalalo	Ii in Honolulu
Kaaleo	Ii in Honolulu
Kaunooa	Ii in Waikiki
Kahapaakai	Ii in Honolulu
Kahoiwai	Ii in Waikiki
Kahui	Ii in Honolulu
Kaikahi	Ii in Honolulu
Kala	Ii in Waikiki
Kalokohou	Ii in Honolulu
Kaluaelaea	Ii in Waikiki
Kaluaauu	Ii in Kailhi
Kaluaohole	Ii in Waikiki
Kaolu, Kawannakoa	Ii in Honolulu
Kapalepo	Ii in Honolulu
Kapiwai 1	Ii in Honolulu
Kapiwai 2	Ii in Honolulu
Kaukahoku	Ii in Honolulu

ISLAND OF NIIHAU

432

ISLAND OF NIIHAU

Location	Awardse	L.C.A.	Book	Page	R. P.	Book	Page	Area	No. of Pgs.
Halaweia	Koakanu	M. A.	20-B	3	327	5573	22	47 App.	1
Kahuku	Koakanu	M. A.	20	3	327	5573	22	47 App.	1

851

LEHUA

The island of Lehua is situated on the northern end of Niihau and the western end of Kauai.

Most local residents of Kauai and Niihau know that island as the home of the sharks because of the surrounding waters infested with sharks.

When I was a young girl, I remembered hearing the story from my grandparents of a fisherman who was found to be dead while fishing at Kunikailawe; a fishing ground located in the kona area of Kauai. The fisherman's body was taken to his home for immediate viewing by his relatives, friends and neighbors. His still body was laid on a bed in the parlor. As the people were mourning over him, a black cat entered from the front door climbed and crossed over the dead man, jumped down and left through the back door of the house. The dead man woke up and wondered why the people in his home was crying. The people were amazed that he was alive. He told them he was not dead, but he had travelled with the sharks to visit the homes of the sharks. He told how he travelled to Lehua and to Pu'uloa (Pearl Harbor) and also with Kamahooli'i, the shark god, and brother of Pele.

NI'IIHAU

There are so many legends of Ni'ihau that I remembered hearing from the kupunas. The story of Pahiula, the red eel. The story of the school for the ali'i children on Ni'ihau. The famous battle of Ni'ihau and legendary hero Benehakaka Kanahale (Kaiwi), though he was known as "Ben Kanahale" by the military. Some scary stories told to me by my late father in-law, Michael Haluluolehua Kaiwi, son of Benehakaka Kanahale.

My favorite will always be of that hero, Benehakaka Kanahale who unarmed, subdued the enemy, while wounded by three gunshot wounds.

When I was a young girl my father would always tell us, his children, about the story of Ben Kanahale. I was fascinated by my father's story telling about this man who I will idolize in my mind's memory.

In 1974, I eventually married Ben Kanahale's grandson and namesake. We raised four children and named our youngest son Benehakaka Kanahale Kaiwi III, after the infamous hero. My son is tall, strong and handsome Hawaiian stature like his forefather.

One day, I hope my children can visit that island of their ancestors with freedom and locate the burial sites of their kupuna's. Those of the Koakanu and Kanahale families and the areas of these people. Freedom to know where their remains are located, that they may respect their honor of the past.

KOAKANU

Koakanu son of Keawe-a-Olohaka (k) and Kekuiapo'iwa (w) was awarded two ahupua'a on the island of Ni'ihau; Halawela and Kahuku. His father, Keawe-a-Olohaka was first cousin to Paiea, Kamehameha I. Keawe-a-Olohaka's father was the high chief Keawemauihi of Hawaii. Koakanu also fought side by side with Kamehameha I in conquering the Hawaiian islands. He married Loeau daughter of Kalanilumoku (k) and Ku-ali'i (w). Kalanilumoku's mother, Naneaipo is sister to King Kaunuali'i's father Kaeokulani of the royal Maui families.

With the union of marriage of Hawaii's ali'is and Maui's ali'i families the islands became peaceful and all wars ceased. Peace among all the Hawaiian islands was finally achieved.

During the Great-Mahele of 1848, the lands were acquired in Fee Simple. The island of Ni'ihau was apportioned into five ahupua'as. Two to Koakanu, as mentioned above, and three to Kamehameha III, under government lands. Kaluahonu, Paauhala, Pohueloa; the entire island of Ni'ihau comprising of an area of seventy-three square miles.

Koakanu's daughter Liliha, had four children. Her daughter Abigail Maheha was the mother of Keanolani, the love child and daughter of Lot Kapo'iwa, Kamehameha V. Through this daughter she had many descendants who still live today throughout the world.

REFERENCES

- An Account Of The Polynesian Race - Abraham Fornander
- The Niihau Incident - Allan Beekman
- Indices Of Awards - The Board Of Commissioners To Quiet Land
Titles In The Hawaiian Islands
- Genealogy Of The Koakanu Family - State Of Hawaii Archives
- Royal Childrens School - Juliette/Montague Cooke
- Oral Traditional Storytelling - Kupunas
- Hauai Line Of Chiefs Genealogy - Norman Temple, Laie, Oahu, Hawaii



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0264
12 March 1998

Ms Belle Kaiwe
3-4280 Kuhio Hwy #5
Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Ms Kaiwe:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: I am opposed to the presence of the military on the island of Ni'ihau and it's proposed uses based on the significant impact of its testing of rockets and the disturbance of ancient sites of historical facts.
- Response 1: Section 3. 2.1.4 of the enclosed Draft EIS describes existing cultural resources at Niihau, and Section 4.2.1.3 addresses potential impacts to cultural resources on Niihau.
- Comment 2: Who knows where the exact and true location of the school for the ali'I children are? Will the testing destroy these historical and ancient sites? Where do I know exactly my kupuna's burial sites? Will it be desecrated by the presence of missiles? Will the island still be famous for it's beautiful shell leis? How will these tests affect it?
- Response 2: Section 3. 2.1.4 of the enclosed Draft EIS describes existing cultural resources at Niihau, and Section 4.2.1.3 addresses potential impacts to cultural resources on Niihau.
- Comment 3: Will the surrounding waters be affected, especially the shark population and its legendary island, Lehua?
- Response 3: Potential impacts on the waters surrounding Niihau are discussed in Sections 4.2.1.3, Niihau Biological Resources, and 4.2.1.4, Niihau Water Resources. Potential impacts on Lehua are discussed in Section 4.2.1.8, Niihau Land Use.
- Comment 4: What about the bird population living on Lehua? What about the fishing grounds?
- Response 4: Potential impacts on the waters surrounding Niihau are discussed in Sections 4.2.1.3, Niihau Biological Resources, and 4.2.1.4, Niihau Water Resources. Potential impacts on Lehua are discussed in Section 4.2.1.8, Niihau Land Use.
- Comment 5: Will the military allow fishermen to fish or will it be entirely a restricted area?
- Response 5: The Navy expects that the maximum number of launches per year at Niihau would not exceed eight. Clearance of the launch hazard area would be required for up to four hours per launch; therefore, the maximum number of hours per year that Niihau fishermen would be affected would be 32. Launches at PMRF requiring clearance of the launch hazard area would occur more frequently but not more than 30 times per year.
- Comment 6: What happened to the rights of the tenants as granted on the Great-Mahele? Do these people living on the island agree to the proposal or because their master tells them to? What happened to

human rights? The rights of the aboriginal kanaka maoli?

Response 6: The enclosed Draft EIS incorporates recent work of an independent expert working with and on behalf of the people of Niihau. That work has been groundtruthed by the people of the island, including translation into Hawaiian. Our earlier public scoping process included an information meeting on Niihau, and residents of Niihau attended public meetings on Kauai. We envision a similar outreach process to discuss this Draft EIS.

Comment 7: And lastly, do you Robinson have clear title to these lands?

Response 7: Disputes over title to Niihau are not within the scope of the Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet

S-W-025

for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

*ON BEHALF OF THE KINGDOM OF HAWAII, RESTORED
JUNE 7, 1992, I'M RE-SUBMITTING A COPY OF
THE PUBLIC NOTICE FROM THE KINGDOM OF
HAWAII (HOW.S.B. AUG. 15, 1992) WHICH
SAYS ALL THAT I DESIRE TO COMMENT ON.
I PRAY THAT YOU WILL CONSIDER SERIOUSLY
THE CONSEQUENCES OF FURTHERING GRASS
INJUSTICES AGAINST THE KANAKA MAOLI AND
OTHERS WHO CALL THESE "ISLES OF THE SEA"
HOMER. NIIHAU DOES NOT "BELONG" TO
THE ROBINSONS, ALLODIAL TITLE/PATENT
IS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE
KINGDOM OF HAWAII.*

Please place form in the drop
box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Shana K. Moritsugu</i>
Street Address	<i>P.O. Box 3165</i>
City	<i>Lihue KAUAI</i>
State/ZIP	<i>HAWAII 96766</i>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

S-W-0024

LEGAL NOTICE

PUBLIC NOTICE
From The
KINGDOM OF HAWAII

WHEREAS, By the Grace of God, and under the laws of the Kingdom of Hawaii, along with the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between the United States Republic of America and His Majesty, the King of the Hawaiian Islands, I, Kamehameha VI, as heir to the throne, publicly announces the following notice to all those living and or doing business in Hawaii at this time:

WHEREBY, claims on all of the Crown, Government and Chief/Konohiki Lands held in Allodial/Alloodium for the Successor and Heirs by birth and Consanguinity have been completed and documented by KAMEHAMEHA VI and the HOUSE OF NOBLES (Konohiki Council of Chiefs), and placed in Trust for every living Kanaka Maoli-regardless of blood quantum-and those yet unborn.

WHEREBY, the recent publication of the Kingdom of Hawaii being restored, including the Declaration, Proclamation, and Royal Decree by Kamehameha VI that placed the crown that represents sovereignty on every Kanaka Maoli, removes any and all question of jurisdiction by all foreign entities, including the fictitious State of Hawaii.

WHEREBY, the arrogance of the citizens of the United States and other foreign entities that are now operating illegally in concert with the United States and its constituent agencies against the Kingdom of Hawaii and it's Citizens as owners of these lands must cease.

NOW THEREFORE, Let this Notice be a warning that any and all Land transactions, Sales, Purchases, Foreclosures, Developments, Civil and Criminal actions against the Kanaka Maoli through the judicial process as it deals with their rights to these lands, are hereby declared illegal and will be handled accordingly during the transitional period from the "State of Hawaii" into it's correct status as the KINGDOM OF HAWAII.

THEREFORE, I, KAMEHAMEHA VI, BY ROYAL DECREE, By Treaties with Twenty Six Nations of the World, Notify those foreign Heads of State, that they will be called to carryout the mandate of those treaties; to aid, assist and enforce all judicial judgements made by this Kingdom, and remove their citizens from operating illegally under and with the State of Hawaii, to stop the gross injustice and their occupation of all lands belonging to the Kingdom of Hawaii.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have caused the Seal and Hand to this Royal Decree as a Public Notice in the Kingdom of Hawaii, this 12th day of August, in the Year of Our Lord, Nineteen Hundred and Ninety Two.

KAMEHAMEHA VI

By The King
KALANORU HERBERT HOLT KAUAI
MEMBER

(Hon 5 11 Aug 15 1992)

(311 5086)



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO
5090
Ser 00/0170
11 March 1998

Ilona Moritsugu
PO Box 3165
Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Ilona Moritsugu:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I pray that you will consider seriously the consequences of furthering gross injustice against the Kenaka Maoli and others who call these "isles of the sea" home. Niihau does not "belong" to the Robinsons. Allodial Title/Patent is within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Hawaii.

Response 1: Disputes over title to Niihau are not within the scope of the Draft EIS.

Comment 2: NOW THEREFORE, Let this Notice be a warning that any and all Land transactions, Sales, Purchases, Foreclosures, Developments, Civil and Criminal actions against the Kanaka Maoli through the judicial process as it deals with their rights to these lands, are hereby declared illegal and will be handled accordingly during the transitional period from "State of Hawaii" into it's correct status as The KINGDOM OF HAWAII. THEREFORE, I, KAMEHAMEHA VI, BY ROYAL DECREE, By Treaties with Twenty Six Nations of the World, Notify these foreign Heads of State, that they will be called to carry out the mandate of those treaties; to aid, assist and enforce all judicial judgements made by this Kingdom, and remove their citizens from operating illegally under and with the State of Hawaii, to stop the gross injustice and their occupation of all lands belonging to the Kingdom of Hawaii.

Response 2: Disputes over title to Niihau are not within the scope of the Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0025

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-026



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0198
11 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

- ① WE DO NOT WANT ANY ADDITIONAL
MILITARY ANYTHING ON OR AROUND
KAUAI.
- ② YOUR TESTING ETC IS ONLY LEADING
US TO ARMAGEDDON.
- ③ THE US GOVERNMENT IS OUT OF CONTROL
AND THIS IS AN EXAMPLE OF IT.
- ④ STOP TRYING TO BE GOD AND
GIVE HAWAII BACK TO THE HAWAIIAN
PEOPLE.
- ⑤ DON'T YOU DARE DO THIS NONSENSE!
- ⑥ GET A LIFE!

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	DAN SHOOK
Street Address	P.O. 900
City	KILAUEA, HI 96754
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

Mr Dan Shook
PO Box 900
Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Mr Shook:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1:
1. We do not want any additional military anything on or around Kauai.
 2. Your testing etc. is only leading us to Armageddon.
 3. The US government is out of control and this is an example of it!
 4. Stop trying to be God and give Hawaii back to the Hawaiian people.
 5. Don't you dare do this nonsense!
 6. Get a life!

Response 1: PMRF's national security mission has been directed by Congress, and debate over this mission is not within the scope of the Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-O-027

Comment 2:

I think that the Hawaiian people should keep their land and I (object) to having these missiles because this is a sacred island this is for the Hawaiian people and we don't want to turn it into a missile area at all because if we do you guys in the Navy, you know what you are doing? You're messing up the Hawaiian people, you're messing up our island, and you're messing up our state so, please don't do this.

Carl R. DiPalma
Waimea



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0199
11 March 1998

Mr Carl DiPalma
PO Box 507
Waimea, HI 96796

Dear Mr DiPalma:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I think the Hawaiian people should keep their land and I (object) to having these missiles because this is a sacred island this is for the Hawaiian people and we don't want to turn it into a missile area at all because if we do you guys in the Navy, you know what you're doing? You're messing up the Hawaiian people, you're messing up our island, and you're messing up our state so, please don't do this.

Response 1: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment 3:

S-O-028

I live in Kekaha. I don't believe a thing you are telling me here today. I never have believed anything the government has told me and I have no reason to change that opinion. Because the government still continues to manipulate people, use people, hurt people, and to come here today and tell me this is the information that you are giving me, in my opinion I just can't even begin to believe any of it. Actually my opinion about the military is I believe in peace and unity. I believe we don't need this here on Niihau. I believe Keith Robinson should give the Hawaiians back Niihau. Let the Hawaiians take care of their stuff over there. Not to maintain so much control.

Tashi Deibel
Kekaha, Hawaii



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0171
11 March 1998

Tashi Deibel
PO Box 1231
Kekaha, HI 96752

Dear Tashi Deibel:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I live in Kekaha. I don't believe a thing you are telling me here today. I never have believed anything the government has told me and I have no reason to change that opinion. Because the government still continues to manipulate people, use people, hurt people, and to come here today and tell me this is the information that you are giving me, in my opinion, I just can't even begin to believe any of it. Actually my opinion about the military is I believe in peace and unity. I believe we don't need this here in Niihau. I believe Keith Robinson should give the Hawaiians back Niihau. Let the Hawaiians take care of stuff over there. Not to maintain so much control.

Response 1: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,
J.A. BOWLIN
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0028



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0200
 11 March 1998

Ms Kathy Oliver
 PO Box 802
 Anahola, HI 96703

Dear Ms Oliver:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: People of Niihau need an unbiased expert to represent both their interests and the Navy's.

I am requesting that a committee, selected by representatives from: the community of Kauai, especially Native Hawaiians, the Hawaiian Sovereignty movement, appropriate governmental agencies, the University of Hawaii School of Social Work, Sociology, and Pacific Island Studies, and the U.S. Navy, choose a locally recognized expert to perform a SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT of the expected effects on the people of Niihau the proposed PMRF project.

Response 1: The enclosed Draft EIS incorporates recent work of an independent expert working with and on behalf of the people of Niihau. That work has been translated into Hawaiian by Niihau residents and validated by the people of the island. This Draft EIS also includes a comprehensive list of its preparers and their qualifications.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet

S-W-030

for the
 Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
 Enhanced Capability
 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

*What does Mr. Robinson plan on doing with children born from insemination by US Navy men - Will the father be allowed to stay on the island - Will the mother be allowed to leave + return to visit family members - what will happen to these indigenous women?
 How dare you use "jobs for people" - to cover up your dastardly behavior - Money always is the bottom line.*

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
 PMRF Public Affairs Office
 P.O. Box 128
 Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>KAREN GIBBONS</i>
Street Address	<i>P.O. Box 1478</i>
City	<i>Kapaa HI</i>
State/ZIP	<i>96746</i>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

S-W-0029

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

I want to know if the people of Niihau
have an advocate - from a totally unbiased
(non employed by the Navy or any governmental
agency) who will tell them the
truth - the whole truth -

Where is Greenpeace

Please place form in the drop
box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Karen Gibbons
Street Address	P.O. Box 1478
City	Kapaa HI
State/ZIP	96746

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0201
11 March 1998

Ms Karen Gibbons
PO Box 1478
Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Ms Gibbons:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: What does Mr. Robinson plan on doing with children born from insemination by US Navymen - Will the father be allowed to stay on the island - Will the mother be allowed to leave and return to visit family members - What will happen to these innocent woman?

Response 1: Military personnel's contact with the culture of Niihau is strictly controlled by a protocol between the Robinson family and PMRF. While there would be some job-related contact during construction activities and during testing, there would not be social contact between Navy personnel and Niihau residents. Protection Protocol would be strengthened if and where that is required.


Comment 2: How dare you use "jobs for people" - to cover up your dastardly behavior - Money always is the bottom line.

Response 2: Thank you.

Comment 3: I want to know if the people of Niihau have an advocate - from a totally unbiased (non employed by the Navy or any governmental agency) who will tell them the truth - the whole truth - Where is Greenpeace

Response 3: The enclosed Draft EIS incorporates recent work of an independent expert working with and on behalf of the people of Niihau. That work has been translated into Hawaiian by Niihau residents and validated by the people of the island. This Draft EIS also includes a comprehensive list of its preparers and their qualifications.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet

S-W-031

for the
 Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
 Enhanced Capability
 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

To Whom It May Concern -

PMRF is a very "good neighbor." They not only contribute to the well-being of our Island economy, they are extremely conscientious of the environment and the people.

I wholeheartedly support PMRF and am extremely proud that Kauai and Niihau are the chosen site (s) for the facility.

Donna Apisa

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
 PMRF Public Affairs Office
 P.O. Box 128
 Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>DONNA APISA</i>	
Street Address	<i>4360 WAILAPA RD.</i>	<i>PO Box 35</i>
City	<i>KILAHEA,</i>	<i>PERUWEE,</i>
State/ZIP	<i>HI 96754</i>	<i>HI 96722</i>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

S-W-0030



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0202
11 March 1998

Ms Donna Apisa
4360 Wailapa Rd
Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Ms Apisa:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: PMRF is a very "good neighbor." They not only contribute to the well-being of our Island economy, they are extremely conscientious of the environment and the people.
I whole heartedly support PMRF and am extremely proud that Kauai and Niihau are the chosen site(s) for the facility.

Response 1: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet

S-W-032

for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

I am very concerned about the effect of this testing on coral reefs and wildlife in the wildlife preserve.

I would like to propose community-PMRF partnerships to monitor coral reefs and work to improve the fisheries surrounding Kauai. We can all work together to improve Kauai's Ocean Resource Management for the good of the residents on Kauai and their families.

It is very difficult for me to support expansion of existing range dimensions, but it would be interesting to work
(over)

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>CARL STEPANI</i>
Street Address	<i>P.O. Box 549</i>
City	<i>Hanalei</i>
State/ZIP	<i>HI 96714</i>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

together in order to improve fisheries
resources and the status of the islands
coral reefs

Carl Stepath
826-2525



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0265
12 March 1998

Mr Carl Stepath
PO Box 549
Hanalei, HI 96714

Dear Mr Stepath:


Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I am very concerned about the effect of this testing on coral reefs and wildlife in the wildlife preserve.
I would like to propose community - PMRF partnerships to monitor coral reefs and work to improve the fisheries surrounding Kauai. We can all work together to improve Kauai's Ocean Resource Management for the good of the residents on Kauai and their families.
It is very difficult for me to support expansion of existing range dimensions, but it would be interesting to work together in order to improve fisheries resources and the status of the islands coral reefs.

Response 1: Potential impacts on fisheries and coral reefs near Kauai are addressed in Section 4.1.1.3, PMRF/Main Base Biological Resources, and Section 4.1.1.10, PMRF Socioeconomics.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

16 June 1997

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

S-W-033

Ms. Mossman:

Here are my comments concerning issues which I believe are relevant for the EIS dealing with Theater Missile Defense tests associated with PMRF. My comments are based upon review of the 23 May 1997 EIS Preparation Notice, past reviews of various analyses of the impacts of STARS and Vandal launches at PMRF, review of the 1994 BMDO Programmatic EIS, and review of the 1994 Theater Missile Defense Extended Test Range EIS. These comments represent my views and are not official positions of the Dept. of Physics & Astronomy or of the Univ. of Hawaii.

Issues to consider in the EIS for "Enhancement of the Capability of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, HI To Conduct Missile Defense Testing and Training Activities"

Information needed

The EIS needs to provide detailed information about the scope of the theater missile defense tests --

- how many tests over what time period
- what target boosters will be used, their exhaust products and hazard areas
- what interceptors will be used and whether they will be launched from land or at sea
- what new launch and instrumentation sites will be used
- what materials will be used to simulate warheads containing conventional explosives, chemical weapons, and nuclear weapons
- what interceptor warhead technologies will be used (e.g. kinetic or explosive)
- what ordnance requires additional storage at Kamokala Caves

Safety

The EIS needs to examine the reliabilities of all missiles to be used in tests. The reliabilities should include the rocket motors as well as other systems and should be compared with the results of recent launches. The EIS should state explicitly if the reliability of any missile component (e.g. rocket motors) is withheld because the data are classified.

The EIS should examine capabilities (e.g. fire-fighting equipment) for dealing with a catastrophic launch failure at all launch sites on land. In particular, the consequences of failures like the 20 August 1991 Arias failure at Patrick AFB in Florida and the 15 June 1993 Minuteman I failure at Vandenberg AFB in California should be examined as examples.

The trajectories for the targets and interceptors should be given, along with the impact points for misses and expected impact areas for debris from successful intercepts. Estimates should be made of the risk of missiles and debris hitting ships and aircraft -- including civilian ships, small planes, and helicopters.

Treaty compliance

The EIS should indicate what restrictions the START and INF treaties impose on theater missile defense tests. The ranges and reentry speeds for target missiles should be given so that they can be compared with the ABM/TMD demarcation limits agreed to by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin at the Helsinki summit in March. This is of particular concern for the Strategic Target System (STARS) booster, which has a possible range greater than the agreed 3,500 kilometer limit for TMD tests.

Air quality

The EIS should examine the impacts of rocket exhaust products on air quality and indicate what air quality monitoring will be done. Because of problems with monitoring of the 1st and 3rd STARS launches at PMRF, there is still no reliable measurement of the hydrogen chloride (HCl) concentration either near the launch pad or downwind at the boundary of the ground hazard area for STARS launches. For the 3rd launch, the HCl monitors 140 feet from the launch pad saturated at a concentration of 140 ppm, which exceeds the level of 100 ppm deemed "immediately dangerous to life and health."

Water contamination

The EIS should indicate what baseline surveys and subsequent monitoring will be done at new launch sites. It should also review sampling results at PMRF and indicate what monitoring will be done for future launches. The 1997 Dept. of Energy report "Linking Legacies" (DOE/EM-0319) notes a contaminated water volume of 5,700 cubic meters at the Kauai Test Facility (KTF).

Soil contamination

The Dept. of Energy "Linking Legacies" reports a volume of 1,400 cubic meters of contaminated soil at KTF. The EIS should state what baseline surveys and subsequent soil sampling will be done at PMRF (including KTF) and at new launch sites. This is especially important for HCl, a major exhaust product of solid-fuel rocket motors. Soil sampling after the 1st STARS launch showed that 87% of samples had increased HCl concentrations but it was unclear how much of the increase was due to the STARS exhaust. Another potentially serious contaminant is lead, which is emitted by some rocket motors. For example, the Talos motor used for the Vandal missile emits about 45 pounds of lead. Elevated lead levels were seen near some KTF launch pads in soil sampling done in 1990 so it is important to do baseline sampling near the Vandal launch pad and to monitor the amount of lead contamination from the Vandal launches. Baseline sampling and monitoring for lead should also be done at any new sites where missiles emitting lead will be launched.

Ozone depletion

The EIS should estimate the amount of ozone depletion due to the HCl in the rocket exhaust. Halon 2402, which depletes ozone six times more effectively than common freon, is emitted in substantial amounts by the STARS 2nd stage motor (90 kilograms) and by the SR19-AJ-1 motor (120 kilograms) which can be used as the 1st stage motor for the HERA missile. So the EIS should estimate halon 2402 emissions and the resulting ozone depletion.

Space debris

The EIS should estimate the amount of debris that would remain in orbit from any test

of an anti-satellite weapon (ASAT) that hits an orbiting object. An article in the 24 March 1997 issue of Aviation Week & Space Technology reports that an ASAT test using a STARS launch at KTF is being contemplated for FY 1998.

Secret programs

There are "black" military programs whose budgets and other details are secret, even from members of Congress. Some of these programs involve rocket launches that could have devastating environmental impacts. An example is the Timberwind program to develop rockets powered by nuclear reactors. In the early 1990's PMRF was considered as a potential site for a nuclear propulsion test facility. How many past rocket launches at PMRF have been for "black" programs and how many of these launches are expected during the period when theater missile defense tests will be done?

Restrictive Easement

The EIS should provide results of baseline surveys and periodic water and soil sampling so that State of Hawaii officials and the public can judge whether there are "any contaminants or pollutants found within the easement area as a result of the launches which significantly threaten the public health" discussed in item 14 of the Restrictive Easement. This is especially important for lead levels in soil samples near the Vandal launch pad. The response to my comment about impacts of lead releases on the draft Restrictive Easement EIS stated that the Navy would do a baseline survey and periodic monitoring around the Vandal launch site. The EIS should examine the results of these surveys.

The EIS should contain a list with dates of STARS and Vandal launches that have occurred under the easement since 1994. It should also indicate how many times the GRANTEE has exercised the easement in 1994, 1995, and 1996; whether the GRANTEE provided the required notices seven days before each scheduled launch; and how long the GRANTEE maintained exclusive control of the ground hazard area each time the easement was exercised.

Alternatives

The EIS should indicate which of the planned tests could be done at other test ranges and compare the impacts at these other ranges with those at PMRF. An EIS evaluating the impacts of similar tests in the Eglin Gulf Test Range is currently being done. The 1994 Theater Missile Defense Extended Test Range EIS examined the impacts of similar tests; the 21 March 1995 Record of Decision for this EIS decided to proceed at the White Sands Missile Range and at the Kwajalein Missile Range. PMRF was eliminated from consideration "because of the lack of the full range of land-based instrumentation sites to observe intercepts and inadequate land area for interceptor deployment or for placement of instrumentation that would have to be brought in from another range."

Michael Jones
Dept. of Physics & Astronomy
Univ. of Hawaii
2505 Correa Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00:0266
12 March 1998

Dr Michael Jones
Dept of Physics and Astronomy
University of Hawaii at Manoa
2505 Correa Road
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear Dr Jones:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Information needed

The EIS needs to provide detailed information about the scope of the theater missile defense tests--
how many tests over what time period
what target boosters will be used, their exhaust products and hazard areas
what interceptors will be used and whether they will be launched from land or at sea
what new launch and instrumentation sites will be used
what materials will be used to simulate warheads containing conventional explosives, chemical weapons, and nuclear weapons
what interceptor warhead technologies will be used (e.g. kinetic or explosive)
what ordinance requires additional storage at Kamakla Caves

Response 1: All of the detailed information that you requested is contained in Chapter 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS, Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives.

Comment 2: Safety

The EIS needs to examine the reliabilities of all missiles to be used in tests. The reliabilities should include the rocket motors as well as other systems and should be compared with the results of recent launches. The EIS should state explicitly if the reliability of any missile component (e.g. rocket motors) is withheld because the data are classified. The EIS should examine capabilities (e.g. fire-fighting equipment) for dealing with a catastrophic launch failure at all launch sites on land. In particular, the consequences of failures like the 20 August 1991 Aries failure at Patrick AFB in Florida and the 15 June 1993 Minuteman 1 failure at Vandenberg AFB in California should be examined as examples. The trajectories for the targets and interceptors should be given, along with the impact points for misses and expected impact areas for debris from successful intercepts. Estimates should be made of the risk of missiles and debris hitting ships and aircraft--including civilian ships, small planes, and helicopters.

Response 2: The missile systems proposed for use are current systems used by the Department of Defense. PMRF will establish safety areas from which the public will be excluded and where all debris from a flight termination would fall. The Strategic Target System would continue to be used

under both the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action.

Specific risk analyses have not been conducted for each vehicle proposed to be launched as part of the Proposed Action. However, since Kauai Test Facility (KTF) first started operations in 1962, approximately 360 rocket systems have been launched from the KTF. During this period, there have been no ground or airborne failures that have caused injury, loss of life, damage or destruction of any facilities or the environment. Early in KTF history (1964), assembly procedural errors resulted in the premature ignition of the second stage on the launch pad coincident with booster ignition, resulting in a ground fire that spread to the brush adjacent to the facility. As a result, system-specific Safe Operating Procedures (SOPs) were modified, and their use in conjunction with safety checklists has prevented a recurrence. In 1974, in an effort to increase performance of the Strypi Rocket System, a system using a Castor II rocket motor was designed as the first stage versus the original Castor I. Two flight tests were conducted at KTF, with the first one ejecting a nozzle liner at ignition. The system landed within the ground hazard area and caused no injury or damage. The other system experienced burn-through in the casing and landed in the broad ocean area within the cleared hazard area. This system was not developed further and has not flown since.

The Navy expects to continue this excellent safety record in implementing the No-Action or Proposed Action Alternative.

- Comment 3: The EIS should indicate what restrictions the START and INF treaties impose on theater missile defense tests. The ranges and reentry speeds for target missiles should be given so that they can be compared with the ABM/TMD demarcation limits agreed to by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin at the Helsinki summit in March. This is of particular concern for the Strategic Target System (STARS) booster, which has a possible range greater than the agreed 3,500 kilometer limit for TMD tests.
- Response 3: All testing at PMRF currently complies and will continue to comply with U.S. policy direction concerning treaty obligations. Detailed discussion of political and international policy issues are outside the scope of this Draft EIS.
- Comment 4: The EIS should examine the impacts of rocket exhaust products on air quality and indicate what air quality monitoring will be done. Because of the problems with monitoring of the 1st and 3rd STARS launches at PMRF, there is still no reliable measurement of the hydrogen chloride (HCl) concentration either near the launch pad or downwind at the boundary of the ground hazard area for STARS launches. For the 3rd launch, the HCl monitors 140 feet from the launch pad saturated at a concentration of 140 ppm, which exceeds the level of 100ppm deemed "immediately dangerous to life and health."
- Response 4: The Strategic Target System Environmental Monitoring Program report for the 26 February 1993 launch of the Strategic Target System from PMRF analyzed pre- and post-launch air quality and confirmed there are no exceedances of guidance levels at any public exposure location. Sections 3.1.1.1 and 4.1.1.1 address potential effects to air quality. We acknowledge your opinion that monitoring was inadequate to determine the effects on air quality. We believe the monitoring was adequate to determine any realistic threat to human health and safety outside the LHA.
- Comment 5: The EIS should indicate what baseline surveys and subsequent monitoring will be done at new launch sites. It should also review sampling results at PMRF and indicate what monitoring will be done for future launches. The 1997 Dept. of Energy report "Linking Legacies" (DOE/EM-0319) notes a contaminated water volume of 5,700 cubic meters at the Kauai Test Facility (KTF).
- Response 5: The Water Resources section in Section 4 for each area describes potential impacts to water quality for both the No-action alternative (continuation of existing activities) and the Proposed Action. We do not anticipate the need for additional monitoring.

- Comment 6: The Dept. of Energy "Linking Legacies" reports a volume of 1,400 cubic meters of contaminated soil at KTF. The EIS should state what baseline surveys and subsequent soil sampling will be done at PMRF (including KTF) and at new launch sites. This is especially important for HCl, a major exhaust product of solid-fuel rocket motors. Soil sampling after the 1st STARS launch showed that 87% of samples had increased HCl concentrations but it was unclear how much of the increase was due to the STARS exhaust. Another potentially serious contaminant is lead, which is emitted by some rocket motors. For example, the Talos motor used for the Vandal missile emits about 45 pounds of lead. Elevated lead levels were seen near some KTF launch pads in soil sampling done in 1990 so it is important to do baseline sampling near the Vandal launch pad and to monitor the amount of lead contamination from the Vandal launches. Baseline sampling and monitoring for lead should also be done at any new sites where missiles emitting lead will be launched.
- Response 6: Existing conditions related to soils are described in the Geology and Soils sections for each location in Section 3. Potential impacts to soils from contaminants are described in the Geology and Soils and Hazardous Materials and Waste in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigations.
- Comment 7: The EIS should estimate the amount of ozone depletion due to the HCl in the rocket exhaust. Halon 2402, which depletes ozone six times more effectively than common freon, is emitted in substantial amounts by the STARS 2nd stage motor (90 kilograms) and by the SR19-AJ-1 motor (120 kilograms) which can be used as the 1st stage motor for the HERA missile. So the EIS should estimate Halon 2402 emissions and the resulting ozone depletion.
- Response 7: Halon and Freon are not exhaust components of newly proposed missiles. As such, no portion of the Proposed Action would result in an increase of Halon or Freon. Current emissions due to the STARS program are addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Strategic Target System.
- Comment 8: The EIS should estimate the amount of debris that would remain in orbit from any test of an anti-satellite weapon (ASAT) that hits an orbiting object. An article in the 24 March 1997 issue of Aviation Week and Space Technology reports that an ASAT test using a STARS launch at KTF is being contemplated for FY 1998.
- Response 8: While ongoing activities under the No-action alternative may involve an anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons test, the impacts to the space environment from orbital debris are not considered part of the scope of this EIS.
- Comment 9: There are "black" military programs whose budgets and other details are secret, even from members of Congress. Some of these programs involve rocket launches that could have devastating environmental impacts. An example is the Timberwind program to develop rockets powered by nuclear reactors. In the early 1990's PMRF was considered as a potential site before a nuclear propulsion test facility. How many past rocket launches at PMRF have been for "black" programs and how many of these launches are expected during the period when theater missile defense tests will be done?
- Response 9: We cannot discuss classified programs in a public forum; however, environmental effects of all activities conducted at PMRF are being analyzed.
- Comment 10: The EIS should contain a list with dates of STARS and Vandal launches that have occurred under the easement since 1994. It should also indicate how many times the GRANTEE has exercised easement in 1994, 1995, and 1996; whether the GRANTEE provide the required notices seven days before each scheduled launch; and how long the GRANTEE maintained exclusive control of the ground hazard area each time the easement was exercised.
- Response 10: Section 3.1.2 of the enclosed Draft EIS addresses past use of this area. The Navy adheres to the conditions of the Memorandum of Agreement allowing use of the restrictive easement.

Comment 11: The EIS should indicate which of the planned tests could be done at other test ranges and compare the impacts at these other ranges with those at PMRF. An EIS evaluating the impacts of similar tests in the Eglin Gulf Test Range is currently being done. The 1994 Theater Missile Defense Extended Test Range EIS examined the impacts of similar tests; the 21 March 1995 Record of Decision for the EIS decided to proceed at the White Sands Missile Range and at the Kwajalein Missile Range. PMRF was eliminated for consideration "because of the lack of the full range of land-based instrumentation sites to observe intercepts and inadequate land area for interceptor deployment for placement of instrumentation that would have to be brought in from another range."


Response 11: The enclosed Draft EIS addresses the environmental consequences of both ongoing activities at PMRF and the proposed enhancement of the capability of PMRF and its range so that it can support testing and evaluation of Navy TMBD and other DOD TMD systems as desired by Congress. The purpose and need for the proposed enhancement are described in Section 1.2 of the Draft EIS.

Comment 12: The EIS should provide results of baseline surveys and periodic water and soil sampling so that the State of Hawaii officials and the public can judge whether there are any "contaminants or pollutants found within the easement area as a result of the launches which significantly threaten the public health" discussed in item 14 of the Restrictive Easement. This is especially important for lead levels in soil samples near the Vandal launch pad. The response to my comments about impacts of lead releases on the draft Restrictive easement EIS stated that the Navy would do a baseline survey and periodic monitoring around the Vandal launch site. The EIS should examine the results of these surveys.

Response 12: The Navy and U.S. Army have conducted sampling of areas within the restrictive easement as part of the Strategic Target System Program. Results of the monitoring were contained with the Environmental Monitoring Program for the February 1993 Launch of the Strategic Target System, Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii. Data from this report are contained in the Air Quality, Geology and Soils, and Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste sections in Section 3 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Scoping Meeting 19 Jun 97

Transcribed Tape

COMMENT 1:

My name is Janet Ashkenazy, I am a resident of Kauai. I very much object to the Navy building further missile installations, this is one of the last plights of the world where we have a more pristine environment, and to create new installations which you would like to do would certainly be disrupting wildlife such as the birds on Tern Island which are endangered as well as the monk seals. Missiles do not belong here. These animals and the environment cannot take the toxins which will surely be introduced into the environment. This is wrong, wrong, wrong. Many people, many thoughtful people on this island and the rest of Hawaii object to these proposals. The answer from most of the people I know, in fact all the people I know is no no no. This is totally outrageous, totally unthinkable, especially considering many of the military bases have been shutdown. It makes one wonder why you choose such a beautiful area of the world from the most pristine places left in this really compromised planet of ours. Left to further destruction, are we trying to complete the task of complete desecration of this island its wrong, absolutely not. It's ungodly, its totally totally unacceptable.

Janet Ashkenazy
PO Box 1204
Lihue, HI 96766



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0203
 11 March 1998

Ms Janet Ashkenazy
 PO Box 1204
 Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Ms Ashkenazy:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: I very much object to the Navy building further missile installations, this is one of the last plights of the world where we have a more pristine environment, and to create new installations which you would like to do would certainly be disrupting wildlife such as the birds on Tern Island which are endangered as well as the monk seals. Missiles do not belong here. These animals and the environment cannot take the toxins which will surely be introduced into the environment. This is wrong, wrong, wrong. Many people, many thoughtful people on this island and the rest of Hawaii object to these proposals. The answer from most of the people I know, in fact all the people I know is no, no, no.
- Response 1: Potential impacts to wildlife on Tern Island are discussed in Section 4.3.1.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 2: This is totally outrageous, totally unthinkable, especially considering many of the military bases would have been shutdown. It makes me wonder why you choose such a beautiful area of the world from the most pristine places left in this really compromised planet of ours. Left to further destruction, are we trying to complete the task of complete desecration of these island its wrong, absolutely not. It's ungodly, it's totally unacceptable.
- Response 2: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-035



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0204
11 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

There are no immediate threats of war & no need whatsoever for expanding our supply of missiles. We are in a cold war period. Show us the need! It's military's way of continuing to spend money wastefully. How dare the Navy put paradise in JEOPARDY of first strike locations

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Joseph Coker</i>
Street Address	_____
City	_____
State/ZIP	_____

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

Mr Joseph Coker
332 Aina Loli Place
Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Mr Coker:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: There are no immediate threats of war and no need whatsoever for expanding our supply of missiles. We are in a cold war period. Show us the need! It's military's way of continuing to spend money wastefully. How dare the Navy put paradise in JEOPARDY of first strike locations.

Response 1: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,
J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-035

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-036

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

*I would like the address of the
Assistant Secretary of the Navy for installation
& environment.*

*I feel psychologically that I live in
Kauai because it is peaceful &
has a non-military atmosphere.
How visible is the enhancement
going to be in terms of military
vehicles, airplanes & ships?*

Please place form in the drop
box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>P. WOODYARD, PhD</i>
Street Address	<i>R.O. 1986</i>
City	<i>Kapea, HI 96746</i>
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

June 2, 1997

Letter to the Editor
Kauai Times
Forum
P.O. 231
Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Editor,

As a taxpayer, I am outraged at the Senate Appropriations Committee report that resulted in the Navy proposing to "enhance" the capability of PMRF at taxpayer expense. It will cost the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars to develop the Navy's Theater Missile Defense (TMD) program. It will cost us a lot more money to develop a missile base site thousands of miles away from the continental United States than it would be to build one on the coast of the United States. We have already paid for numerous missile sites already built in the land mass of the United States. We will now be paying extra for equipment and personnel to be flown by special planes or sent by special ships back and forth across the Pacific. What kind of cost analysis has been done and comparison of costs to build these missile sites closer to the Continental United States as opposed to out in the middle of the Pacific?

Building missile sites in wildlife areas is incongruent with the purpose and intent of designating wildlife areas. As taxpayers, we now have to pay for an EIS which would not even have been necessary if new areas of land and ocean were not being considered for missile sites. Guam already has numerous Navy facilities, including Naval Station, Naval Air Station, Naval Communications Station, and Naval Magazine. Guam is also surrounded by 42,000 square miles of open ocean range. Why not build the missile site there?

Kauai, and Hawaii, by continuing to have military bases and in particular missile sites will continue to be a target of the enemy. By "enhancing" our capability we are "enhancing" our chances of being a target.

We can stop the military from draining our tax dollars by voting out of office the senators and congressmen who continue to appropriate money to the military regardless of the cost of what is being asked for by the military. If our senators and congressmen have no consideration for our wildlife or quality of life maybe they should be voted out of office. Senator Inouye and Senator Akaka have something to do with representing Hawaii to the Senate. If they support the Theater Missile Defense program and its expansion in Kauai they are responsible for what happens to Kauai and our wildlife.

pg 2

In terms of jobs, if Kauai and or the state of Hawaii were given the money that it is going to cost us to build the Theater Missile Defense system, many more jobs could be created that would have a much more positive effect on our quality of life. We could repair Rice street, take better care of Kokee State Forest and other state parks and beaches, we could help our non-profit agencies which provide human services, we could create county and state jobs for whatever needs we have, and we could even give raises to teachers.

As taxpayers, we need to speak up as to how we want our hard earned tax money spent. We do not need to continue to support an expensive military industrial complex at the expense of our quality of life. The people we send to Washington to represent us need to know how we want our money spent.

Rosemary Woodyard
P. O. 1986
Kapaa, HI 96766
822-7728



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0267
12 March 1998

Dr E Woodyard
PO Box 1986
Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Dr Woodyard:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I would like the address of the Assistant Secretary of the navy for installation and environment.

Response 1: The address of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Installation and Environment is 1000 Navy Pentagon, Washington, DC 20350-1000.

Comment 2: I feel psychologically that I live in Kauai because it is peaceful and has a non-military atmosphere.


Response 2: Thank you.

Comment 3: How visible is the enhancement going to be in terms of military vehicles, airplanes and ships?

Response 3: Visibility issues are described in the Visual and Aesthetic Resources sections of Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Proposed Mitigations, of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-037

June 19, 1997

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

PMRF Commander
via: Public Affairs Office
P.O. 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

- 1) What impact will this have: noise abatement, environmental pollution, solid waste disposal, aerial pollution, public access to roads, psychological impact on residents/visitors to that part of Hawaii?
- 2) Why isn't it enough - look at what happened to the residents of that area. They were all moved to Egypt (Egyp) in terrible housing, crowded conditions and sub-standard sewer systems.
- 3) In the alternative, the budget justifies it. Huge budget. As a taxpayer I am against the setting up additional Trucking Stations - especially on Kaula.

This letter is being sent in response to requests to identify concerns that need to be addressed in the EIS for the TMD at PMRF.

The EIS should address the construction of fences and the impact of such fences upon existing wildlife and human activities. Where will the fences be constructed? What will they be like? How tall? What material? What area will they enclose? How will the fences affect wildlife in the area? Will the fences inhibit current hiking trails, scenic views, tourist areas, pig hunting trails, roads, fishing, snorkeling, surfing, or other activities currently in the areas that will be enclosed? How will access to the areas fenced in be made? Will there be manned stations? Where will the gates be? Will passes be necessary and how will they be obtained if they are? The impact of fencing in of current areas used by the public needs to be addressed in the EIS.

It is of great concern when areas are cut off from public use. Fences will transform areas in many ways. There is no doubt fences will be part of the "enhanced capability" proposed for PMRF. How will they affect us, the residents?

E. Woodyard, Ph.D.
E. Woodyard, Ph.D.
P.O. 1986
Kapaa, HI 96746

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Mary Carol O'Brien</i>
Street Address	<i>4090 Kekoa Hwy</i>
City	<i>Kapaa, HI</i>
State/ZIP	<i>HI 96746</i>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

June 2, 1997

Capt. Thomas Daniels
PMRF Commander
via: Public Affairs Office
P.O. 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

The following comments and concerns are being sent to you in response to the request for input from the community published in the Kauai Times, May 24, 1997 in regards to the EIS to be developed for the proposed "enhanced capability" to handle testing of the Navy's Theater Missile Defense (TMD) program at Pacific Missile Range Facility.

Enhanced dangers of being a target.

A number of the proposed sites are already involved in activities related to military interests. Any site that is engaged in something to do with weapons becomes a target for enemies. Any EIS that is developed needs to address the issue of the site being destroyed by the enemy. What will the impact be on the site and its surroundings? Are the proposed sites being selected because they are islands with few inhabitants? This does not take into account that there are some inhabitants as well as protected wildlife in some areas. The EIS needs to have the worst scenario, meaning destruction of the site and its surroundings, for each of the areas being considered.

What about Guam?

The Navy already has a number of bases and capabilities for military actions based in Guam. There is Naval Station, Naval Communications Station, Naval Magazine, Naval Air Station. Guam is also in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. Why was Guam not considered to be included in the EIS?

Costs

All of the sites mentioned as being considered require shipment of equipment and personnel long distances. What are the comparative costs involved of the different locations of not only building the sites but maintaining and operating the sites? They will probably require numerous flights carrying cargo and personnel over extended periods of time. Most of the sites do not have commercial airlines flying into them so that means special Navy flights. What is it going to cost me as a taxpayer? The EIS

pg²

should address a comparison of costs of everything at the various sites including operations for the duration of the site's existence. There is no doubt that sites closer to the continental United States would be a lot cheaper to build and maintain than areas outside of the continental United States. As a taxpayer, I am very concerned that the Senate Committee may not even have available or consider cost comparisons or EISs when making their reports. Their reports are merely statements of findings, which may be based on limited facts. The Senate Committee report does not give direction as to how a finding should be implemented. From what I read in the newspaper and hear on television, some people in Florida are upset because the Everglades are being considered for missile sites. The Everglades certainly are closer to the continental United States and it would cost less to practice firing missiles there. I am not sure the United States needs missile sites both in Florida and the Pacific. When proposing what should be included in an EIS it seems some alternative sites should be presented which cost less. On the face of it, building a site and or launching missiles from the continental land mass is going to cost less than building a site and launching missiles in the middle of the Pacific, thousands of miles from anywhere.

Jobs/Economy

The creation of new jobs or help to the economy are non-issues. If we, through our government, wanted to create new jobs this certainly could be done without building missile launching sites. There is no doubt that money could be spent to create jobs anywhere doing any number of things. The issue is what kinds of jobs and for whose benefit do we spend our tax money? I would rather see my taxes spent on local needs rather than on a missile system. For instance, our county or state government could be given the money that it takes to build and operate these sites and these local governments could create innumerable jobs for the citizens that reside in the county and the state. We have all kinds of local projects that could use extra manpower. Some of these projects include repair of Rice St., our main thoroughfare in downtown Lihue, replacing one lane dangerous bridges in the Wailua Homesteads area with two lane bridges, building a shelter for the homeless, taking better care of Kokee State Forest and other state parks and beaches, and giving our non-profit service agencies increased funding to provide needed human services. These are just some of the suggestions of ways to spend the money being used to build these missile sites and conduct missile firing tests. These alternative ways of spending the money would also create jobs and in addition improve the quality of life in Hawaii and Kauai. Expenditures for local needs also helps the local economy. An EIS should address alternative ways of spending the money if economy or jobs is mentioned as a factort in the EIS.

pg 3

Wildlife

When the Senate Appropriations Committee reported that PMRF's "air, surface and subsurface ranges and associated test and exercise infrastructure provide the unique capability to conduct virtually unrestricted test and evaluation in ideal conditions..." the committee may not have meant that wildlife areas were to be part of the areas to be considered for the test area. It is questionable if the committee even knew there were wildlife areas included in the area to be considered for TMD. How many of the committee members ever visited any of the areas under consideration? The committee could just as easily have said Wyoming, Arizona, and California are great areas for tests, but that does not mean missile sites would have been put in Yellowstone National Park, Grand Canyon National Park, or Yosemite National Park. It seems that when an area is designated as a National Wildlife Refuge, the intent is to keep it as such. If we built military installations in our national parks what is the point in having areas designated as national parks? The same goes for wildlife refuges, why designate them for wildlife if there is no intention of leaving them as refuges? To launch missiles in a refuge is the same as launching a missile in one of our national parks. It certainly wouldn't make any sense. An EIS should address the issue of comparing a site not in a refuge with one in a refuge. Parts of Arizona might be better to use than the Grand Canyon, the same is true for our island seabird refuges, areas not designated as refuges should take priority over areas designated as refuges, and refuges should not even be considered.

I would like to summarize my concerns and views concerning the enhanced capability of PMRF.

As a taxpayer I am very concerned that more and more expensive weaponry continues to be developed and we are asked to continue to pay for it without questioning whether in fact there is duplication of effort, whether it could be done cheaper, and whether it will be obsolete after we have spent a fortune on it. I believe all these military expenditures will eventually bankrupt the country. Therefore, I would like some reassurance through an EIS that alternatives have been thoroughly considered in regards to cost.

As well, I am very concerned about living in an area that will become of more interest as a target for the enemy. Needless to say, Pearl Harbor was a target and Kauai is not that far away from Oahu.

The construction of a missile facility in a wildlife refuge is, of course, ridiculous.

Submitted by E. Woodyard, Ph.D. *E. Woodyard Ph.D.*
 P.O. 1986
 Kapaa, HI 96746

pg 4

cc Senator Inouye
 Congresswoman Patsy Mink
 Senator Akaka
 Congressman Abercrombie

June 2, 1997

Letter to the Editor
Kauai Times
Forum
P.O. 231
Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Editor,

As a taxpayer, I am outraged at the Senate Appropriations Committee report that resulted in the Navy proposing to "enhance" the capability of PMRF at taxpayer expense. It will cost the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars to develop the Navy's Theater Missile Defense (TMD) program. It will cost us a lot more money to develop a missile base site thousands of miles away from the continental United States than it would be to build one on the coast of the United States. We have already paid for numerous missile sites already built in the land mass of the United States. We will now be paying extra for equipment and personnel to be flown by special planes or sent by special ships back and forth across the Pacific. What kind of cost analysis has been done and comparison of costs to build these missile sites closer to the Continental United States as opposed to out in the middle of the Pacific?

Building missile sites in wildlife areas is incongruent with the purpose and intent of designating wildlife areas. As taxpayers, we now have to pay for an EIS which would not even have been necessary if new areas of land and ocean were not being considered for missile sites. Guam already has numerous Navy facilities, including Naval Station, Naval Air Station, Naval Communications Station, and Naval Magazine. Guam is also surrounded by 42,000 square miles of open ocean range. Why not build the missile site there?

Kauai, and Hawaii, by continuing to have military bases and in particular missile sites will continue to be a target of the enemy. By "enhancing" our capability we are "enhancing" our chances of being a target.

We can stop the military from draining our tax dollars by voting out of office the senators and congressmen who continue to appropriate money to the military regardless of the cost of what is being asked for by the military. If our senators and congressmen have no consideration for our wildlife or quality of life maybe they should be voted out of office. Senator Inouye and Senator Akaka have something to do with representing Hawaii to the Senate. If they support the Theater Missile Defense program and its expansion in Kauai they are responsible for what happens to Kauai and our wildlife.

pg 2

In terms of jobs, if Kauai and or the state of Hawaii were given the money that it is going to cost us to build the Theater Missile Defense system, many more jobs could be created that would have a much more positive effect on our quality of life. We could repair Rice street, take better care of Kokee State Forest and other state parks and beaches, we could help our non-profit agencies which provide human services, we could create county and state jobs for whatever needs we have, and we could even give raises to teachers.

As taxpayers, we need to speak up as to how we want our hard earned tax money spent. We do not need to continue to support an expensive military industrial complex at the expense of our quality of life. The people we send to Washington to represent us need to know how we want our money spent.

Rosemary Woodyard
P. O. 1986
Kapaa, HI 96766
822-7728

7-122



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0268
12 March 1998

Ms Mary Carol Odonnell
4-0900 Kuhio Hwy
Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Ms Odonnell:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: What impact will this have on noise abatement?

Response 1: The main noise source that would result from either the No-action Alternative or Proposed Action would be from missile launching activities. Potential noise impacts at each location are described in the Noise sections of Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

Comment 2: (What impact will this have on) environmental pollution?

Response 2: This question is answered in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Section 4 describes all potential environmental effects of the No Action and Preferred Action alternatives.

Comment 3: (What impact will this have on) endangered species?

Response 3: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 4: (What impact will this have on) ocean pollution?

Response 4: Potential impacts to the ocean are discussed in Section 4.4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 5: (What impact will this have on) public access to beaches?

Response 5: The conditions of access to PMRF beaches will be similar to current conditions under the No-Action alternative. Conditions of closure of Polihale State Park would not change from current conditions. Potential impacts to access and recreation are described in Sections 4.1.1.8 and 4.1.2.7.

Comment 6: (What impact will this have on) psychological impact on residents/visitors to that part of Kauai?

Response 6: The wide dissemination of information about forthcoming test launches would be designed to minimize disruption to the daily routine of residents and visitors.

Comment 7: Why isn't Kwajalein enough - look at what happened to the residents of that atoll - they were all moved to Eyby (EBY) in terrible housing, crowded conditions and sub standard sewer systems.

Response 7: The Proposed Action would not require the relocation of any resident.

Comment 8: Is this another way the Navy justifies its huge budget. As a taxpayer, I am against the putting up additional tracking stations - especially on Kauai.

Response 8: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-038



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO
5090
Ser 00:0205
11 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

*I am in favor of this program.
This program would really
enhance the economic area
of our islands. It would
provide jobs for our people.
The defense of our nation
is important. This would be
a means of future defense.*

Ms Emmaline Lovell White
PO Box 155
Anahola Kauai, HI 96703

Dear Ms Lovell White:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I am in favor of this program. This program would really enhance the economic area of our islands. It would provide jobs for our people.

Response 1: Thank you.

Comment 2: The defense of our nation is important. This would be a means of future defense.

Response 2: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Emmaline Lovell White</i>
Street Address	<i>P.O. Box 155</i>
City	<i>Anahola, Kauai 96703</i>
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

S-W-038

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-039



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO
5090
Ser 00/0206
11 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

I am confident that EDAW + the Navy will examine
all pertinent issues. The project is vital to the defense
of our nation and the security of U.S. citizens. PMRF
and the people of Niihau + Kauai would be privileged
to contribute to + facilitate this invaluable strategic
research, and would benefit economically as well.

Ms Trudi Nekomoto
98-201 Aieakai Pl
Aiea, HI 96701

Dear Ms Nekomoto:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I am confident that EDAW & the Navy will examine all pertinent issues.

Response 1: Thank you.

Comment 2: This project is vital to the defense of our nation and the security of U.S. citizens. PMRF and the people of Niihau & Kauai would be privileged to contribute to & facilitate this invaluable strategic research, and would benefit economically as well.

Response 2: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,
J. A. BOWLIN
J. A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Please place form in the drop
box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Trudi Nekomoto
Street Address	98-201 Aiea Kai Pl
City	Aiea, HI 96701
State/ZIP	

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-040

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

1. I support the need to test the TBUD at PMRF. We certainly need systems to shoot down flying cattle cars like the Iraqis sent up during the Gulf War.
2. But you need to do a better job of winning the public's support. Your present set-up, I think, discourages participation because it's conceived as a one-way presentation. Because individuals are not allowed to make public comments - such as in a public hearing - they may feel it would be useless to attend. (I realize that public hearings are often not the

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	David Helala
Street Address	180 HAWAIIANA ST
City	KAPAHA HI
State/ZIP	96746

most productive way. However, it does get people out to your shows and they frequently go home learning something new.)

3. Let me suggest that you target the leading groups on this island for special sessions. Perhaps a combination show like you have today and a public hearing period with the CD and experts on stage responding to people's concerns. By all means get the Office of Hawaiian Affairs on your side, especially Moses Keale and Clayton Hee.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0207
 11 March 1998

Mr David Helala
 180 Hawaiiana St
 Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Mr Helala:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I support the need to test the TBMD at PMRF. We certainly need systems to shoot down flying cattle cars like the Iraqi's sent up during the Gulf War.

Response 1: Thank you.

Comment 2: But you need to do a better job of winning the public's support. Your present set up I think, discourages participation because it's conceived as a one-way presentation. Because individuals are not allowed to make public comments - such as in a public hearing - they may feel it would be useless to attend. Let me suggest that you target the leading groups on this island for special sessions. Perhaps a combination show like you have today and a public hearing period with the CO and experts on stage responding to people's concerns.

Response 2: While not an open forum with the opportunity for public speaking, at each scoping meeting the public was encouraged to view the exhibit area which was staffed by technical personnel. The layout of the exhibit area was designed to facilitate an open and relaxed atmosphere for communication between the public and the technical representatives. Attendees were invited to make oral statements, which were recorded by a tape recorder at each meeting. Pre-formatted comment sheets were also available so attendees could either turn in a written comment during the meeting or mail the comment to the address printed on the form. Letters written in advance were also accepted.

A total of 47 comments (42 written and 5 oral) were received during the scoping meetings held at Waimea, Kilauea, Lihue, and Honolulu. The information meeting format at Nihoa respected traditions of group communication.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-041



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 178
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0208
11 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

I am concerned about control of lands by the military and access to shoreline areas in the vicinity of PMRF.

The military has a very poor reputation for returning lands in the state to civilian use - and returning them in a useable condition.

I also worry that as the operations at PMRF grow the number of days (area?) in which the area is off limits will also grow. This needs to be addressed with guarantees for the people on Kauai and Niihau.

Mr Andy Bushnell
6510 Oloheua Road
Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Mr Bushnell:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: I am concerned about the control of lands by the military and access to shoreline areas in the vicinity of PMRF.
The military has a very poor reputation for returning lands in the state to civilian use - and returning them in a useable condition.
I also worry that as the operations at PMRF grow the number of days (area?) in which the area is off limits will also grow. This needs to be addressed with guarantees for the people on Kauai and Niihau.
- Response 1: The conditions of access to PMRF beaches will be similar to current conditions under the No-Action alternative. Conditions of closure of Polihale State Park would not change from current conditions. Potential impacts to access and recreation are described in Sections 4.1.1.8 and 4.1.2.7.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,
J. A. Bowlin
J. A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Andy Bushnell</i>
Street Address	<i>6510 Oloheua Rd.</i>
City	<i>Kapaa HI</i>
State/ZIP	<i>96746</i>

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-041

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-042



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO
5090
Ser 00/0209
11 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

My main area of concern is how you plan to mitigate any adverse environmental impacts on Tern Island. Since the island is about 4000 feet long and the launch safety zone is 3000 feet, how do you propose to launch missiles there without adversely impacting the wildlife there?

Mr Bert Lyon
PO Box 742
Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Mr Lyon:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: My main area of concern is how you plan to mitigate any adverse environmental impacts on Tern Island. Since the island is about 4000 feet long and the launch safety zone is 3000 feet, how do you propose to launch missiles there without adversely impacting the wildlife there?

Response 1: Potential impacts to wildlife on Tern Island are discussed in Section 4.3.1.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Bert Lyon</i>
Street Address	<i>P.O. Box 742</i>
City	<i>Kilauea</i>
State/ZIP	<i>HI 96754</i>

Aug. 23, 1992

June 20 1997
 Pacific Missile Range Facility
 Sirs:

It is unconscionable on the part of the U.S. military to promote further buildup of the missile program here in the Hawaiian islands. The military has already destroyed and rendered Kahoolawe and other areas of the Hawaiian islands, plus several South Pacific islands unfit for human habitation, not mentioning the environment, the marine and animal life that has suffered. When will this madness stop? We must be warned of the worst case scenario and the double talk that puts a smokescreen on what we in Hawaii face.

"Remember Pearl Harbor", - We in Hawaii were the victims of that debacle wholly due to the military buildup here. It certainly is not our duty to support such a program that would jeopardize our very existence on planet earth. Hawaii is a peaceful loving country. Why must the U.S. make the Hawaiian islands a threatening fortress when we have no enemies? The military thru modern warfare is putting us civilians in harms way. Their short-sightedness scares me. Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Marshall islands, Kahoolawe, Makua and other places to mention a few are reasons for me to be concerned..
 Aloha 'Aina.

Paul D. Lemke
Paul D. Lemke
 6281-F Kawaihau Rd.
 Kapa'a HI 96746
 Ph. 8224360

The Editor;

I did not intend getting into the "Star Wars" controversy but I must satisfy my conscience by giving my views on the matter as I was involved when the missile program was in its early years.

I am part-Hawaiian, a world war two veteran, participated in the Korean and Vietnam wars by being a crew member on ships that supplied the military installations around the world.

One would be naive to think that the Russians have destroyed their ballistic nuclear arsenal. The threat is still there and you better believe it. They have missiles just as efficient and accurate as ours. Since my native Kaua'i will become a major Stars* launching compound, (God forbid), the island will be all the more vulnerable - a prime objective to be destroyed by any potential enemy.

Back in the 1960's I was crew member on the missile tracker MST5 Longview a converted world war two victory ship. We were one of two ships, the other being the MST5 Sunnyvale stationed in Honolulu. Our mission was to track missiles launched from Vandenberg Air Force base in California... 2,000 plus miles away. At launching time we traversed the area in the vicinity of the French Frigate Shoals north of Kaua'i, tracking the flight of missiles and the eventual splashdown. According to the Bendix Corp. technicians our missiles were almost always on target. Yes, this was 30 years ago. It was scary, we were not the only nation tracking missiles. The Russians had their fleet of missile trackers as we did and were using the same area for their "exercises". So one can surmise that these islands were and could still be zeroed in.

I'm not opposed to the U.S. experimenting with "Stars" but what I disagree on is that this testing will be performed on Sovereign Hawaiian lands which the U.S. military has not paid a dime for its past and present use while my Hawaiian brothers suffer homelessness, abuse and denied Sovereignty of their lands. Look what has happened to 45 sq. miles of Hawaii's land mass. The island of Kahoolawe is an example of Hawaiian land desecrated, polluted and left unfit for human habitation. - What Shame!!

I'm in opposition to any escalation of military presence here. Enough is enough. They need us and our free Hawaiian lands and that's precisely why they are here even if there is a halt to Star War missile launchings, The U.S. government (most military) occupy and control more than 400,000 acres (combined area Kaua'i & Ni'ihau) of Hawaiian lands never paid for nor any back rent to the Kanaka Maoli -one of the great frauds of the century. This hunger for more Hawaiian lands such as the Mana area is of grave concern to our Hawaiian Nationalists and for that matter the concern of all Hawaiians and Hawaiians at heart. Aloha 'ino!

Aloha 'aina
 Paul D. Lemke
 Kapa'a HI 96746

Paul D. Lemke



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0226
11 March 1998

Mr Paul Lemke
6281-F Kawaihau Rd
Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Mr Lemke:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1:** It is unconscionable on the part of the U.S. military to promote further buildup of the missile program here in the Hawaiian Islands. The military has already destroyed and rendered Kahoolawe and other areas of the Hawaiian islands, plus several South Pacific islands unfit for human habitation, not mentioning the environment, the marine and animal life that has suffered. When will this madness stop? We must be warned of the worst case scenario and the double talk that puts a smokescreen on what we in Hawaii face.
- Response 1:** The proposed action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capabilities of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development. The enclosed Draft EIS fully documents the potential impacts to the human and natural environments of the proposed enhancement.
- Comment 2:** "Remember Pearl Harbor", - We in Hawaii were the victims of that debacle wholly due to the military buildup here. It certainly is not our duty to support such a program that would jeopardize our very existence on planet earth. Hawaii is a peaceful loving country. Why must the US make the Hawaiian Islands a threatening fortress when we have no enemies. The military thru modern warfare is putting us civilians in harms way. Their short-sightedness scares me. Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Marshall Islands, Kahoolawe, Makuia and other places to mention a few are reasons for me to be concerned. Aloha 'Aina
- Response 2:** The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.
- Comment 3:** One would be naïve to think that the Russians have destroyed their ballistic nuclear arsenal. The threat is still there and you better believe it. They have missiles just as efficient and accurate as ours. Since my native Kauai will become a major STARS launching compound, (God forbid), the island will be all the more vulnerable - a prime objective to be destroyed by any potential enemy.
- Response 3:** The potential for health and safety impacts is addressed in detail in Section 4.1.1.7 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Because the TBMD program would be similar to current testing activities at PMRF, we do not believe that there will be any increase in PMRF's vulnerability as an enemy target.
- Comment 4:** I'm not opposed to the military experimenting with "Stars" but what I disagree on is that this testing will be performed on Sovereign Hawaiian lands which the US military has not payed a dime for its past and present use while my Hawaiian brothers suffer homelessness, abuse and


denied Sovereignty of their lands. Look what has happened to 45 sq. miles of Hawaii's land mass. The island of Kahoolawe is an example of Hawaiian land desecrated, polluted and left unfit for human habitation. What Shame!!

I'm in opposition to any escalation of military presence here. Enough is enough. They need us and our free Hawaiian lands and thats precisely why they are here even if there is a halt to our Star Wars missile launchings. The US government (most military) occupy and control more than 400,000 acres (combined area of Kauai and Niihau) of Hawaiian lands never paid for nor any back rent to the Kanaka Maoli - one of the great frauds of the century. This hunger for more Hawaiian lands such as the Mana area is of grave concern to our Hawaiian Nationalists and for that matter the concern of all Hawaiians and Hawaiians at heart. Aloha 'ino!

- Response 4:** The Land Use sections of the EIS address the use of land and issues of access on Kauai (Sections 4.1.1.8, 4.1.2.7, 4.1.3.8, 4.1.4.8, 4.1.5.7, and 4.1.6.4). The Environmental Justice section of the EIS considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources and Water Resources.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

S-W-044

Carol Bain
PO Box 2320
Lihue, HI 96766

PMRF scope input from Carol Bain

June 21, 1997

TO: Pacific Missile Range Facility, Vida Mossman, PMRF Public Affairs Office, PO Box 128, Kekaha, HI

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

1. Recommend "open microphone" on podium during public hearing so community can ask/dialogue (very important to include public "verbal" comments)
2. I would like copy of PMRF public/environmental safety report record beginning 1990 annually until current year (1997) or 1996

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Carol Bain
Street Address	2111 Hanaleiua St.
City	Lihue, HI 96766
State/ZIP	96766

Dear Ms. Mossman,

I understand that you are required to obtain input from people who live within the County of Kauai. I have listened carefully to native Hawaiians, kupuna and caretakers I have met. I care about what is "pono" or "good" for the land and its people and would like to include the input listed below.

March 23, 1992, I attended and testified at the last public hearing held by PMRF regarding Environmental Impact Statement about the Strategic Target System (STARS) program.

For anyone working with the Pacific Missile Range Facility, whether they are native Hawaiian or not, they must ask themselves, should the land at Mana and Ni'ihau and its waters be used for the purpose of warfare? Should land and ocean that makes food and sustenance for all the people be used as a means of destruction and annihilation? Is that the legacy for the future?

Please, I insist the EIS include specific answers with detailed responses to the following items:

1. Title search of the land the military is or may occupy or use within the County. (title search to the Mabele)
2. How much does PMRF pay for the land they use on both islands of Ni'ihau and Kaua'i? (Please break the quantity down to each island, and fully describe location, duration of military occupancy and quantity.)
3. Who will receive these payments? What are their addresses so that I may write to them and ask for future concerns about how their land is being used?
4. Please provide a full cultural use assessment, both current and historical, that describes how the land has been used and how it is currently used. (ie. where are taro patches, lo'i, fish ponds, fishing areas, gardens, livestock, traditional gathering sites, burial sites, living areas, landfills, etc.)
5. Please provide descriptions of all activities for military occupancy of land within the County of Kaua'i used for all current and future military project(s) that might affect cultural, environmental, health, landfill, etc.
6. The population base of Ni'ihau which is currently native Hawaiian by majority may be impacted by the infusion of quantities of "ha'ole" or foreign people. What curriculum of cultural sensitivity training will employees receive prior to being assigned to work on this island? The suggestion that all learn the native Hawaiian language is appropriate, as the island of Ni'ihau has long been revered and promoted by many (including the Robinson family) as a cultural resource so must be preserved.
7. Regarding the last EIS for PMRF (EIS hearing held 3/24/92), How many local jobs within the County of Kauai were promised? How many jobs within the County of Kauai received by long-term county residents, not newcomers, were created? ... Are now filled?
8. For the upcoming EIS, how many jobs will be promised for each island? How many local jobs versus those filled by non-residents or military? What are the job descriptions for local populations (maintenance/security versus


12:48 PM June 21, 1997

Page 2

- administrative/management)? Will new roads or housing need to be built for workers on Ni'ihau? If so, where and how will these negatively impact the area and current culture?
9. Please provide a list for all potentially toxic or health affecting substances, including chemicals, gas, residues and electromagnetic discharges, currently released or planned during or after missile tests or other tests by PMRF within the County of Kaua'i and within 1 mile offshore.
 10. On the current PMR Facility, please provide a complete description of each chemical, PCB, hazardous or toxic substance or any military item disposal. Describe how, quantity, and what item(s) are currently disposed of by PMRF or planned for disposal within the county? What are its estimated and potential toxic or environmental or health affects between now and the year 2030? . . . Between now and 2030? Provide a detailed map of all military related waste disposal sites on Kaua'i so that those generations that come after can plan to avoid these toxic areas to grow food or build homes
 11. Similarly, provide a detailed map of all military related waste disposal sites on Ni'ihau so that those generations that may come after the year 2030 can plan to avoid these toxic areas to grow food or build homes.
 12. Describe precisely how the economic impact of PMRF adds any, if at all, infusion to Kauai's economy. Include in this description how military personnel may be using on-base PX, BX, fuel, or other retail outlets, not be subject to state tax, property tax, or county vehicle fees, or other fees most residents must pay. Subtract the support the County of Kauai must provide toward all military personnel for parks use, health when they run to the public facilities when hurt, highway and other basic services that non-privileged non-military must pay for.
 13. Describe potential impact to public safety this project may have to the County of Kauai. Include the fact that Kauai County may become an increased "target" to the international perspective.
 14. Describe how a non-partisan, independent group made up of community residents and environmental groups, including Sierra Club and Ahupua'a Alliance, will be created to fully include diverse and under-represented groups of people to annually monitor and review the safety and health standards during the next 30 years or the project duration, whichever is longer.
 15. Should any statistically significant (.05%) increase of health conditions occur after initiation of military testing or related projects, (such as an increase cancer rates in individuals on either Ni'ihau or Kaua'i) will the U.S military provide health benefits and cancer treatment for the families affected beyond the year 2030? How and who will be monitoring these annual health statistics?
 16. Include an assessment of all marine and bird life during 1 full year of monitoring. Include the quantities of migratory animals such as whales and kulca, or plover. Describe how and who will provide the annual monitoring and on-going assessment.
 17. Many marine animals and birds are sensitive to electronic sounds and soundwaves. How will the military tests affect these animals? As many fish, such as sharks, locate their prey using electromagnetics, describe how the electromagnetic testing will affect feeding habits. Provide demonstrations that prove no change in any animal behaviors.
 18. Describe the methods the ongoing assessment findings and reporting will occur on an annual basis of items 16 and 17 and how this information will be made readily available to the public and media.

Thank you for providing detailed answers to my concerns and questions. I apologize for any offense that I may have caused by my request for information. Please notify and send me a copy of any future related publications.

Mahalo pume hana,
Carol Bain
Co. news media




DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0277
12 March 1998

Ms Carol Bain
2111 Hanalima St
Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Ms Bain:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Recommend "open microphone" on podium during public hearing so community can ask/dialogue (very important to include "verbal" comments).

Response 1: Public and agency comments on the Draft EIS will be sought at public hearings which will include a public address system.

Comment 2: I would like a copy of PMRF public/environmental safety report and record beginning 1990 annually until current year (1997) or 1996.

Response 2: The Draft EIS addresses PMRF's safety record for activities to date. See Section 3.1.1.7 and 4.1.1.7.

Comment 3: 1. Title search of the land the military is or may occupy or use within the County. (title search to the Mahele.)
2. How much does PMRF pay for the land they use on both islands of Ni'ihau and Kauai? (Please break the quantity down to each island, and fully describe location, duration of military occupancy and quantity.)
3. Who will receive these payments? What are their addresses so that I may write to them and ask for future concerns about how their land is being used.
5. Please provide descriptions for all activities for military occupancy of land within the County of Kauai used for all current and future military project(s) that might affect cultural, environmental, health, landfill, etc.)

Response 3: Appendix E of the enclosed Draft EIS addresses ownership and lease agreements involving PMRF and Department of Energy activities in the Hawaiian Islands. In addition, Chapter 2, Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives, provides an overview of activities that occur on these lands.

Comment 4: 4. Please provide a full cultural use assessment, both current and historical, that describes how the land has been used and how it is currently used (i.e.: where are taro patches, lo'i, fish ponds, fishing areas, gardens, livestock, traditional gathering sites, burial sites, living areas, landfills, etc.)

Response 4: In the enclosed Draft EIS, Section 3.1.1.4 addresses cultural resources at PMRF, Section 3.1.1.8 describes current land use, Section 3.1.1.10, describes socioeconomics, and Section 4.5.1 includes descriptions of impacts on cultural resources, land use, and socioeconomics on Kauai.

Comment 5: 6. The population base of Ni'ihau which is currently native Hawaiian by majority may be impacted

by the infusion of quantities of "ha'ole" or foreign people. What curriculum of cultural sensitivity training will employees receive prior to being assigned to work on this island? The suggestion that all learn the native Hawaiian language is appropriate, as the island of Niihau has long been revered and promoted by many (including the Robinson family) as a cultural resource so must be preserved.

Response 5: Military personnel's contact with the culture of Niihau is strictly controlled by a protocol between the Robinson family and PMRF. The action would follow the protocol to the letter, minimizing contact during construction activities and during testing. The Protection Protocol would be strengthened if and where that is required.

Comment 6: 7. Regarding the last EIS for PMRF (EIS hearing held 3/24/92), How many local jobs within the County of Kauai were promised? How many jobs within the county of Kauai received by long term county residents, not newcomers, were created? . . . Are now filled?
8. For the upcoming EIS, how many jobs will be promised for each island? How many local jobs versus those filled by non-residents or military? What are the job descriptions for local population?

Response 6: PMRF, as of September 1997, employed an approximate number of 850 personnel on a full time basis. Most are long term residents of Kauai. As to new jobs created by the Proposed Action, we cannot predict who will be qualified for specific jobs requiring specific skills in support of program activities. PMRF has non-discriminatory hiring practices designed to fairly consider all qualified applicants.

Comment 7: Will new roads or housing need to be built for workers on Niihau? If so, where and how will these negatively impact the area and current culture?

Response 7: Potential construction requirements on Niihau are described in Section 2.3.4.2. No new roads or personnel housing will be required on Niihau.

Comment 8: 9. Please provide a list for all potentially toxic or health affecting substances, including chemicals, gas, residues and electromagnetic discharges, currently released or planned during or after missile tests or other tests by PMRF within the county of Kauai and within 1 mile offshore.

Response 8: In the enclosed Draft EIS, the Air Quality, Health and Safety, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, and Water Resource sections in Chapters 3 and 4 for each location provide a description of the hazardous materials potentially released during a launch. The same sections in Section 4 also evaluate the potential impacts from normal missile flight, an early flight termination, and transportation of these materials.

Comment 9: 10. On the current PMRF Facility, please provide a complete description of each chemical, PCB, hazardous or toxic substance or any military item disposal. Describe how, quantity, and what item(s) are currently disposed of by PMRF or planned for disposal within the county? What are its estimated and potential toxic or environmental or health affects between now and the year 2003? . . . Between now and 2030? Provide a detailed map of all military related waste disposal sites on Kauai so that those generations that come after can plan to avoid these toxic areas to grow food or build homes?

11. Similarly, provide a detailed map of all military related waste disposal sites so that those generations that may come after the year 2030 can plan to avoid these toxic areas to grow food or build homes.

Response 9: The PMRF hazardous materials and waste section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Table 3.1.1.6-1) provides a list of the hazardous materials disposed of by PMRF and their support facilities in 1996. This section also addresses the disposal procedures utilized by PMRF. All Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste are disposed of in accordance with applicable state and federal regulations. No hazardous waste is disposed by PMRF on the remote locations being considered on Kauai.

Comment 10: 12. Describe precisely how the economic impact of PMRF adds any, if at all, infusion to Kauai's economy. Include in this description how military personnel may be using on-base PX, BX, fuel or other retail outlets, not to be subject to state tax, property tax, or county vehicle fees, or other fees most residents must pay. Subtract the support the County of Kauai must provide toward all military personnel for parks use, health when they run to the public facilities when hurt, highway and other basic services that non-privileged non-military must pay for.

Response 10: There are no records about the economic impact of PMRF on Kauai's economy that incorporate the aspects you describe. Available information about economic impacts of PMRF is described in Section 4.1.1.10 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 11: 13. Describe potential impact to public safety this project may have to the County of Kauai. Include the fact that Kauai County may become an increased "target" to the international perspective.

Response 11: The TBMD program would be similar to current testing activities at PMRF. Potential impacts to health and safety are described for each location in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

Comment 12: 14. Describe how a non-partisan, independent group made up of community residents and environmental groups, including Sierra Club and Ahupua Alliance, will be created to fully include diverse and under-represented groups of people to annually monitor and review the safety and health standards during the next 30 years or the project duration, whichever is longer.

15. Should any statistically significant (0.5%) increase of health conditions occur after initiation of military testing or related projects, (such as an increase cancer rates in individuals on either Niihau or Kauai) will the US military provide health benefits and cancer treatment for the families affected beyond the year 2030? How and who will be monitoring these annual health statistics?

Response 12: As described in the Health and Safety sections of Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS, no short or long-term issues have been identified that would have a long-term impact on public health and safety. Therefore, no additional monitoring of public health would be required. The State of Hawaii, Department of Health, maintains a program to monitor the health of Niihau residents through regular health team visits to the island.

Comment 13: 16. Include an assessment of all marine and bird life during 1 full year of monitoring. Include the quantities of migratory animals such as whales and kolea, or plover. Describe how and who will provide the annual monitoring and on-going assessment.

17. Many marine animals and birds are sensitive to electronic sounds and soundwaves. How will the military tests affect these animals? As many fish, such as sharks, locate their prey using electromagnetics, describe how the electromagnetic testing will affect feeding habits. Provide demonstrations that prove no change in any animal behaviors.

Response 13: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.


Comment 14: 18. Describe the methods the ongoing assessment findings and reporting will occur on an annual basis of items 16 and 17 and how this information will be made readily available to the public and media.

Response 14: There is no requirement for an annual "ongoing assessment" of the programs potential environmental impacts. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the President's Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508), ensures that environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken.

If unanticipated impacts are discovered with implementation of the Proposed Action, the program would coordinate with appropriate resource agencies to determine any required action.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Statement regarding Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) range expansion EIS

by William Frank Georgi

P.O. Box 1256
Kekaha, HI 96752-1256

Overview

In this statement I will briefly discuss what Pacific Missile Range Facility currently does, and what it may do with an expanded range. I would also like to address some of the environmental concerns with the range expansion. Finally, I will address why I feel that the range expansion should be allowed.

Before I begin, however, I'd like to tell you who I am. I'm Bill Georgi, and I work for ITT Federal Services Corporation, at PMRF. I support range operations by producing post operational data, so that the range user can tell what happened during their training or tests. I am a former National Park Ranger and spent 10 years as a volunteer ski patroller. Much of my love for the sea comes from the fact that I'm from a commercial fishing family...even though I now do most of my fishing with a camera!

PMRF Benefits to Kauai

PMRF does a lot more for Kaua'i than just supply a few jobs...or even a lot of jobs. Many of you will remember the disaster relief provided through PMRF after Hurricane Iniki. Others will remember rescues of fishermen and others at sea...rescues by the PMRF boats and helicopters. Still others may remember seeing PMRF helicopters carrying buckets of water in support of firefighting efforts. Surfers know PMRF for the good surf break at Major's Bay...and know that the Base opens beaches for recreation whenever possible. Many school children know of PMRF as a place they toured...and were encouraged to continue their education.

PMRF Missions

PMRF currently has two basic missions. These are (1) fleet training, and (2) testing and evaluation (T&E). The fleet training mission includes such activities as submarine detection and tracking, anti-aircraft defense practice (using unmanned drones), amphibious landing practice, etc. Some recent T&E missions included the NASA Pathfinder, a solar powered, unmanned aerial vehicle which set a new world altitude record. Another was a series of research flights to attempt to locate objects underwater. The planned use for that technology included the cleanup of underwater areas off of Kahoolawe.

PMRF Expanded Mission

As I understand it, the primary expanded mission for PMRF would be an expanded role in Theater Ballistic Missile Defense (TBMD). So what is TBMD? In short, it's developing a defense against SCUD (and similar) missiles. As you are probably aware, SCUDs are not terribly accurate. They aren't much good as a military weapon against small military targets. They are typically developed and used as a weapon of terror against civilian populations. PMRF's dual mission would be to launch target missiles and to provide tracking data to help evaluate test results. To properly simulate the SCUD missiles, PMRF will require launch sites up to several hundred miles from the impact area.

Are SCUD type missiles a realistic threat in today's world? When we look at who has them, we understand that they are a considerable threat. North Korea is reportedly developing one with a range that will enable it to hit Japan. Why would they want weapons with that range? Certainly, not for any target in South Korea! Iraq, Iran, and Libya have all acquired SCUDs.

In short, a defense against the SCUD missiles would benefit not only the peace of the United States, but of the world.

A related area is the defense against anti-ship and other cruise missiles. A supersonic sea-skimming missile may give a ship only seconds to react to protect itself or other ships...such as oil tankers and other vessels. PMRF has been involved in research to increase that time, and hence increase our defensive capability.

Environmental Concerns

I would also like to address a couple of environmental concerns. The first of these is the subject of marine mammals, especially whales. During the three years that I have spent working at PMRF, I have seen operations moved to other areas, delayed, or even canceled, due to the presence of marine mammals in the planned operations area. I have seen Navy ships and boats change course to avoid areas where whales were present...to avoid them and stay well clear. I've seen some of the training materials that PMRF uses to teach crew how to identify marine mammals...and how to stay away from them. What I haven't seen are collisions between PMRF boats (or other Navy craft) and whales...unlike what has happened in the Whale Sanctuary when whale watching boats intentionally try to get close to whales. Statistically, whales seem to be safer on the Range than in the so-called sanctuary!

I'm sure that some people are going to talk about birds today, especially the rare and endangered species. We have had a project on Kaua'i to reintroduce the nene to Kauai. As a part of that project, nene were placed in Kalalau valley. Whereupon, some of them started spending a lot of their time at the PMRF radar facilities at Makaha Ridge! In their minds, at least, they prefer to spend their time in the company of radar operators who mostly ignore them, rather than with campers who are often trying to take their pictures.

I think that we should remember, too, that the Kennedy Space Center is adjacent to a bird sanctuary, with no apparent damage to the bird populations. For all the apparent foraw to the contrary, missile launches don't seem to much disturb the birds.

Conclusion

In summary, then, I believe that we should support those young men and women that we send out to protect us. We ask them to risk their lives; we owe it to them to provide the best possible training and tools to defend themselves...and us. The expansion of PMRF will enable us to give them that training and to help develop those tools.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0269
12 March 1998

Mr William Georgi
PO Box 1256
Kekaha, HI 96752-1256

Dear Mr Georgi:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: PMRF does a lot more for Kauai than just supply a few jobs. . . or even a lot of jobs. Many of you will remember the disaster relief provided through PMRF after Hurricane Iniki. Others will remember rescues of fishermen and others at sea. . . rescues by the PMRF boats and helicopters. Still others may remember seeing PMRF helicopters carrying buckets of water in support of firefighting efforts. Surfer's know PMRF for the good surf break at Major's Bay. . . and know that the base opens beaches for recreation when ever possible. Many school children know of PMRF as a place they toured. . . and were encouraged to continue their education.

Response 1: Thank you.

Comment 2: Are SCUD type missiles a realistic threat in today's world? When we look at who has them, we understand that they are a considerable threat. North Korea is reportedly developing one with a range that will enable it to hit Japan. Why would they want weapons with that range? Certainly, not for any target in South Korea! Iraq, Iran, and Libya have all acquired SCUDs. In short, a defense against the SCUD missiles would benefit not only the peace of the United States, but of the world.

Response 2: Thank you.

Comment 3: During the three years that I have spent working at PMRF, I have seen operations moved to other areas, delayed, or even canceled, due to the presence of marine mammals in the planned operations area. I have seen Navy ships and boats change course to avoid areas where whales were present. . . to avoid them and stay well clear. I've seen some of the training materials that PMRF uses that teaches crew how to identify marine mammals. . . and how to stay away from them. What I haven't seen are collisions between PMRF boats (or other Navy craft) and whales. . . unlike what has happened in the Whale Sanctuary when whale watching boats intentionally tried to get close to whales. Statistically, whales seem to be safer on the Range than in the so-called sanctuary!

Response 3: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 4: We have had a project on Kauai to reintroduce the nene to Kauai. As a part of that project, nene were placed in Kalalau valley. Whereupon, some of them started spending a lot of their time at PMRF radar facilities at Makaha Ridge! In their minds, at least, they prefer to spend their time in

the company of radar operators who mostly ignore them, rather than with campers who are often trying to take their pictures. I think that we should remember, too, that the Kennedy Space Center is adjacent to a bird sanctuary, with no apparent damage to the bird populations. For all the apparent foaraw to the contrary, missile launches don't seem to much disturb the birds.

Response 4: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 5: I think that we should support those young men and women we send out to protect us. We ask them to risk their lives; we owe it to them to provide the best possible training and tools to defend themselves. . . and us. The expansion of PMRF will enable us to give them that training and to help develop those tools.

Response 5: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

- ① The EIS should address what impacts there might be on the marine environment through the action of missile debris after launches and target servicing.
- ② A full (faunal and floral) survey of candidate areas on Niihau should be conducted to assess the presence of endangered, threatened, or candidate species. No full survey has yet been done for Niihau (due to its being privately owned) and the potential for the presence of candidate species and "Species of Concern" (which have a good chance of being listed by the time the EIS is finished) is high.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter	
Name	Neal Evenhuis
Street Address	Bishop Museum
City	1525 Bernice St.
State/ZIP	Honolulu, HI 96817

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0211
11 March 1998

Mr Neal Evenhuis
Bishop Museum
1525 Bernice St
Honolulu, HI 96817

Dear Mr Evenhuis:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: The EIS should address what impacts there might be on marine environment through the action of missile debris after launches and target servicing.

Response 1: Potential impacts to the ocean are discussed in Section 4.4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 2: A full (faunal and floral) survey of candidate areas on Niihau should be conducted to assess the presence of endangered, threatened, or a candidate species.

Response 2: Potential impacts to wildlife resources on Niihau are addressed in Section 4.2.1.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

19 June 1997

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Ms. Mossman:

The 1994 Ballistic Missile Defense Programmatic EIS stated that BMDO "will promote the public comment process in an efficient, effective manner." The current EIS for Theater Missile Defense tests associated with PMRF could take a small step toward this goal by providing information about the proposed tests on a web site and by allowing E-mail comments during the scoping process, as is being done for the EIS analyzing similar tests at the Eglin Gulf Test Range. Environmental analyses for previous rocket launch programs at PMRF and monitoring reports for STARS launches provide examples indicating that improvement is needed. These examples are discussed briefly below; for more details, see document 0047 in the Ballistic Missile Defense Final Programmatic EIS. These comments are based on my experience and supplement those in my letter dated 16 June; they are not official positions of the Dept. of Physics & Astronomy or of the Univ. of Hawaii.

Public access to relevant documents

The Administrative Record for the STARS EIS was not available for public review until four months after the final EIS was issued. Several missing documents were not made available for an additional three months. It took two Freedom of Information Act requests to get the report (dated 23 August 1991) on the 20 August 1991 Arias launch failure at Patrick AFB in Florida. The document was sent in March 1994, a year after the second FOIA request. Some of the text and all the Appendices were missing from the document.

The most egregious disregard for public involvement is illustrated by the Environmental Assessment for the CDX project at KTF. The FONSI was signed on 22 May 1992 and the CDX launch occurred early in the morning of 24 May, but the CDX EA was not sent to the Hawaii Office of Environmental Quality Control until November.

Reliability of the STARS booster

The STARS EIS claimed a 97% reliability for the STARS booster but did not acknowledge that the Sandia report from which this number was taken had assumed 100% reliability for the 1st and 2nd stage rocket motors. The actual reliabilities were not used because they were classified. How can the public comment process be efficient and effective if essential information is withheld?

Impacts of Vandal launches

Only vague, and sometimes contradictory, responses were provided to comments about reliability, adequacy of the hazard area, and impacts of the lead emitted for Vandal launches. There apparently has never been an environmental assessment of Vandal launches. The conclusion that the cumulative impact of 72 Vandal launches emitting a total of 3,400 pounds of lead would not be significant was based on assertions in the ZEST Environmental Assessment that no significant impacts were expected from two ZEST launches emitting

about 90 pounds of lead.

Monitoring of the 1st and 3rd STARS launches

The November 1991 protocol specified that there would be six monitoring sites for the first STARS launch. The number of sites was reduced from six to two in July 1992; no documents were provided to show that the Hawaii Dept. of Health was consulted about this change. It took until August 1993 to get a copy of the monitoring report of the 1st launch, which occurred in Feb. 1993. There were no monitors downwind of the launch pad at the boundary of the ground hazard area and hydrogen chloride monitors near the launch pad gave conflicting data. I received only superficial responses to my comments on this monitoring report, which I had included as part of my comments on the draft Restrictive Easement EIS.

I did not receive the monitoring report on the 3rd STARS launch (22 July 1994) until August 1995. I noted serious problems with the monitoring results in a letter to the Army Space and Strategic Defense Command (SSDC) on 29 August 1995. I am sure that the Army SSDC received my letter because a copy of it was sent to a Hawaii State Representative along with a letter from a PMRF employee complaining that my "trivial inquiries are wasting our time and taxpayers' money." I finally received a response from the Army SSDC in Sept. 1996 after both Rep. Mink and Sen. Inouye contacted the Army. The cover letter in the Army's response stated that, "Our delay resulted from confusion over who should provide a response to ensure your concerns were thoroughly addressed." I think that the monitoring problems are so serious that it is questionable whether the Army SSDC has fulfilled the commitment in the Record of Decision for the STARS EIS to collect air samples "to validate the accuracy of the models and to evaluate compliance with federal and state standards."

One would hope that improved communication would reduce confusion and promote an efficient, effective public comment process for the current EIS. However, so far detailed information, especially about possible launch sites in National Wildlife Refuges, has been difficult to obtain. For example, Rep. Mink wrote to the Navy on 2 Dec. 1996 asking about plans for TMD tests. She received a 13 Jan. 1997 letter from BMDO stating that the Navy had asked BMDO to respond and that BMDO was preparing a detailed reply. It seems that BMDO and the Navy could have provided more detailed information by now given that details about possible launch and instrumentation sites are contained in the 10 Jan. 1997 document "Draft PMRF Enhanced Capability Facility Siting/In-Field Considerations." In addition, information promoting PMRF for TMD and other tests was provided for articles in the 24 March 1997 issue of Aviation Week & Space Technology. How can the public get access to this information? Why weren't the locations of all potential launch sites specified in the EIS Preparation Notice and in the Notice of Intent published in the 23 May 1997 Federal Register?



Michael Jones
Dept. of Physics & Astronomy
Univ. of Hawaii
2505 Correa Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P O BOX 128
 KLEKAHA, HAWAII 96757-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0270
 12 March 1998

Dr Michael Jones
 Dept of Physics and Astronomy
 University of Hawaii at Manoa
 2505 Correa Road
 Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear Dr Jones:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: The 1994 Ballistic Missile Defense Programmatic EIS stated that BDMO "will promote the public comment process in an efficient, effective manner." The current EIS for Theater Missile Defense tests associated with PMRF could take a small step toward this goal by providing information about the proposed tests on a website and by allowing E-mail comments during the scoping process, as is being done for the EIS analyzing similar tests at the Eglin Gulf Test Range. . . Public access to relevant documents (In the past documents have not been available to the public.) . . . How can the public comment process be efficient and effective if essential (classified) information is withheld? . . . There apparently has never been an environmental assessment of Vandal launches . . . I received only superficial responses to my comments on the STARS monitoring report, which I had included as a part of my comments on the draft Restrictive Easement EIS. . . I think that the monitoring problems are so serious that it is questionable whether the Army SSDC has fulfilled the commitment in the Record of Decision for the STARS EIS to collect air samples "to validate the accuracy of the models and to evaluate compliance with federal and state standards." . . . So far detailed information, especially about possible launch sites in National Wildlife Refuges, has been difficult to obtain.


Response 1: While a website was not constructed for this program and no e-mail address was provided to receive comments, at each scoping meeting an exhibit area, staffed by technical personnel, was provided because of the complex nature of both on-going activities and the proposed action. The layout of the exhibit area was designed to facilitate an open and relaxed atmosphere for communication between the public and the technical representatives. Attendees were invited to make oral statements, which were recorded by a tape recorder at each meeting. Pre-formatted comment sheets were also available so attendees could either turn in a written comment during the meeting or mail the comment to the address printed on the form. Letters written in advance were also accepted.

The relevant related environmental documents are identified in Section 1.5.1 of the enclosed Draft EIS. However, classified information, by its very nature, cannot be discussed in a public forum.

Monitoring of contaminants from STARS launches did confirm that air contaminants were well below those levels which would potentially affect public health and safety and consistent with the modeling results used for the analysis.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

**American
Friends
Service
Committee
Hawai'i Area
Program Office**

2426 O'ahu Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Phone: (808) 988-6266
Fax: (808) 988-4876
email: afsc@pixi.com

Program Committee:

George Harris
Committee Clerk
Joyce Ahuna-Ka'ai'ai
Nancy Aieck
John Furbright
Renee Furuyama
Mary "Kit" Glover
Gail Hovey
Terry Lau
James Nakepa Jhu
Kalei Puhā
Iona Sai
Betty Simmerer
Roy Takura
Noe Tanigawa
Jeanne Thompson

Sub-committees:

Demilitarization
Economic Justice
Joint Fundraising
Same Sex Marriage
Sovereignty Education

Staff:

June Shimokawa
Kyle Kajihira

Date: June 23, 1997
To: DLNR and PMRF Commanding Officer
From: AFSC Demilitarization Sub-committee, Kyle Kajihira, coordinator.
Re: Preparation Notice for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, dated 13 May, 1997.

The American Friends Service Committee is a Quaker-based peace and justice organization founded in 1917. We oppose the expansion of the Pacific Missile Range Facility. Following are some of our many concerns:

Cultural and sociological considerations:

The expansion of PMRF to include several potential launch sites on Niihau puts the people and culture of that island at enormous risk in numerous ways. Niihau's people are a cultural treasure because they have maintained their language and culture relatively intact. Any student of anthropology would know that major economic and social changes introduced to an indigenous people, such as the incursion of large scale military operations on Niihau, will undoubtedly affect that culture. How will the language of the Niihauans be affected by the increased contact with military outsiders? How will their traditional lifestyle be affected by the increased traffic of military personnel and equipment?

Niihau's citizens already have limited freedom due to the private ownership of the island: The owners of the island exercise a tremendous amount of power over the Niihau population. With the addition of several launch sites to their very small island (eight by eighteen miles at its greatest), the rights and freedoms of Niihauans could be even more severely restricted. Their gathering rights, their very basic ability to move freely about, would be severely diminished, which in turn would profoundly and negatively alter their culture.

Under this expansion plan, between two and eight sites would be built on Niihau. The hazard arcs that are planned would each spread 20,000 feet - nearly four miles wide - having a significant impact on the indigenous culture. We quote from page 3-39 of the Preparation Notice: "There is enough area to provide the maximum ground hazard area 6,096-meters (20,000 feet) potentially required as part of the proposed TBMD program. The island's population center is within an off-limits area on the west side of the island and well outside of any ground hazard area that would be proposed. The large ground hazard area could be accommodated on both the north and south sides of the island."

Cultural sites on Kauai have also been impacted by the missile tests. The Nohili area contains many Native Hawaiian burial sites and culturally sensitive areas. Have the previous missile launches affected Native Hawaiian cultural sites or caused any Native Hawaiians to be denied access to traditional culturally sensitive sites? If so please describe these incidents. What is the cumulative impact on the restrictions on Native Hawaiian cultural practices? Given the existing missile programs, please explain how the proposal to expand the missile launch activities will affect Native Hawaiian cultural practices in the area.

Catastrophic accidents:

What would be the impact of a catastrophic accident with the proposed launches, both immediate and long term? What hazardous materials will be included in the launch vehicles, including spent radioactive materials? What will be the impact of these materials in an accident?

Missile base expansion:

The Pacific Missile Range Facility is located on a narrow strip of federally-leased land surrounded by state land, for which a restrictive easement is required if the base is to continue its recently expanded operations. The current restrictive easement, garnered in order to have the 10,000 foot ground hazard arc required by the STARS program which began in 1993, expires in

Maluhia Me Ka Pono (Peace with Justice)

Regional Office: 980 North Fair Oaks Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91103 Phone: (818) 791-1978
National Office: 1501 Cherry Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102 Phone: (215) 241-7000

2003. Current plans are to request an extension of that easement to the year 2030 so that it can run concurrently with, and expire with, the base's lease.

We have grave concerns that PMRF may be planning to move its entire operation to the island of Niihau at that time, given the willingness of its owners to promote the base's expansion and the ease with which they approach curtailment of the freedoms of its resident Hawaiian population. Are there any plans to shift more of PMRF operations to Niihau in the distant future? If so, please make these plans public so that this information becomes part of the discussion.

Economic considerations:

Preparing for war is not a viable community economic development strategy. AFSC believes that the recent promotions of this program in terms of its perceived economic benefits to the people of Niihau, Kauai, and the State of Hawaii in general are very misleading. Jobs that would go to the people of Kauai and Niihau are paltry and few - short-term construction jobs and some grounds maintenance.

As was the case with the STARS-related activities of 1993 onward, the bulk of economic benefits would be reserved for those personnel who are historically flown into the state, given per diem allowances and professional salaries, then flown out again at the completion of each round of launches.

We request public disclosure of the project budget projections, separating the construction budget from the operations budget. Please include an analysis of the projected jobs, with a breakdown of the number of actual Kauai and Niihau based jobs to be created, versus the number of contracted positions. Who would the private defense contractors be? Please describe the types of jobs to be required, noting which jobs may be so technical as to preclude local hires.

Please complete a cost-benefit analysis. What is the "cost" of lost cultural and environmental resources? What is the value of the opportunities that would be lost by expansion of the missile range?

Environmental degradation:

While environmental concerns are not the primary focus of the AFSC, they are inevitably entwined with the human condition. Because of this, we express our opposition to this base expansion due to the extremely sensitive nature of both the federal and state lands involved in this proposal.

The Northwest Islands National Wildlife Refuge is the last home of several severely diminished and endangered species. As such, the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands are not suitable for missile launch sites. The lands and waters surrounding Niihau and Kauai are equally blessed.

The base expansion proposal poses significant risks to the human, plant and animal; areas where each could thrive would be greatly restricted. Accidents happen; launches fail; wind directions change; toxins spread upon the sea and air.

Rights of Marshallese Peoples:

The impact of these missile tests also include the peoples at the receiving end of the launches. What has been the impact of previous missile tests on the peoples of Kwajalein or any other islands involved in U.S. missile tests, the short term as well as cumulative impacts? Have there been any accidents or "misses" in past launches, and what were the results? What are the potential risks to the Marshallese people? What are the cumulative impacts and potential hazards of spent nuclear materials on the native populations and the environment? How will construction activities affect local fisheries and fish consumers in Micronesia? Have any populations been removed from their ancestral lands to accommodate military facilities or activities? Have any of their cultural rights been affected by these tests? What have been the past reactions from the affected Pacific Island peoples? How will the TMD program affect international laws and agreements?

Need:

Finally, the AFSC believes that there is no justification for PMRF's expansion. *The United States is the world's primary trader in munitions and global insecurity.* The US will spend in excess of \$600 billion this year for "defense" as compared to \$10 billion by the Middle Eastern states and Russia's \$50 billion. Sadly, safety is not the underlying consideration of those who would limit the practices, rights, and very basic freedoms of Hawaii's last native populations.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your attention to these matters.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0270
12 March 1998

Mr Kyle Kajihiro
Hawaii Area Program Office
American Friends Service Committee
2426 Oahu Ave
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear Mr Kajihiro:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: We oppose the expansion of the Pacific Missile Range Facility.

Response 1: Thank you.

Comment 2: The expansion of PMRF to include several potential launch sites on Niihau puts the people and the culture of that island at enormous risk in numerous ways. Niihau's people are a cultural treasure because they have maintained their language and culture relatively intact. Any student of Anthropology would know that major economic and social changes introduced to an indigenous people, such as the incursion of large scale military operations on Niihau, will undoubtedly affect that culture. How will the language of the Niihauans be affected by the increased contact with military outsiders? How will their traditional lifestyle be affected by the increased traffic of military personnel and equipment? . . . Their gathering rights, their very basic ability to move freely about, would be severely diminished, which in turn would profoundly and negatively alter their culture.

Response 2: Military personnel's contact with the culture of Niihau is strictly controlled by a protocol between the Robinson family and PMRF. The action would follow the protocol to the letter, minimizing contact during construction activities and during testing. The Protection Protocol would be strengthened if and where that is required. Cultural resources are described in Sections 4.2.1.4, and Socioeconomics are described in Section 4.2.1.10.

Comment 3: Cultural sites on Kauai have also been impacted by the missile tests. The Nohili area contains many native Hawaiian burial sites and culturally sensitive areas. Have the previous missile launches affected Native Hawaiian or caused any Native Hawaiians to be denied access to traditional culturally sensitive sites? If so please describe these incidents. What is the cumulative impact on the restrictions on Native Hawaiian cultural practices? Given the existing missile programs, please explain how the proposal to expand the missile launch activities will affect Native Hawaiian cultural practices in the area.

Response 3: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety,

Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources.

Comment 4: What would be the impact of a catastrophic accident with the proposed launches, both immediate and long term?

Response 4: The Health and Safety sections for each location in Sections 3 and 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS address the potential impacts of a potential missile mishap. Hazardous materials are similarly discussed in the Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste sections.

Comment 5: What hazardous materials will be included in the launch vehicles, including spent radioactive materials? What will be the impact of these materials in an accident?

Response 5: In the enclosed Draft EIS, the Air Quality, Health and Safety, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, and Water Resource sections in Chapters 3 and 4 for each location provide a description of the hazardous materials potentially released during a launch. The same sections in Section 4 also evaluate the potential impacts from normal missile flight, an early flight termination, and transportation of these materials.

Comment 6: We have grave concerns that PMRF may be planning to move its entire operation to the island of Niihau at that time, given the willingness of its owners to promote the base's expansion and the ease with which they approach curtailment of the freedoms of its resident Hawaiian population. Are there any plans to shift more PMRF operations to Niihau in the distant future? If so, please make these plans public so that this information becomes part of the discussion.

Response 6: There are no plans to move PMRF's entire operation to Niihau. The Draft EIS fully describes reasonably foreseeable future activities at Niihau.

Comment 7: Jobs that would go to the public of Kauai and Niihau are paltry and few - short-term construction jobs and some ground maintenance.

As was the case with the STARS-related activities of 1993 onward, the bulk of economic benefits would be reserved for those personnel who are historically flown into the state, given per diem allowances and professional salaries, then flown out again at the completion of each round of launches. . . Please include an analysis of the projected jobs, with a breakdown of the number of actual Kauai and Niihau based jobs to be created, versus the number of contracted positions. Who would the private defense contractors be? Please describe the types of jobs to be required, noting which jobs may be so technical as to preclude local hires.

Response 7: PMRF, as of September 1997, employed an approximate number of 850 personnel on a full time basis. Most are long term residents of Kauai. As to new jobs created by the Proposed Action, we cannot predict who will be qualified for specific jobs requiring specific skills in support of program activities. PMRF has non-discriminatory hiring practices designed to fairly consider all qualified applicants.

Comment 8: We request public disclosure of the project budget projections, separating the construction budget from the operations budget.

Response 8: The Navy TBMD Program Acquisition costs are \$462.7 million in fiscal year 1998 and \$418.9 million in fiscal year 1999. Construction costs for launch sites have not yet been determined. Once decisions are made to go forth with the program, more specific costs will be developed.

Comment 9: Please complete a cost-benefit analysis. What is the "cost" of lost cultural and environmental resources? What is the value of the opportunities that would be lost by expansion of the missile range?

Response 9: A quantified cost-benefit analysis in environmental impact statements, where all of the benefits and costs of the project are monetized, is not required. Rather, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that federal agencies develop methods to ensure that "presently unquantified environmental amenities and values" be given appropriate consideration in decision-making along


with economic and technical considerations. The Navy has complied with this requirement by including the necessary environmental analysis in this environmental impact statement.

The Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the NEPA do not require that the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of the various alternatives be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important qualitative considerations (40 CFR 1502.23). This Draft EIS fully discusses these considerations in each appropriate section.

- Comment 10: Because of this, we express our opposition to this base expansion due to the extremely sensitive nature of both the federal and state lands involved in this proposal. The Northwest Islands National Wildlife Refuge is the last home of several severely diminished and endangered species. As such, the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands are not suitable for missile launch sites. The lands and waters surrounding Nihoa and Kauai are equally blessed. The base expansion proposal poses significant risks to human, plant and animal; areas where each could thrive would be greatly restricted. Accidents happen; launches fail; wind directions change; toxins spread upon the sea and air.
- Response 10: Potential impacts on biological resources are addressed in the Biological Resources sections for each candidate area, including the Ocean Area, in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Similarly, potential risks to humans are described in the Health and Safety section for each area.
- Comment 11: The impact of these missile tests also include the peoples at the receiving end of the launches. What has been the impact of previous missile tests on the peoples of Kwajalein or any other islands involved in US missile tests, the short term as well as the cumulative impacts? Have there been any accidents or "misses" in past launches, and what were the results? What are the potential risks to the Marshallese people? What are the cumulative impacts and potential hazards of spent nuclear materials on the native populations and the environment? How will construction activities affect local fisheries and fish consumers in Micronesia? Have any populations been removed from their ancestral lands to accommodate military facilities or activities? Have any other cultural rights been affected by these tests? What have been the past reactions from the affected Pacific Island peoples? How will the TMD program affect international laws and agreements?
- Response 11: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources. The USAKA EIS (1989) and Supplemental EIS (1993) describe the effects of missile testing at USAKA.
- Comment 12: The AFSC believes that there is no justification for PMRF's expansion. The United States is the world's primary trader in munitions and global insecurity. The US will spend in excess of \$600 billion this year for "defense" as compared to \$10 billion by the Middle Eastern states and Russia's \$50 billion. Sadly, safety is not the underlying consideration of those who would limit the practices, rights, and very basic freedoms of Hawaii's last native populations.
- Response 12: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

23 June 1997

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

We offer the following comments on the EIS Preparation Notice (23 May 1997) dealing with PMRF Theater Missile Defense (TMD) tests proposed for Tern Island (French Frigate Shoals), Midway Atoll, Kure Atoll and Johnston Atoll, all of which are part of the Hawaii and Pacific Remote Islands National Wildlife Refuge. We have the following concerns:

National Wildlife Refuge Status

The construction and operation of TMD testing facilities is a completely inappropriate use of National Wildlife Refuge lands. National Wildlife Refuge lands are set aside for the protection of federally protected wildlife species and their habitats, and the supporting legislation for NWR's specifically prohibits incompatible uses of land within NWR's. How does PMRF justify this clearly incompatible use of a unique NWR? What is the position of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service on this issue? Military activities on these islands have been extremely damaging to wildlife species and their habitats in the past, and pollutant and physical hazards to wildlife remain, years and even decades after departure of the military. What new information is available to suggest these TMD tests will be any different from past negative impacts?

Endangered species

The unavoidable negative impacts on endangered and threatened species that are posed by TMD testing must be addressed, and should be avoided at all costs. All of the islands proposed for TMD test sites support breeding populations of the threatened green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*), and all but Johnston have pupping and haul out habitat for the endangered Hawaiian monk seal (*Monachus schauinslandi*). French Frigate Shoals supports the greatest breeding concentrations of both of these species, with about 80 percent of Hawaiian Islands turtles nesting and (historically) more than half of all monk seal pupping taking place there. Military activities at all of these islands have, in the past, been the principal cause of declines in the populations of and breeding activity by these two federally listed and protected species. Currently the French Frigate Shoals monk seal population is undergoing a decline and needs enhanced protection and management—now is not the time to add a severe disturbance of a kind that has clearly caused severe declines in the past. The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) have spent millions of dollars in the last two decades to assist the recovery of these endangered species at these islands. It is unconscionable that the construction of missile launch facilities are being proposed just as these listed species, as well as other federally protected species, are beginning to recover from the effects of military activities.

Midway and Kure Atolls both have at least one or more plant species (e.g., *Lepidium bidentatum*) that are being considered for listing as endangered species. Not only could the construction and operation of TMD testing facilities jeopardize the continued existence of both plant and animal endangered species, the introduction of alien species likely to be associated with these TMD activities could have far-reaching effects (see "Alien Species" below).

Alien Species

Alien species introductions are one of worst threats posed to wildlife by any sort of human activities on remote islands. Human activities on these refuge islands are both physically and behaviorally disturbing to the breeding, resting, and feeding behavior of protected animal species in the refuge. In addition, virtually all types of human activities on these islands (including everything from guano mining and feather collecting to scientific research, conservation management and military activity) in the past have resulted in the unintentional (as well as intentional) introduction of alien species. The worst impacts of this type have resulted from rat introductions (from military ships during WWII), for example, on Midway, which caused the extinction of the Laysan Rail and Laysan Finch from Midway, the dramatic reduction of population sizes of most of the breeding seabirds, and damage to native plant species.

Numerous alien plant species have been documented to have negative effects on native ecosystems. For example, on Laysan Island, *Cenchrus echinatus* and *Pluchea indica* replace native plants and reduce habitat quality for native animals. On Midway Atoll, the introduced golden crown-beard (*Verbesina encelioides*), which grows in seabird colonies becomes so dense that the habitat is not available to some species and some birds become entangled and die while going to or from their burrows. Introduced insects damage native plants; introduced ants can kill newly hatched seabird and Laysan Finch chicks. *Phyllostegia variabilis*, originally confined to the NWHI, is now believed to be extinct, and was last seen on Kure Atoll, where it was apparently exterminated by the introduced plants golden crown-beard and sweet alyssum (*Lobularia maritima*), both introduced by the Coast Guard. The examples go on and on.

Removal of *Cenchrus* to preserve the Laysan ecosystem (and hence the endangered Laysan Finch, Laysan Duck and *Mariscus pennatifolius* sedge) has been undertaken at great expense; the project was started in June 1991, and the cost so far has been between 100,000 and 200,000 per year. *Cenchrus*, along with another pestiferous plant *Conyza bonariensis* were introduced by HIRAN military operation in 1960. According to Herbst and Wagner (1992: "Alien plants on the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands" in the book "Alien Plant Invasions in Native Ecosystems of Hawaii: Management and Research, University of Hawaii Press), non-native *Tournefortia* trees found on Kure in 1959 and Laysan in 1961 are probably the result of ocean dispersal of its fruit from trees that were deliberately planted on Midway before 1923.

Once species are introduced to the more heavily visited islands, they are easily carried or may self-disperse to the less frequently visited islands, thus posing a threat to wildlife and plants in the entire refuge. This has been the case with the above-mentioned *Tournefortia* and, especially, insects, which can damage or eradicate native plants and insects. Construction activities can be a major source of introduced species and military agencies and activities are notorious for introducing alien species (e.g., rats to many remote islands, Brown Tree Snake to

Guam) wherever they carry out their activities. Currently the FWS has an elaborate policy for researchers in these refuge islands that requires the arduous "cleaning" of all gear in order to exclude seeds and insects that might be carried inadvertently to the islands. It is unlikely that the proposed construction activities can or will be carried out with sufficient caution to avoid the alien species introduction risks.

Migratory Birds

The Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, including Tern Island, Midway, and Kure Atoll, comprise the largest concentration of breeding seabirds anywhere in the Pacific basin. Turn-of-the-century guano mining and feather collecting prompted President Theodore Roosevelt to name the islands as a Bird Reservation in 1906. Since then the major negative human impact to these systems has been associated with military defense activities. Seabird populations have recovered substantially on each of the islands where military presence has been decreased or eliminated. To resume military activities will reverse this trend at the same time several species are being negatively affected by other activities such as long-line fishing. This would be counter to the purpose of the National Wildlife Refuge, and would indirectly (due to domino effects from alien species introductions, human disturbance, etc.) result in the take of many federally protected seabirds every year.

Reversal of Progress

When we began working in these islands in the early 1980s, it looked as though military presence was finally going to be phased out once and for all. During the last two decades, concurrent with the phase-out of Coast Guard and Navy activities at Tern Island, and Kure and Midway Atoll, dozens of biologists working for federal, state and numerous academic institutions throughout the country have worked to understand and conserve these unique ecosystems and their species assemblages. For example,

1. NMFS spent 12 years enhancing female monk seal survival and adding female seals to the population at Kure. This enhancement, combined with the abandonment of the atoll by the Coast Guard turned the population around. There is little doubt that the installation of TMD testing facilities will reverse this positive trend.
2. Both the number of green sea turtles nesting at Tern Island and the number of monk seals hauling out on the island dramatically increased after the Coast Guard vacated the island and stringent restrictions on human traffic on the islands were enforced. Again, TMD facilities would reverse this trend as well.
3. The Navy has just left Midway, which is now a NWR with a unique open-door policy for stringently controlled ecotourism and commercial aircraft activities. Alien species are being controlled and human activity has been greatly curtailed. Monk seals and burrowing seabirds have begun to show a positive response to the changes at Midway. Although it is too soon to see much response from the ecosystem, there is no doubt that at least some species (e.g., burrowing seabirds) will benefit greatly from the reduction in human activity and the clean up (of both pollutants and alien species) of the environment.

Are we going to throw this progress, which cost millions of taxpayers dollars and untold person-years of effort by biologists and volunteers away? We believe the construction and

operation of TMD facilities will do just that. We are now in the recovery phase for these ecosystems, it makes no sense to abandon decades of work by allowing activities we know will negate our successes in wildlife management and restoration.

Conclusion

In conclusion, as we see it, any proposal to increase human activities and presence on Tern Island, Midway, Kure and Johnston Atolls would do irreversible harm to the federally protected species and many endangered species that occur there, as well as to their habitats. TMD missile facilities are a completely inappropriate use of lands in a NWR. The EIS must consider all the issues we have raised and explain how it will be possible to mitigate the profoundly negative effects that would result from the proposed activities. Frankly, we don't think there is any way such activities can be carried out without tremendous and irreversible harm to unique and irreplaceable natural resources.

These are our opinions, based on many years of collective experience working at these sites and being involved with issues related to wildlife in the Hawaii and Pacific Remote Islands National Wildlife Refuge. Our views do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Zoology, University of Hawaii at Manoa or the Hawaii Wildlife Fund.

From:

Jail Blanks or Made Marks

#2497 10:11:66 Page 2 of 8

FROM : Biology Programs

INDEX NO. : 8009564745

Jun. 23 1997 09:30A1 P3



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0212
11 March 1998

Thank you for considering these comments. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Sheila Conant, Ph. D.
Professor
Department of Zoology
University of Hawaii at Manoa
3663 Alani Drive
Honolulu, HI 96822

WILLIAM D. OBENDORF
HAWAII WILDLIFE PRESERVATION FUND
55-472A Palakana St.
LAIE, HI 96762

Marie P. Morin, Ph. D.
Certified Wildlife Biologist
Assistant Researcher
Department of Zoology
University of Hawaii at Manoa
P. O. Box 3543
Kaihu-Kona, HI 96745-3543

Ms Sheila Conant
Dept of Zoology
University of Hawaii at Manoa
3663 Alani Dr
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear Ms Conant:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: The construction and operation of TMD testing facilities is a completely inappropriate use of National Wildlife Refuge lands. National Wildlife Refuge lands are set aside for the protection of federally protected wildlife species and their habitats, and the supporting legislation for NWR's specifically prohibits incompatible uses of land within NWR's. How does PMRF justify this clearly incompatible use of a unique NWR? What is the position of the US Fish and Wildlife Service on this issue?

Response 1: Section 4.3.1.8 describes potential land use compatibility impacts on Tern Island. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities taking place, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained within this EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required on Tern Island.

Comment 2: Military activities on these islands have been extremely damaging to wildlife species and their habitats in the past, and pollutant and physical hazards to wildlife remain, years and even decades after departure of the military. What new information is available to suggest these TMD tests will be any different from past negative impacts?

The unavoidable negative impacts on endangered and threatened species that are posed by TMD testing must be addressed, and should be avoided at all costs. It is unconscionable that the construction of missile launch facilities are being proposed just as these listed species, as well as other federally protected species, are beginning to recover from the effects of military activities.

Alien species introductions are one of the worst threats posed to wildlife by any sort of human activities on remote islands. It is unlikely that the proposed construction activities can or will be carried out with sufficient caution to avoid the alien species introduction risks.

To resume military activities will reverse this trend at the same time several species are being negatively affected by other activities (on the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands) such as long-line fishing. This would be counter to the purpose of the National Wildlife Refuge, and would indirectly (due to domino effects from alien species introductions, human disturbance, etc.) result in the take of many federally protected seabirds every year.

S-W 00/50

Response 2: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 3: Are we going to throw this progress, which cost millions of taxpayer dollars and untold person-years of effort by biologists and volunteers away? We believe the construction and operation of TMD facilities will do just that. We are now in the recovery phase for these ecosystems, it makes no sense to abandon decades of work by allowing activities we know will negate our successes in wildlife management and restoration.

As we see it, any proposal to increase human activities and presence on Tern Island, Midway, Kure, and Johnston Atolls would do irreversible harm to the federally protected species and many endangered species that occur there, as well as their habitats. TMD missile facilities are a completely inappropriate use of lands in a NWR. The EIS must consider all the issues we have raised and explain how it will be possible to mitigate the profoundly negative effects that would result from the proposed activities. Frankly, we don't think there is any way such activities can be carried out without tremendous and irreversible harm to unique and irreplaceable natural resources.

Response 3: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

June 23, 1997

"You told me
you freed me from your war
and I should be grateful to you as my liberator

You established your government on my island
without my permission...

Now you tell me
I cannot live without
your money
your way
your things
I believe you

But I can only get them
if I give you my island and freedom..."

- Excerpted from "Republic of Belau" by Moses Uludong

Over the last several years, we have heard more and more often about the dawning of the 'Pacific Age,' about the economics, the enormous potential, the rich promises of the Pacific Basin and its diverse populations. About the opportunities waiting there for any who would share them.

What does this mean, exactly? Does it mean concerted enrichment and protection of the societies which have lived on these islands for generations? Does it mean increased understanding of indigenous cultures, added protections for the flora and fauna that are unique to the Pacific's vast expanses? Does it mean garnering and treasuring resources that could benefit all our futures? Additional opportunities for non-Pacific populations to further their own development by emulating systems that have been highly functional for hundreds of years? Mutual nourishment for the teachers and the taught?

Or does it mean something else? What is the 'Pacific Age'? Does it mean, in reality, one of the last opportunities for massive exploitation by gigantic forces, wholesale trashing of land, freshwater, ocean systems, plant and animal life? A playground where the world's superpowers can practice their swaggering at the expense of the rare and diminishing human populations still desperately clinging to their sources of strength - their living cultures, their soil, their ocean, their reasons for being?

The United States of America will spend over \$600 billion this year on defense. By contrast, Russia will spend under \$50 billion. The Middle Eastern states that are so confusing to us, so volatile, so frightening, so truly dangerous, will spend under \$10 billion.

We're not safe enough, we're told. We haven't spent enough money, made a big enough bang. Now, for safety's sake (we're told), our Navy needs to set up two or three or eight more launch sites on Niihau; Barking Sands, a few miles away, isn't enough any more. We hear that our nation's defense requires the Niihau Hawaiians to be confined to an even smaller portion of their island, their tiny little island - eight by eighteen miles, it is. They want Niihau, and Tern, and Kure, islands with populations they want to move, or remove, or whose demise they can mitigate somehow. A small price to pay for freedom, so we are told.

I have read the "Preparation Notice for State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility." A number of serious concerns have arisen through that examination. In the hopes of getting real answers to real questions from the people who have developed the expansion plans for PMRF, I believe these are a few of the questions we all need to ask:

1. What is the unstated agenda for the island of Niihau? How will the people of that island fare at the hands of the military over the coming decades if this program is allowed to proceed? Is not this plan for two (or three or four or eight) launch sites, in fact, just the beginning? *Please keep in mind that we were told, with straight faces, that no PMRF expansions were planned by anyone after the Army's STARS launches.* How will Niihau's people be faring after they've finished building the Navy's structures and doing its maintenance chores, and receiving a few thousand dollars for doing so? How will their fates differ from those of the people of Bikini, and Rongelap, and Eniwetok, and Belau, and other Pacific islands the military has cast its long and greedy eye upon?

Concurrently, please discuss the long-range plans for the Pacific Missile Range Facility at Barking Sands. Please do so in the context of the Range's physical layout and limitations - a narrow strip of land bordered by a heavily used state park, state lands, and an ocean brimming with endangered flora and fauna. A narrow strip of land, *too narrow*, if you want to keep bringing bigger and bigger rocketry programs in. Niihau isn't too narrow though, is it? You could have a 20,000-ft ground hazard area there - twice the size of the hazard arc for STARS - or more, and not keep having to go back to the State's Department of Land and Natural Resources for those restrictive easements you need in order to put the areas adjacent to PMRF at risk. You may get the restrictive easement extended to the year 2030, like you want, but what about when that expires? You might not have such a compliant state agency to deal with in 2030. And you might not get your base's lease renewed either. It expires in 2030 too. If you just had Niihau...If your long-range plans are to relocate the human population of Niihau (depending, of course, upon the will of its 133-year-long "owners"), where do you plan to move them?

2. The U.S. Air Force is competing against the Navy for funding to test and evaluate this Theater Missile Defense System. They already have all the instrumentation in place to enact the program in the Gulf of Mexico. The

Pacific Missile Range Facility, however, is lacking adequate instrumentation to perform this "essential" program, and the area under scrutiny is teeming with resources - human and otherwise - that would be put at risk by enacting it.

Please examine the logic underlying such a choice. If our safety from real and imagined enemies is still inadequate (\$600 billion per year's worth of inadequate), please explain how this program could possibly make a difference, and why the precious resources that exist here and nowhere else should be put to such great risk.

3. At the bottom of page 1-3 and top of 1-4 of your Preparation Notice document (13 May, 1997) is the following quote: *The distances between PMRF and some of the locations under consideration may exceed limitations in current international agreements...Any testing would comply with current US policy concerning compliance with treaties and international agreements.*

Please explain how this defense program could both violate and not violate existing treaties at the same time.

4. During the STARS launches (we were told), each launch generated approximately \$12 million; supposedly that was money for Kauai's beleaguered economy. In fact, an enormous portion of those \$12 million increments went to the enrichment of *New Mexico's* economy - Sandia, the primary contractor, is headquartered in Albuquerque. STARS created two additional jobs at PMRF, and the 60-some people who were flown in for each launch and meeting were given per diem allowances to spend on Kauai. Other than that, much of the money generated by STARS left Hawaii on departing airplanes.

In your draft and final EIS documents, please discuss the finances of this program fully. Tell us what jobs you plan to create, how long they would last, where the specific labor pools exist that you plan to tap for each job, and the skill and education levels required for each position. Tell us how much money would go to defense contractors, how much to infrastructure development, how much to public relations programs, how much to transportation and per diem expenses of the off-island personnel you plan to bring to Hawaii and then return to other parts of the world. Tell us how much money will go to economies outside the state. Tell us what the off-island contractors' profit margins are expected to be.

Please devise a system to compare those figures with the anticipated and potential degradations of Hawaii's resource pool - how much would a worst-case scenario catastrophic launch cost Hawaii? By contrast, who would profit from the attempted clean-up, where are those companies based, and how much money would they make?

5. The rhetoric that is being generated in support of this expansion relies, as ever, on the threat that if we don't support the missile base and its needs, Kauai's third-largest employer might just fold up and go away. The 30 recent layoffs at the base are held up and waved around - "SEE? That's what's going to happen..."


Now - knowing that this expansion is not necessary to make the United States safe from its enemies; that adequate programs are already in place to provide that safety; that vast portions of the income generated by the base's colonizing of Niihau, Kure, Tern, et al. will go into the pockets of defense contractors who would be the only real victors in this fantasy; that many of the plant and animal resources risked by the planned expansion are the last of their kinds on this earth; and that Niihau is the very last of Hawaii, please explain why you would risk and spend on superfluous militarism while letting the essential and peaceful opportunities that would actually boost Kauai's economy - opportunities that abound at Barking Sands - go begging. The much-publicized solar wing is a fine example. The fruit-fly eradication program has long been another. There are many others.

6. Your Preparation Notice dated 13 May, 1997, the document which leads directly to the draft and final EIS documents for PMRF's expansion, deals only with actions directly related to the State of Hawaii, despite the fact that the expansion itself involves extensive federal, as well as state, property and resources.

Where is the early-stages documentation of your plans for the Northwest Islands National Wildlife Refuge? Why were your plans fragmented this way, when you know that the next two rounds must include both state and federal considerations, effects, ramifications? Could it have been to reduce public input into the process, prevent our citizenry from participating as fully as they might? How is freedom being served here?

7. Finally, in your draft and final EIS documents, please include, verbatim, all the input you receive in response to your EIS Preparation Notice dated 13 May, 1997. Your attentive public has a right to share that input.

Thank you very much.



Suzanne Marinelli
2335 A Oahu Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
(808) 946 5712



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752 0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0276
12 March 1998

Ms Suzanne Marinelli
2335 A Oahu Ave
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear Ms Marinelli:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: What is the unstated agenda for the island of Niihau? How will the people of that island fare against the hands of the military over the coming decades if this program is allowed to proceed? Is not this plan for two (or three or four or eight) launch sites, in fact, just the beginning? Please keep in mind that we were told, with straight faces, that no PMRF expansions were planned by anyone after the Army's STARS launches. How will Niihau's people be faring after they've finished building the Navy's structures and doing its maintenance chores, and receiving a few thousand dollars for doing so? How will their fates differ from those of the people of Bikini, and Rongelap, and Eniwetok, and Belau, and other Pacific islands the military has cast its long and greedy eye upon?
You may get the restrictive easement extended to the year 2030, like you want, but what about when that expires? You might not have such a compliant state agency to deal with in 2030. And you might not get your base's lease renewed either. It expires in 2030 too. If you just had Niihau. . . If your long range plans are to relocate the human population of Niihau (depending, of course, upon the will of its 133-year-long "owners"), where do you plan to move them?
- Response 1: There is no unstated agenda for the Island of Niihau, nor was there a plan to expand PMRF at the time of the EIS for STARS launches. The current proposal responds to congressional guidance to use PMRF as a primary range for TBMD testing. Military personnel's contact with the culture of Niihau is strictly controlled by a protocol between the Robinson family and PMRF. While there would be some job-related contact during construction activities and during testing, there would not be social contact between Navy personnel and Niihau residents. The Protection Protocol would be strengthened if and where that is required.
- Comment 2: Concurrently, please discuss the long range plans for the Pacific Missile Range facility at Barking Sands. Please do so in the context of the facility's physical layout and limitations - a narrow strip of land bordered by a heavily used state park, state lands, and an ocean brimming with endangered flora and fauna. A narrow strip of land, too narrow, if you want to keep bringing bigger and bigger rocketry programs in. Niihau isn't too narrow though, is it? You could have a 20,000 ft ground area there - twice the size of the hazard arc for STARS - or more, and not keep having to go back to the State's Department of Land and Natural Resources for those restrictive easements you need in order to put the areas adjacent to PMRF at risk.
- Response 2: The Proposed Action, described in Section 2.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS, constitutes the current long-range plan and reasonably foreseeable activities proposed for PMRF at Barking Sands. Other than the limited proposed action, there are no plans to expand operations on Niihau.

Comment 3: The US Air Force is competing against the Navy for funding to test and evaluate this Theater Missile Defense System. They already have all the instrumentation in place to enact the program in the Gulf of Mexico. The Pacific Missile Range Facility, however, is lacking adequate instrumentation to perform this "essential" program, and the area under scrutiny is teeming with resources - human and otherwise - that would be put at risk by enacting it. Please examine the logic underlying such a choice. If our safety for real and imagined enemies is still inadequate (\$600 billion per year's worth of inadequate), please explain how this program could possibly make a difference, and why the precious resources that exist here and nowhere else should be put to such great risk.

Response 3: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development. The Senate Appropriations Defense Subcommittee recognized that PMRF "is specifically equipped . . . to support tests of theater missile defense systems and concepts." The final FY-95 Defense Appropriations Bill conference report directs the designation of PMRF as the "primary test range for the completion of Navy (TBMD) flight tests." We further note that the total annual defense budget is less than half of the amount you state.

Comment 4: At the bottom of page 1-3 and top of 1-4 of your Preparation Notice document (13 May 1997) is the following quote: The distances between PMRF and some of locations under consideration may exceed limitations in current international agreements. . . Any testing would comply with current US policy concerning compliance with treaties and international agreements. Please explain how this defense program could both violate and not violate existing treaties at the same time.

Response 4: While the distance of some of the proposed target missile launch sites from the PMRF Main Base may or may not exceed the limitations in current international agreements, the actual distances between the proposed target missile launch sites and the location of the defensive missiles aboard Navy ships in the open ocean, can be planned so as to comply with all treaties. All activities associated with TBMD would be conducted in compliance with U.S. Policy for treaty compliance.

Comment 5: During the STARS launches (we were told), each launch generated approximately \$12 million; supposedly that was money for Kauai's beleaguered economy. In fact, an enormous portion of those \$12 million increments went to the enrichment of New Mexico's economy - Sandia, the primary contractor, is headquartered in Albuquerque. STARS created two additional jobs at PMRF, and the 60-some people who were flown in for each launch and meeting were given per diem allowances to spend on Kauai. Other than that, much of the money generated by STARS left Hawaii on departing airplanes.

In your draft and final EIS documents, please discuss the finances of this program fully. Tell us what jobs you plan to create, how long they would last, where the specific labor pools exist that you plan to tap for each job, and the skill and education levels required for each position. Tell us how much money would go to defense contractors, how much to infrastructure development, how much to public relations programs, how much to transportation and per diem expenses of the off-island personnel you plan to bring to Hawaii and then return to other parts of the world. Tell us how much money will go to economies outside the state. Tell us what the off-island contractors' profit margins are expected to be.

Please devise a system to compare those figures with the anticipated and potential degradations of Hawaii's resource pool - how much would a worse case scenario launch cost Hawaii? By contrast, who would profit from the attempted clean-up, where are those companies based, and how much would they make?

Response 5: It is outside the scope of this Draft EIS to forecast the likelihood of any particular group meeting the skills requirements of any particular job. The Land Use section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.1.1.8) addresses impacts to shore fishing and other recreational activities that occur

along the coast. The Socioeconomic section (Section 4.1.1.10) of the EIS addresses impacts to commercial fishing. Section 4.1.1.7, Health and Safety, describes potential hazards related to the No Action and Preferred Action alternatives. In fact, the majority of employees at PMRF are permanent residents of Kauai. PMRF practices equal employment opportunities in the selection of employees.

Comment 6: Please explain why you would risk and spend on superfluous militarism while letting the essential and peaceful opportunities that would actually boost Kauai's economy - opportunities that abound at Barking Sands - go begging. The much publicized solar wing is a fine example. The fruit fly eradication program has long been another. There are many others.

Response 6: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development. Debate over spending priorities is beyond the scope of this EIS.

Comment 7: Your Preparation Notice dated 13 May, 1997, the document which leads directly to the draft and final EIS documents for PMRF's expansion, deals only with actions directly related to the State of Hawaii, despite the fact that the expansion itself involves extensive federal, as well as state, property and resources.

Where is the early stages documentation of your plans for the Northwest Islands National Wildlife refuge? Why were your plans fragmented this way, when you know that the next two rounds must include both state and federal considerations, effects, ramifications? Could it have been to reduce public input into the process, prevent our citizenry from participating as fully as they might? How is freedom being serve here?

Response 7: Far from attempting to reduce public input into the scoping process, or preventing citizen participation, the program has fully complied with the scoping process procedures outlined in the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act.


The PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS public scoping period began on 23 May 1997 when the Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the Federal Register. Concurrently, announcement articles for the EIS Preparation Notice for the State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of PMRF were published in the Office of Environmental Quality Control's bulletin. (The Preparation Notice is a state requirement, HRS 343, and therefore described potential state decisions.) In addition, meetings with interested agencies and groups were held before publication of the NOI, and paid advertisements were placed in the Garden Island, Honolulu Advertiser, and the Honolulu Star-Bulletin newspapers. Four public scoping meetings were held from 17-23 June, 1997 in Waimea, Kilauea and Lihue on Kauai, and in Honolulu on Oahu. Additionally, an information meeting was held with the residents of Niihau. The entire proposed action was fully described at each of those meetings, and substantial written material was available.

Comment 8: Finally, in your draft and final EIS documents, please include, verbatim, all the input you receive in response to your EIS Preparation Notice dated 13 May 1997. Your attentive public has a right to share that input.

Response 8: All of the input received in response to the EIS Preparation Notice in The Environmental Notice and the Notice of Intent in the Federal Register is contained in Volume 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



SIERRA CLUB, HAWAII CHAPTER

P.O. Box 2577,
Honolulu, Hawaii 96803
(808) 538-6616

June 23, 1997

U.S. Navy:

The Sierra Club, Hawaii'i Chapter, with over 5000 dues-paying members, opposes the planned missile launching and associated activities on Kaua'i, Ni'ihau, Kure Atoll and other Pacific Islands (Johnston Island, Midway Atoll, Wake Atoll, Tern etc). The impact from these activities would be devastating. They would:

- Industrialize natural areas;
- Destroy endangered plant species (through the introduction of alien species, chemical releases and other human activities);
- Harm endangered bird species;
- Harm endangered humpback whales, monk seals and other marine species;
- Permanently scar wildlife refuges;
- Release hazardous substances -- exposing the public and native species to unreasonable chemical risks;
- Create visual blight;
- Increase polluted runoff into coastal waters (through construction activities, launches and disturbances to pristine sites on Northwest Hawaiian islands); and
- Curtail native cultural practices (including gathering) as recognized by the Hawaii'i Supreme Court in the PASII decision.


The Draft Environmental Impact Statement should fully address these impacts. It should include a detailed survey of all sites where construction is to take place -- and all areas over which missiles will fly -- for endangered species.

It should assess the quantities of hazardous chemicals to be released -- and their impact from:

- launching activities;
- intentional missile explosions;
- unintentional missile explosions; and
- transportation accidents.

Finally, it should thoroughly impact the loss to native Hawaiians of their constitutional rights to exercise traditional and cultural practices including gathering. These rights will be permanently extinguished on parts of Kaua'i and Ni'ihau under the present plan.

Sincerely,


David Kimo Frankel
Director



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0271
12 March 1998

Mr David Kimo Frankel
Director
Sierra Club, Hawaii Chapter
PO Box 2577
Honolulu, HI 96803

Dear Mr Frankel:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: The Sierra Club, Hawaii Chapter, with over 5000 dues paying members, opposes the planned missile launching and associated activities on Kauai, Ni'ihau, Kure Atoll and other Pacific Islands (Johnston Island, Midway Atoll, Wake Atoll, Tern, etc.).
- Response 1: Thank you.
- Comment 2: The impact from these activities would be devastating. They would: Industrialize neutral areas;
- Response 2: Potential land use impacts of the proposed development associated with the Proposed Action are described in the Land Use section for each location in Section 4, of the Draft EIS.
- Comment 3: (The impact would)
Destroy endangered plant species (through the introduction of alien species, chemical releases and other human activities);
Harm endangered bird species;
Harm endangered humpback whales, monk seals and other marine species;
- Response 3: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 4: (The impact would)
Permanently scar wildlife refuges;
- Response 4: Section 4.3.1.8 describes potential land use compatibility impacts on Tern Island. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities taking place, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained within this EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required on Tern Island.
- Comment 5: (The impact would)
Release hazardous substances -- exposing the public and native species to unreasonable chemical risks;

S-W-00152

Response 5: In the enclosed Draft EIS, the Air Quality, Health and Safety, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, and Water Resource sections in Chapters 3 and 4 for each location provide a description of the hazardous materials potentially released during a launch. The same sections in Section 4 also evaluate the potential impacts from normal missile flight, an early flight termination, and transportation of these materials.

Comment 6: (The impact would)
Create visible blight;

Response 6: Visibility issues are described in the Visual and Aesthetic Resources sections of Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Proposed Mitigations, of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 7: (The impact would)
Increase polluted runoff into coastal waters (through construction activities, launches, and disturbances to pristine sites on Northwest Hawaiian islands) and;

Response 7: The Water Resources section in Section 4 for each area describes potential impacts to water quality for both the No-Action alternative (continuation of existing activities) and the Proposed Action.

Comment 8: (the impact would)
Curtail native cultural practices (including gathering) as recognized by the Hawaii Supreme Court in the PASH decision.

Response 8: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomic, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources. Also, the cultural resources section of each proposed location describes potential impacts to cultural resources and sites.

Comment 9: The Draft Environmental Impact Statement should include a detailed survey of all sites where construction is to take place -- and all areas over which missiles will fly -- for endangered species.

Response 9: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 10: it should assess the quantities of hazardous chemicals to be released -- and their impact from:
-launching activities;
-intentional missile explosions;
-unintentional missile explosions; and
-transportation accidents.

Response 10: In the enclosed Draft EIS, the Air Quality, Health and Safety, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, and Water Resource sections in Chapters 3 and 4 for each location provide a description of the hazardous materials potentially released during a launch. The same sections in Section 4 also evaluate the potential impacts from normal missile flight, an early flight termination, and transportation of these materials.

Comment 11: Finally, it should thoroughly impact the loss to native Hawaiians of their constitutional rights to exercise traditional and cultural practices including gathering. These rights will be permanently extinguished on parts of Kauai and Niihau under the present plan.

Response 11: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety,

Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet for the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

This is a classic case of Environmental racism. Poor indigenous communities are always at elevated risk for environmental harm, including and especially cultural impact. This EIS is a W H L attempt, in any way possible, to cover up the irreparable damage which PMRF has done, is doing, and would do further to the Kanaka Maoli people. Be BRAVE for a change - include the assessments of real Kanaka Maoli researchers who have not been paid off by you to lie so you can continue your genocide of the Kanaka Maoli people, killing them off as you have killed every indigenous population you have ever encountered.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman PMRF Public Affairs Office P.O. Box 128 Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name: Lailani Teale Street Address: 47-388 Hui'iwa St. #14-304 City: Kaneohe Hawaii, 96744 State/ZIP:

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

Comment Sheet for the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

12898 Feb 11, 1994 1-103 b-c

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

Because the DOD has had many years on Ni'ihau and Kaua'i to strategize and to promote its activities, it needs to allow other interested parties which hold an opposing view (eg. native Hawaiian activists) an equal opportunity to educate Ni'ihau residents. Because Ni'ihau is an isolated community, the residents have not had access to adequate information - including the points of view of those who oppose PMRF expansion - in order to make an informed decision. Therefore, the Navy (EIS of DOD) does not have the informed consent of the population which it must have in order to proceed.

If the Navy wants informed consent, it must provide means (including monies) for opposing viewpoints to be thoroughly communicated to Ni'ihau's people, and time for them to consider all of the options.

Ms. Vida Mossman PMRF Public Affairs Office P.O. Box 128 Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name: Lailani Teale Street Address: 47-388 Hui'iwa St. #14-304 City: Kaneohe HI 96744 State/ZIP:

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

S-W-0053

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0172
11 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

In order to get better (although probably still not really adequate, since there will still be many people who do not have the chance to be informed/make commentary/feel empowered) public input, I highly recommend the following:

1) buy advertisements at prime listening time on KINE, KCCN, KRTR etc. announcing that people still have till July 7 to comment. If necessary, take budget money from promotion of the plan (eg staff, material etc.) to do this. make advertisements as unbiased as possible, not promoting the plan, just soliciting comments.

2) give stacks of comment sheets and EIS forms, along with information about the use of these forms, to the UH Ctr. for Hawaiian Studies, the Ethnic Studies Dept. and other Hawaiian organizations to fill out

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Commenter Name	Laulani Teale
Street Address	47-388 Hui'iwa St #14-304
City	Kāne'ohe Hawai'i 96744
State/ZIP	

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Laulani Teale
47-388 Hui'iwa St #14-304
Kāne'ohe, HI 96744

Dear Laulani Teale:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: This is a classic case of environmental racism. Poor indigenous communities are always at elevated risk for environmental harm, including and especially cultural impact. The EIS WILL attempt, in any way possible, to cover up the irreparable damage which PMRF has done, is doing, and would do further to the Kanaka Maoli people. Be BRAVE for a change - include the assessments of real Kanaka Maoli researchers who have not been payed off by you to lie so you can continue your genocide of the Kanaka Maoli people, killing them off as you have killed every indigenous population you have ever encountered.

Because the DOD has had many years on Kauai and Niihau to strategize and to promote it's activities, it needs to allow other interested parties which hold an opposing view (e.g. Native Hawaiian Activists) and equal opportunity to educate Niihau residents. Because Niihau is an isolated community, the residents have not had access to adequate information - including the points of view of those who oppose PMRF expansion - in order to make an informed decision. Therefore, the Navy (and all of DOD) does not have the informed consent of the population which it must have in order to proceed. If the Navy wants informed consent, it must provide means (including monies) for opposing viewpoints to be thoroughly communicated to Niihau's people, and time for them to consider all of the options.

Response 1: A meeting, prior to the start of this EIS, was held on the island of Niihau to receive input from the island residents on the proposed activities to be held on the island. The Draft EIS also uses information from a recent analysis, "Niihau, Present Circumstances and Future Requirements in an Evolving Hawaiian Community", developed by an independent expert working with the people on the island. A meeting will also be held on the island requesting any comments the island residents may have on the results of the analysis conducted in this Draft EIS. See Section 4.5 Environmental Justice.

Comment 2: 1) Buy advertisements at prime listening time on KINE, KCCN, KRTR, etc. announcing that people still have until July 7 to comment. If necessary, take budget money from promotion of the plan (e.g. staff, material, etc.) to do this. Make advertisements as unbiased as possible, not promoting the plan, just soliciting comments. 2) give stacks of comment sheets and EIS forms, along with information about the use of these forms, to the UH Ctr. for Hawaiian Studies, the Ethnic Studies, Dept. and other Hawaiian organizations to fill out.

Response 2: Thank you for your suggestions. The program fully complied with the scoping process outlined in the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act.

The PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS public scoping period began on 23 May 1997 when the Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the Federal Register. Concurrently, announcement articles for the EIS Preparation Notice for the State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of PMRF were published in the Office of Environmental Quality Control's bulletin. In addition, meetings with interested agencies and groups were held before publication of the NOI, and paid advertisements were placed in the Garden Island, Honolulu.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waiimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,
J.A. BOWLIN
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0053

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Maniow Kelly</i>
Street Address	<i>4117 Black Pt. Rd.</i>
City	<i>Honolulu, HI</i>
State/ZIP	<i>96816</i>

Comments on the U. S. Navy's Plan to Enhance Capabilities
of the Pacific Missile Range Facility
June 23, 1997

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Commanding Officer
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P. O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawai'i 96752-0128

FROM: Marion Kelly, Associate Professor, Ethnic Studies
Department, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

SUBJECT: Navy's proposal to expand its Pacific Missile Range
Facilities.

I have a few comments to make on the Navy's plans to increase its missile program in the Pacific. I write to express my own personal opinion, and do not represent the University or my Department.

The Navy's plans for expanding its missile program on islands in the Pacific needs to be seriously reviewed and reconsidered, especially where they propose to invade islands that have been designated wild life refuges, or where the indigenous population has been greatly isolated and protected from daily western contact.

Most of the plans call for using small atolls that are extremely environmentally fragile and should be left strictly alone to recover from a devastating fifty year experience of coral reef kills as a result of dredging and pollutants provided by the U.S. military, airplanes killing birds in flight, and the complete disappearance of the Laysan Island rail from Midway Island, not to mention toxic waste sites on the islands. It would seem most reasonable that, instead of planning for additional trashing of some of our most unique resources, we should spend our tax money on cleaning them up and bringing these islands back to as pristine a condition as is possible. We should clean up our act and allow nature to live.

For example, Midway has suffered under the U.S. Navy since WW II. It has just been turned over to the State as a Wild Life Refuge and plans are going forward to clean up the mess left by the military.

How in the world can anyone even think that it would be a good idea to build a missile range facility on the island that has not yet recovered from fifty years of abuse? The same holds true for French Frigate Shoals.

In the 1920s, I traveled with my family to Midway, Pearl and Hermes Reef, Laysan, Lisiansky, and French Frigate Shoals. I know what beautiful islands they were before WWII. I have read about the terrible things have been done to Midway and French Frigate Shoals since the end of WWII, but we should have learned by this time that we cannot go on destroying the fragile environments of these atolls. The whole idea is preposterous.

On the issue of Ni'ihau, I should point out that in 1994, the Human Genome Diversity Project, which is a multinational initiative by scientists, who seek to sequence the DNA in the entire human genetic structure, have listed the indigenous people of Ni'ihau as one of the 722 indigenous populations identified as so-called "isolates of historic interest." It is clear that the indigenous residents of Ni'ihau need protection to survive. I want to stress how special is the community that is contained on Ni'ihau. Even an international consortium of scientists, universities, governments and other interests in North America and Europe have recognized the Ni'ihau indigenous residents' need for special efforts. This program is supported by the World Bank, the World Health Organization and the World Trade Organization. The best chance for the survival of the Ni'ihau indigenous population is not to invade their territory, but rather, for the U.S. military to back away from establishing any kind of military site, a missile site, or (I could not believe it when I read it) a 6000 ft. emergency airplane landing field. With the Kaua'i airport only a few miles away, and the Barking Sands missile site just a stones throw away, there is absolutely no need to mess up that little island of Ni'ihau and cause its vulnerable residents to be so easily accessible. Of course the Human Genome Diversity Project is not the answer for the indigenous people of Ni'ihau. What is the answer for them is that everyone else must respect the right of the Ni'ihau indigenous population to live their lives as much undisturbed as they wish, and that we respect their right to self-determination and to the protection of their environment.

The expansion of the Kaua'i missile site is also disturbing. It is quite clear that the jobs that the people of Kaua'i get are the lowest paying jobs at the Navy missile facility at Barking Sands. If the

discussion is about jobs, how much better it would be, if the Navy came up with environmental research projects that provided jobs that pointed in a positive direction and were at the same time protective of the environment. This world has had too many world wars. It is about time that we develop peaceful projects for the world, and as an act of faith in our ability to succeed in such an endeavor, we will put away our war tools.

In summary, I would say to the U.S. Navy: No structures on Ni'ihau, nor on any islands in the northwest chain of island. And especially no dredging of any kind. The seals, turtles and birds need our help to preserve the diversity of life on the northwest islands. Indigenous people of Ni'ihau need our help as well, to preserve the values in their culture that they cherish. We have a great responsibility. Don't botch it for us.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0213
11 March 1998

Mr Marion Kelly
4117 Black Pt Rd
Honolulu, HI 96816

Dear Mr Kelly:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: The Navy's plans for expanding its missile program on islands in the Pacific need to be seriously reviewed and reconsidered, especially where they propose to invade islands that have been designated wildlife refuges, or where the indigenous population has been greatly isolated and protected from daily western contact.

Most of the plans call for using small atolls that are extremely environmentally fragile and should be left strictly alone to recover from a devastating fifty year experience of coral reef kills as a result of dredging and pollutants provided by the US military, airplanes killing birds in flight, and the complete disappearance of the Laysan Island rail from Midway Island, not to mention toxic waste sites on the islands. It would seem most reasonable that, instead of planning for additional trashing of some of our most unique resources, we should spend our tax money on cleaning them up and bringing these islands back to as pristine a condition as possible. We should clean up our act and allow nature to live.

How can anyone even think that it would be a good idea to build a missile range facility on the island that has not yet recovered from fifty years of abuse? The same holds true for French Frigate Shoals.

Response 1: The purpose of this EIS is to analyze the potential effects of the enhancement of PMRF on the ecosystem, species, and other resources in the areas where activities are proposed.

Comment 2: On the issue of Ni'ihau, I should point out that in 1994, the Human Genome Diversity Project, which is a multinational initiative by scientists, who seek to sequence the DNA in the entire human genetic structure, have listed the indigenous people of Ni'ihau as one of the 722 indigenous populations identified as so-called "isolates of historic interest." It is clear that the indigenous residents of Ni'ihau need protection to survive. I want to stress how special is the community that is contained on Ni'ihau. Even an international consortium of scientists, universities, governments and other interests in North America and Europe have recognized the Ni'ihau indigenous residents' need for special efforts.

The best chance for the survival of the Ni'ihau indigenous population is not to invade their territory, but rather, for the US military to back away from establishing any kind of military site, a missile site, or (I could not believe when I read it) a 6000 ft. emergency airplane landing field.

What is the answer for them is that everyone must respect the right of the Niihau indigenous population to live their lives as much undisturbed as they wish, and that we respect their right to self-determination and to the protection of their environment.

Response 2: The Draft EIS incorporates information from a recent analysis of material and cultural circumstances on Niihau, developed by an independent expert working with the people of the island. That report was translated into Hawaiian by Niihau residents to facilitate goundtruthing. An information meeting was held on Niihau to obtain discussion and feedback from islanders, and a further meeting will be held on the island during the Draft EIS comment period.

Military contact with the culture of Niihau is strictly controlled by a protocol between the Robinson family and PMRF. The action would follow the protocol to the letter, minimizing contact during construction activities and during testing. The Protection Protocol would be strengthened if and where that is required.

Comment 3: The expansion of the Kauai missile site is also disturbing. It is quite clear that the jobs that the people of Kauai get are the lowest paying jobs at the Navy missile facility at Barking Sands.

Response 3: PMRF, as of September 1997, employed an approximate number of 850 personnel on a full time basis. Most are long term residents of Kauai. As to new jobs created by the Proposed Action, we cannot predict who will be qualified for specific jobs requiring specific skills in support of program activities. PMRF has non-discriminatory hiring practices designed to fairly consider all qualified applicants.

Comment 4: If the discussion is about jobs, how much better it would be, if the Navy came up with environmental research projects that provided jobs that pointed in a positive direction and were at the same time protective of the environment. This world has had too many world wars. It is about time that we develop peaceful projects for the world, and as an act of faith in our ability to succeed in such an endeavor, we will put away our war tools.

Response 4: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

Comment 5: In summary, I would say to the US Navy: No structures on Niihau, nor any other islands in the northwest chain of island. And especially no dredging of any kind. The seals, turtles, and birds need our help to preserve the diversity of life on the northwest islands.


Response 5: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 6: Indigenous people of Niihau need our help as well, to preserve the values in their culture that they cherish. We have a great responsibility. Don't botch it for us.

Response 6: A public information meeting prior to the start of this EIS was held on Niihau to receive input from the island residents on the proposed activities to be held on the island. The Draft EIS also uses information from a recent analysis of circumstances and needs on Niihau, developed by an independent expert working with the people on the island. A meeting will also be held on the island requesting any comments the island residents may have on the results of the analysis conducted in this EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Transcript from Honolulu meeting

Comment 1

Laulani Teale
47-388 Hui'iwa Street #14-304
Kane'oha, Hawaii 96744

Aloha. My name is Laulani Teale and I am from the University of CYCWA, of University of Hawaii. I'd like to make the comment that this expansion of the PMRF in Hawaii, is a classic example of racial injustice. This is a project which severely impacts one economic, and ethnic group much, much more than any others. Because native Hawaiians are at increased risk for all health problems, any effects which has been studied on any other groups will be amplified, in this population and that will lead to extreme differential between the impact on native Hawaiians and on any other group, which I can about only the one and only population existing of intact culture in which the language is spoken, and remember the language itself is the determining factor in the existence of native cultures. If culture does not have a group within it, a subgroup at least, which speaks its own language, then by some international standards, does not exist as an indigenous population. So if this project is to continue, the threat it would pose to the native Hawaiian population and especially to the one native Hawaiian speaking population in the world, would be so tremendous, that it would constitute international recognized genocide and so this project should definitely not continue on this basis but clearly breaks the standards that are set in (unintelligible) Act is clearly discrimination. Another comment that I would like to make is that even if the people of Niihau agree to participate in this process and in this project, it does not give the military the right to proceed. This is basically the same thing as organ companies which go into depressed regions of stable countries and get populations there to donate their organs for small sum of money. We're talking about a extremely depressed economic group which has a very few options to choose from. So if this group (unintelligible) only to, if this group were to participate in this plan, in this project for the PMRF, it is basically the same thing as selling kidneys. They don't have much other choice. So I would hope that the project be reconsidered. I think that legally there is no basis on which it can proceed. It is very, very clearly racism, genocide in fact, this is a classic example of genocide by any international definitions including the Nuremberg Trials, which the United States participated in. These were the trials against people in Nazi Germany, who attempted to exterminate the Jewish race from Europe. In this case, it is even worse, because we are talking about a culture which is being - there is an attempt to exterminate it from the face of the Earth and there is a really true possibility of that being done if this project is allowed to continue. So, I want to urge the Navy and the Department of Defense to review its plan, to change its actions, to get involved instead defense of things that will protect what we need to survive, and to give up this project. I would like to also say that that when we speak about national interest, national interest basically means that the first thing that should be protected are the things that the people require to survive, yeah. What the American people require to survive is an intact Earth, first and foremost. If you continue with this project, you are impacting the ecological system for one thing, and cultural systems for another thing, in the end, which will, in the end, tremendously impact the health of the American people who would live in the jurisdiction of what is now America for years to come. It has been shown for one thing in Report #112 by Alan Durning and other reports that the health of environmental, the environmental health of indigenous peoples, is a reflection of a direct impact which will eventually be carried out upon peoples everywhere. The rest of the population, basically "the minors can marry thing," you know that indigenous people are the most sensitive to environmental damage and degradation. And so further along the line, other peoples will also be affected also. So this is clearly not in defense of American interest because interest should be our grandchildren, our great grandchildren and our great, great grandchildren for many generations to come. And that know essentially what this project is killing.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0173
11 March 1998

Laulani Teale
47-338 Huiiwa St #14-304
Kaneohe, HI 96744

Dear Laulani Teale:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 209. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: I'd like to make the comment that this expansion of the PMRF in Hawaii, is a classic example of racial injustice. This is a project which severely impacts one economic, and ethnic group much, much more than any others. Because native Hawaiians are at increased risk for all health problems, any effects which has been studied on any other groups will be amplified, in this population and that will lead to extreme differential between the impact on native Hawaiians and on any other group. So if this project is to continue, the threat it would pose to the native Hawaiian population and especially to the one native Hawaiian speaking population in the world, would be so tremendous, that it would constitute internationally recognized genocide and so this project should definitely not continue.
- Response 1: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources.
- Comment 2: Another comment that I would like to make is that even if the people of Niihau agree to participate in this process and in this project, it does not give the military the right to proceed. So, I want to urge the Navy and the Department of Defense to review its plan, to change its actions, to get involved instead defense of things that will protect what we need to survive, and to give up this project. I would like to also say that when we speak about national interest, national interest basically means that the first thing that should be protected are the things that people require to survive, yeah. What the American people require to survive is an intact earth, first and foremost. If you continue with this project, you are impacting the ecological system for one thing, and the cultural systems for another thing, in the end, which will, in the end, tremendously impact the health of the American people who would live in the jurisdiction of what is now America for years to come.
- Response 2: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0225
11 March 1998

Ms Judy Dalton
Kauai Group
Hawaii Chapter Sierra Club
PO Box 3412
Lihue, Kauai, HI 96766

Dear Ms Dalton:


Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: (We would like the EIS to address):
direct and indirect impacts to all rare and endangered species on land and in the sea. Include impacts due to noise, visual cues, and electromagnetic field changes.
- Response 1: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 2: (We would like the EIS to address)
effects of chemical pollutants associated with launch activities, handling and transportation.
- Response 2: In the enclosed Draft EIS, the Air Quality, Health and Safety, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, and Water Resource sections in Chapters 3 and 4 for each location provide a description of the hazardous materials potentially released during a launch. The same sections in Section 4 also evaluate the potential impacts from normal missile flight, an early flight termination, and transportation of these materials.
- Comment 3: (We would like the EIS to address)
affects of source and non-point source pollution and erosion due to development of facilities
- Response 3: The Water Resources section in Section 4 for each area describes potential impacts to water quality for both the No-Action alternative (continuation of existing activities) and the Proposed Action.
- Comment 4: (We would like the EIS to address)
socio-psychological impacts and risks attendant to transforming a civilian population center to a likely military target.
- Response 4: The TBMD program would be similar to current testing activities at PMRF. Potential impacts to health and safety are described for each location in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.
- Comment 5: (We would like the EIS to address)
socioeconomic impacts related to civilian access to commercial, recreational, and scientific uses of expanded range and sites;

- Response 5: The Land Use section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.1.1.8) addresses impacts to shore fishing and other recreational activities that occur along the coast. The Socioeconomic section of the EIS (Section 4.1.1.10) addresses impacts to commercial fishing.
- Comment 6: (We would like the EIS to address)
(including) assessment of impacts to traditional native Hawaiian cultural practices.
- Response 6: The Draft EIS includes a detailed study of the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on the people of Niihau. (Sections 4.2.1 and 4.5.2)
- Comment 7: (We would like the EIS to address)
disclosure and resolution of all land tenure issues, including ceded lands, attendant to the study sites.
- Response 7: Appendix E of the enclosed Draft EIS provides information about ownership and lease agreements involving PMRF and Department of Energy activities in the Hawaiian Islands. The Land Use sections for each location address the use of ceded lands where applicable.
- Comment 8: (We would like the EIS to address)
sociopolitical affects associated with the program vis-a-vis international agreements and international law.
- Response 8: All testing at PMRF currently complies and will continue to comply with U.S. policy direction concerning treaty obligations. Detailed discussion of political and international policy issues are outside the scope of this Draft EIS.
- Comment 9: (We would like the EIS to address)
affects of chemical pollutants associated with launch activities, handling and transportation.
- Response 9: The Hazardous Materials and Waste and Water Resources section in Section 4 for each area describes potential impacts to land areas and water quality for both the No Action alternative (continuation of existing activities) and the Proposed Action.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

23 July 1997

Ms. Vida Massman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P. O. Box 178
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

RE: Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Actions Relating to Enhancing the Capabilities of the PMRF

I think the way you have set up your "presentation" of your plan to the community was designed to intimidate the community of Ni'ihau and Kaua'i, in that culturally Hawaiians are a socially oral people, and by insisting comments be written or technological form (open tape recorder) and having "military/official" people manning the displays, were in my opinion, scare tactics. People felt a bit deceived by that. You effectively blocked some heartfelt comments from residents of Ni'ihau whom you will impact the most, in that English is primarily their second language, and they are not confident or comfortable expressing their comments in written form in what is essentially a "foreign" tongue.

We are in an economic doldrums here on Kaua'i but I still do not see how all this talk of expansion is truly going to benefit Kaua'i. PMRF already is a big employer on Kaua'i and for us to once again depend on any one industry (much like tourism in the 80's) has proven to be a trap to local community survival. It is also common perception that the federal government has not been a good steward of public monies and I foresee that the expansion will "phase out" due to some funding cuts and once again the people of Kaua'i will experience this economic slump we already in to a greater degree. Kaua'i cannot afford not to make wise choices for the survival of the island even when faced with severe economic challenges.

I'm of the view that ANY and ALL activity on the island WILL adversely impact the residents' daily lives big or small. I read you are working with an individual economist regarding Ni'ihau but I think a panel mixed with grassroots/Hawaiian community people would give a better picture for your EIS rather than just one individual's "professional opinion." Hawaiian cultural society always respected knowledgeable kupuna views so I would suggest you start there.

The proposed plan will restrict and limit vast areas of beach or ocean access; this will adversely affect the residents as ocean gathering is a very big part of their daily subsistence lifestyle. The same is true for forest areas on the island they use to hunt for food. Special consideration and research into their cultural subsistence lifestyle should be of top priority. The island is small and in "sustenance lifestyle" is of highest importance. I don't think it is big enough for both military activities and native Hawaiian lifestyle.

I am VERY AGAINST the military considering destroying or encroaching on an entirely unique native population lifestyle or devalue their cultural significance for strategic military convenience. Why not consider using some other abandoned military property -- the buildings and stuff are already there -- and leave Ni'ihau as is?

I am very skeptical about the environmental safety of the oceans etc. This plan seems to minimize or

gloss over. Our island lifestyle here on Kaua'i has already to a great extent been changed over the years just due to civilization. I've read that the plan calls for weapons testing and would like to know to what "minimal" level would this plan affect current ocean and natural land resources? Realistically, what is "minimal" levels of impact? It may not be intended to hurt our ocean resources but the simple fact is that all island activity affect our ocean resources one way or other, and we want to know the facts so we can decide if we want to live with the consequences or not.


I read a recent article that brought up the issue and so I would like to know who are we "beefing" up our military capabilities on Kaua'i for? What threat are we preparing against? And if a "strike" happens against Kaua'i what is the impact to the island? If Kaua'i could become a military stronghold and a possible future target what are the chances of survival on Kaua'i?

Please address in your EIS even the remote possibility and speculation of housing military personnel in the future (I believe it is a 30-year plan) on the island as this will also adversely impact current native lifestyle.

I would also like you to address the rumor that part of the "expansion" on Kaua'i involves ceded land and how does the native Hawaiian population on Kaua'i feel about that. I do not believe that the community-at-large knows about this or they would not remain silent on this issue.

Thank you for "listening".

Sincerely,



D. K. Santos
P. O. Box 447
Hanama'ulu, Kaua'i, Hawaii 96715



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Scr 00/0224
11 March 1998

Mr D K Santos
PO Box 447
Hanamaulu Kauai, HI 96715

Dear Mr Santos:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I think the way you have set up your "presentation" of your plan to the community was designed to intimidate the community of Niihau and Kauai, in that culturally Hawaiians are a socially oral people, and by limiting comments to written or technological form (open tape recorder) and having "military/official" people manning the displays, were in my opinion, scare tactics. People felt a bit deceived by that. You effectively blocked some heartfelt comments from residents of Niihau whom you will impact the most, in that English is primarily their second language, and they are not confident or comfortable expressing their comments in written form in what is essentially a "foreign" tongue.

Response 1: While not an open forum with the opportunity for public speaking, at each scoping meeting the public was encouraged to view the exhibit area which was staffed by technical personnel. The layout of the exhibit area was designed to facilitate an open and relaxed atmosphere for communication between the public and the technical representatives. Attendees were invited to make oral statements, which were recorded by a tape recorder at each meeting. Pre-formatted comment sheets were also available so attendees could either turn in a written comment during the meeting or mail the comment to the address printed on the form. Letters written in advance were also accepted.

A total of 47 comments (42 written and 5 oral) were received during the scoping meetings held at Waimea, Kilauea, Lihue, and Honolulu. The information meeting format at Niihau respected traditions of group communication.

Comment 2: We are in an economic doldrums here on Kauai but I still do not see how all this talk of expansion is truly going to benefit Kauai. PMRF already is a big employer on Kauai and for us to once again depend on any one industry (much like tourism in the 80's) has proven to be a trap to local community survival. It is also common perception that the federal government has not been a good steward of public monies and I foresee that the expansion will "phase out" due to some funding cuts and once again the people of Kauai will experience this economic slump we already in to a greater degree. Kauai cannot afford to make wise choices for the survival of the island even when faced with severe economic challenges.

Response 2: The enclosed Draft EIS provides information on the economic impacts of the No Action alternative and of the Proposed Action alternatives. Please see the Socioeconomics sections of Chapter 4. It is outside the scope of this EIS to analyze impacts of other spending initiatives.

Comment 3: I'm of the view that ANY and ALL activity on the island WILL adversely impact the residents' daily lives big or small. I read you are working with an individual economist regarding Niihau but I think a panel mixed with grassroots/Hawaiian community people would give a better picture for your EIS rather than just one individual's "professional opinion." Hawaiian cultural society always repeated knowledgeable kupuna views so I would suggest you start there. The proposed plan would restrict and limit vast areas of beach or ocean access; this will adversely affect the residents as ocean gathering is a very big part of their daily subsistence lifestyle. The same is true for forest areas on the island they use to hunt for food. Special consideration and research into their cultural subsistence lifestyle should be of top priority. The island is small and in "sustenance lifestyle" is of highest importance. I don't think it is big enough for both military activities and native Hawaiian lifestyle. I am VERY AGAINST the military considering destroying or encroaching on an entirely unique native population lifestyle or devalue their cultural significance for strategic military convenience. Why not consider using some other abandoned military property--the buildings and stuff are already there--and leave Niihau as is?

Response 3: The enclosed Draft EIS incorporates recent work of an independent expert working with and on behalf of the people of Niihau. That work has been groundtruthed by the people of the island, including translation into Hawaiian. Our earlier public scoping process included an information meeting on Niihau, and residents of Niihau attended public meetings on Kauai. We envision a similar outreach process to discuss this Draft EIS.

Comment 4: I am very skeptical about the environmental safety of the oceans etc. this plan seems to minimize or gloss over. Our island lifestyle here on Kauai has already to a great extent been changed over the years just due to civilization. I've read that the plan calls for weapons testing and would like to know what "minimal" level would this plan affect current ocean and natural land resources? Realistically, what is "minimal" levels of impact? It may not be intended to hurt our ocean resources but the simple fact is that all island activity affect our ocean resources one way or other, and we want to know the facts so we can decide if we want to live with the consequences or not.

Response 4: Potential impacts to the ocean are discussed in Section 4.4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 5: I read a recent article that brought up the issue and so I would like to know who we are "beefing" up our military capabilities on Kauai for? What threat are we preparing against? And if a "strike" happens against Kauai what is the impact to the island? If Kauai could become a military stronghold and a possible future target what are the chances of survival on Kauai?

Response 5: Chapter 1 of the EIS describes the purpose and need for the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems that are under development. Because the TBMD program would be similar to current testing activities at PMRF, we do not believe that there will be any increase in PMRF's vulnerability as an enemy target. Potential impacts to health and safety are described for each location in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

Comment 6: Please address in your EIS even the remote possibility and speculation of housing military personnel in the future (I believe it is a 30-year plan) on the island as this will also adversely impact current native lifestyle.

Response 6: There are no plans to house military personnel on Niihau. Potential socioeconomic impacts the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives are described in the Socioeconomics section for each area in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.


Comment 7: I would also like you to address the rumor that part of the "expansion" on Kauai involves ceded land and how does the native Hawaiian population on Kauai feel about that. I do not believe that the community-at-large knows about this or they would not remain silent on this issue.

Response 7:

The Land Use sections of the EIS address the use of land and issues of access on Kauai (Sections 4.1.1.8, 4.1.2.7, 4.1.3.8, 4.1.4.8, 4.1.5.7, and 4.1.6.4). The Environmental Justice section of the EIS considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources and Water Resources. Also, see Appendix E, Land Title.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

June 23, 1997

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Re: Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kaua'i, Hawai'i
Comments on EIS Preparation Notice

Dear Ms. Mossman,

This letter provides comments on issues that we believe the United States Navy and the State of Hawai'i should examine in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") for the Theater Missile Defense testing proposal of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kaua'i, Hawai'i, as described in the May 7, 1997 EIS Preparation Notice ("PN").

The information that needs to be included or questions that need to be answered are:

1. **Possible launch sites** - The PN is not specific about which sites would be located in National Wildlife Refuge areas or sanctuaries and whether or not more sites could be added at a later date. It is important to identify each of these areas specifically as each potential site contains various protected plants, birds, seals and turtles listed in the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts as well as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. This specific information is especially pertinent to Tern Island.
2. **Refuge Compatibility** - A critical issue that must be addressed in the draft EIS is how the Navy's proposal may be consistent or inconsistent with the purposes of the various State and Federal Wildlife Refuges that are potential sites. The compatibility issues must be addressed separately (i.e. specific to each unique refuge), as well as cumulatively (i.e. total effect).
3. **Refuge Studies** - What studies does the Navy intend to conduct regarding potential impacts on refuge wildlife? Who is doing these studies and when will they be completed?
4. **Clean Air Act Compliance** - The EIS should include any data concerning Halon 2402 and Freon and other emissions from any missile and must be in compliance with the statutory provisions, regulations and any guidelines of the Clean Air Act. Wildlife Refuge Areas are not exempt from the Act.
5. **Clean Water Act** - The EIS should indicate how monitoring and

subsequent testing of the water will take place near launch sites in compliance with the Clean Water Act. Again WRAs are not exempt from the act.

6. **Renewal of the Restrictive Easement** - Why is the Navy seeking an easement from the State through 2030? What is the basis, legally and factually, for this length of time? Would the easement be restricted to specific types of tests?

7. **Why separate these documents** - Why did the Navy segment the PN for the State easement and the Notice of Intent ("NOI") for the federal component of the program (e.g., use of federal refuge areas)? We understand that the draft and final EIS will be a joint state-federal document covering all potential sites; is this correct?

8. **Sugar Cane** - The references in the PN to sugar cane must be updated in the EIS as the industry is almost completely gone on Kauai. The Draft EIS must analyze how the demise of this industry affects the proposal (including lowering the levels of background air and soil contamination).

9. **Permits and approvals** - The draft EIS should contain a complete list of permits and approvals necessary for the proposal.

10. **Federal ESA/MMPA** - Has the Navy initiated Section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding likely impacts on protected species? If so, what is the status of this consultation for each species?

11. **State ESA** - How does the Navy intend to comply with the State Endangered Species Act, which currently prohibits "takes" of listed species?

13. **Missile reliability** - What is the actual reliability of the rockets and booster combinations that are potential targets under the Navy's proposal? All information regarding prior testing and any problems (e.g. explosions or aborted launches) must be disclosed. Will any STARS boosters be used for this program?

14. **NEPA /HEPA** - We request that public hearings be held on the DEIS and that you include our names separately on the mailing list for any future notices regarding this project.

Sincerely,


Denise Antolini
University of Hawaii at Manoa
William S. Richardson School of Law
2515 Dole St.
Honolulu, HI 96822


Melissa Vincenty
1721 A Mott Smith Dr.
Honolulu, HI 96822



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0275
12 March 1998

Ms. Denise Antolini
William S Richardson School of law
University of Hawaii at Manoa
2515 Dole St
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear Ms. Antolini:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Possible launch sites- The PN is not specific about which sites would be locate in National Wildlife Refuge areas or sanctuaries and whether or not more sites could be added at a later date. It is important to identify each of these areas specifically as each potential sites contains various protected plants, birds, seals and turtles listed in the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts as well as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. This specific information is especially pertinent to Tern Island.

Response 1: Chapter 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS identifies the specific sites under consideration and evaluated in this EIS.

Comment 2: Refuge Compatibility - A critical issue that must be addressed in the draft EIS is how the Navy's proposal may be consistent or inconsistent with the purposes of the State and Federal Wildlife Refuges that are potential sites. The compatibility issues must be addressed separately (i.e. specific to each unique refuge), as well as cumulatively (i.e. total effect).

Response 2: The Land Use sections of the enclosed Draft EIS discuss compatibility in regards to State and Federal wildlife protected areas. Impacts to biological species are addressed under the Biological Resources sections. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities take place in a National Wildlife Refuge, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained within this EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required within a National Wildlife Refuge.

Comment 3: Refuge Studies - What studies does the Navy intend to conduct regarding potential impacts on refuge wildlife? Who is doing these studies and when will they be completed?

Response 3: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4. A list of the personnel responsible for the preparation of the EIS is provided in Section 5 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 4: Clean Air Act Compliance - The EIS should include any data concerning Halon 2402 and Freon and other emissions from any missile and must be in compliance with the statutory provisions, regulations and any guidelines of the Clean Air Act. Wildlife Refuge Areas are not exempt from

S.W.0059

- the Act.
- Response 4: Halon and Freon are not exhaust components of newly proposed missiles. As such, no portion of the Proposed Action would result in an increase of Halon or Freon. Current emissions due to the STARS program are addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Strategic Target System.
- Comment 5: Clean Water Act - The EIS should indicate how monitoring and subsequent testing of the water will take place near launch sites in compliance with the Clean Water Act. Again, WRA's are not exempt from the act.
- Response 5: The Water Resources section in Section 4 for each area describes potential impacts to water quality for both the No-action alternative (continuation of existing activities) and the Proposed Action. There is no water deluge system planned as part of the Proposed Action; therefore, the only possible surface water contamination would be from the deposition of materials. Studies of deposition from a Strategic Target System launch revealed there was no measurable increment in surface contamination from that launch. The vehicles proposed to be launched as part of the Proposed Action would be much smaller than the STARS; therefore, no contamination is anticipated.
- Comment 6: Renewal of the Restrictive Easement - Why is the Navy seeking an easement from the State through 2030? What is the basis, legally and factually, for this length of time? Would the easement be restricted to specific types of tests?
- Response 6: The Navy is seeking a restrictive easement to cover foreseeable future missile launch activities at PMRF. Extensions to 2030 would be consistent with the leases of State lands on Kauai. The restrictive easement would be used for those types of missiles addressed in Section 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS and required for TBMD and TMD testing.
- Comment 7: Why separate these documents - Why did the Navy segment the PN for the State easement and the Notice of Intent ("NOI") for the federal component of the program (e.g., use of the federal refuge areas)? We understand that the draft and final EIS will be a joint state-federal document covering all potential sites; is this correct?
- Response 7: The separate documents, the Notice of Intent published in the Federal Register for the PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS, and the EIS Preparation Notice for the State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of PMRF published in the Office of Environmental Quality Control's bulletin, The Environmental Notice, were necessary to comply with both Federal and State of Hawaii regulations. The Preparation Notice focused on activities involving State decisions while the NOI related to all aspects of the proposal to enhance PMRF's capability to conduct TBMD testing. However, the enclosed draft document is a joint State of Hawaii and United States Navy EIS that provides a comprehensive environmental analysis to support State and Federal decisions concerning the use of State, Federal and private lands to support range enhancements at the Pacific Missile Range Facility.
- Comment 8: Sugar Cane - The references in the PN to sugar cane must be updated in the EIS as the industry is almost completely gone on Kauai. The Draft EIS must analyze how the demise of this industry affects the proposal (including lowering the levels of background air and soil contamination).
- Response 8: The Socioeconomic section of the Draft EIS (Section 4.1.1.10) addresses the changing agricultural sector of the Kauai economy.
- Comment 9: Permits and approvals - The draft EIS should contain a complete list of permits and approvals necessary for the proposal.
- Response 9: The Draft EIS provides a complete list of all applicable State and Federal permits, licenses, and other entitlements which must be obtained in implementing the proposal. If it is uncertain whether a permit, license or other entitlement is necessary, the Draft EIS so indicates.

- Comment 10: Federal ESA/MMMPA - Has the Navy initiated Section 7 consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service or the National marine Fisheries Service regarding likely impacts on protected species? If so, what is the status of this consultation for each species?
- Response 10: Extensive informal consultation began in late 1996. NMFS staff have been consulted with on many aspects of our preparation of the Draft EIS. Formal consultation will begin with the publication of the Draft EIS.
- Comment 11: State ESA - How does the Navy intend to comply with the State Endangered Species Act, which currently prohibits "takes" of listed species?
- Response 11: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 12: Missile reliability - What is the actual reliability of the rockets and booster combinations that are potential targets under the Navy's proposal? All information regarding prior testing and any problems (e.g. explosions or aborted launches) must be disclosed. Will any STARS boosters be used for this program?
- Response 12: The missile systems proposed for use are current systems used by the Department of Defense. PMRF will establish safety areas from which the public will be excluded and where all debris from a flight termination would fall. The Strategic Target System would continue to be used under both the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action.


Specific risk analysis have not been conducted for each vehicle proposed to be launched as part of the Proposed Action. However, since Kauai Test Facility (KTF) first started operations in 1962, approximately 360 rocket systems have been launched from the KTF. During this period, there have been no ground or airborne failures that have caused injury, loss of life, damage or destruction of any facilities or the environment. Early in KTF history(1964), assembly procedural errors resulted in the premature ignition of the second stage on the launch pad coincident with booster ignition, resulting in a ground fire that spread to the brush adjacent to the facility. As a result, system-specific Safe Operating Procedures (SOPs) were modified, and their use in conjunction with safety checklists has prevented a recurrence. In 1974, in an effort to increase performance of the Strypi Rocket System, a system using a Castor II rocket motor was designed as the first stage versus the original Castor I. Two flight tests were conducted at KTF, with the first one ejecting a nozzle liner at ignition. The system landed within the ground hazard area and caused no injury or damage. The other system experienced burn-through in the casing and landed in the broad ocean area within the cleared hazard area. This system was not developed further and has not flown since.

The Navy expects to continue this excellent safety record in implementing the No-Action or Proposed Action Alternative.

- Comment 13: NEPA/HEPA - We request that public hearings be held on the DEIS and that you include our names separately on the mailing list for any future notices regarding this project.
- Response 13: Public and agency comments on the Draft EIS will be sought at public hearings which will include a public address system.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

TO BE INCLUDED IN THE EIS FOR PMRF EXPANSION

The following should be studied and included in the EIS

- 1) The impact on birds that are protected in the NW Islands. This area was set aside for protection of birds. Expansion to that area may seriously impact their nesting, flying and roosting patterns. Detailed study must be given to these impacts.
- 2) Hawaiian fishing rights. These areas have been set aside as free fishing and gathering areas for all Hawaiians. How can they fish if these areas are closed for launches?
- 3) Impact of increase use of electronic warfare. What impact would this increase in electronic use have on animals, birds and, most importantly, PEOPLE?
- 4) All species of land and sea animals, insects and birds must be studied to be sure there is NO adverse impact. Every piece of land used and every rock and atoll must be studied in detail to find out if anything is adversely affected.
- 5) Any area to be used must have a detailed history of the land and land titles to be sure there is no encroachment on Hawaiian lands or lands with doubtful titles.
- 6) An assessment of present land use and the impacts of removing that land from present use.
- 7) In the last expansion there were promises of jobs for people. How many jobs were promised and how many were given?
- 8) In the last expansion there were promises of increased tourism from people who would come to see launches. Were launches witnessed by tourists and what increases in tourism were there as a result?
- 9) In a world with limited resources is this the most needed, cost effective and efficient way to increase national safety?

In the up-coming EIS each of these questions must be answered in detail and in public so the public can give informed consent. Just saying "no significant impact" or "no known damage" is not enough. There must be detailed studies and they must be made public. Thank you.



Robert & Margery Freeman
6148 Kaahala St.
Kapaa, HI 96746



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0216
 11 March 1998

Mr. And Mrs. Robert and Margery Freeman
 6448 Kaahele St
 Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Mr. And Mrs. Freeman:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: (To be included in the EIS)
 The impact on birds that are protected in the NW islands. This area was set aside for protect of birds. Expansion to that area may seriously impact their nesting, flying and roosting patterns. Detailed study must be given to these impacts.
- Response 1: Potential impacts to wildlife on Tern Island are discussed in Section 4.3.1.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 2: (To be included in the EIS)
 Hawaiian fishing rights. These areas have been set aside as free fishing and gathering areas for all Hawaiians. How can they fish if these areas are closed for launches?
- Response 2: The potential impacts to fishing by Native Hawaiians are addressed in Section 4.5, Environmental Justice, of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 3: (To be included in the EIS)
 Impact of increase use of electromagnetic warfare. What impact would this increase in electronic use have on animals, birds, and...
- Response 3: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 4: (To be included in the EIS)
 What impact would this increase in electronic use have on, most importantly, PEOPLE?
- Response 4: The potential effects of electromagnetic radiation are described in the Health and Safety sections for each location in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.
- Comment 5: (To be included in the EIS)
 All species of land and sea animals, insects, and birds must be studied to be sure there is no adverse impact. Every piece of land used and every rock and atoll must be studied in detail to find out if anything is adversely affected.
- Response 5: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

S-W-0060

- Comment 6: (To be included in the EIS)
 Any area to be used must have a detailed history of the land and land titles to be sure there is no encroachment on Hawaiian lands or lands with doubtful titles.
- Response 6: Appendix E of the enclosed Draft EIS provides information about ownership and lease agreements involving PMRF and Department of Energy activities in the Hawaiian Islands. The Land Use sections for each location address the use of ceded lands where applicable.
- Comment 7: (To be included in the EIS)
 An assessment of present land use and the impacts of removing that land from present use.
- Response 7: The Land Use sections in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS provide an assessment of impacts of removing land from its present use in each proposed location.
- Comment 8: (To be included in the EIS)
 In the last expansion there were promises of jobs for people. How many jobs were promised and how many were given?
- Response 8: No promises of jobs have been made. The Socioeconomic sections for PMRF, Sections 3.1.1.10 and 4.1.1.10, describe the economic factors of PMRF on Kauai, including employment.
- Comment 9: (To be included in the EIS)
 In the last expansion, there were promises of increased tourism from people who would come to see launches. Were launches witnessed by tourists and what increases in tourism were there as a result?
- Response 9: No data was collected by the Navy on the number of tourists witnessing missile launches.
- Comment 10: (To be included in the EIS)
 In a world with limited resources is this the most needed, cost effective and efficient way to increase national safety?
- Response 10: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0060

S-W-062

June 21, 1997

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. BX 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, HI 96752-0128

RE: EIS Enhancement capability of Pacific Missile Range, etc.

Dear Ms. Mossman,


I was off island when the hearing took place. I am writing to go on record as being concerned^{at best} expanding the missile defense testing and training activities at Barking Sands (PMRF).

I have a deep love for my island home and am saddened to read of the proposed military testing and related war-like activities on the Garden Island and Niihau the last Hawaiian refuge.

The islands are a fragile and important resource for a quality of life for ourselves and our children to follow. So much depends on how we wisely use this land today for the tomorrows to come. To set up Kauai as a missile center on land that in truth belongs to the Hawaiian Nation is incomprehensible. The Navy is exploiting the desperate economic reality of Kauai in this most devious way.

I urge you to reconsider your proposal to expand your operations and work for a more peaceful relationship between the world's peoples.

Sincerely,



Marilyn Pollock
P.O. Box 312
Hanalei, 96714 HI



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0217
11 March 1998

Ms Marilyn Pollock
PO Box 312
Hanalei, HI 96714

Dear Ms Pollock:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I have a deep love for my island home and am saddened to read of the proposed military testing and related war-like activities on the Garden Island and Niihau the last Hawaiian refuge. The islands are a fragile and important resource for a quality of life for ourselves and our children to follow. So much depends on how wisely we use this land today for the tomorrows to come. To set up Kauai as a missile center on land that in truth belongs to economic reality of Kauai in this most devious way.

Response 1: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,



J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-063

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090
Ser 00/0272
12 March 1998

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

Mr Greg Holzman
PO Box 764
Kekaha, HI 96752

Dear Mr Holzman:

I am concerned about limited access into the waters around Niihau. This is a problem that ~~would~~ will not go away with any missile launches on Niihau. This is my fishing grounds and as a bottom fisherman I anchor around the island and can not afford to move my boat for your launches since it is impossible to get back on my spot with accuracy. Also Keith mentioned future expansion of your projects which would conflict even more in the future. Shooting toward Kaula also endangers fishermen in that area and we will not tolerate anymore limited access into this AEA.

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I am concerned about limited access into the waters around Niihau. This is a problem that will not go away with any missile launches on Niihau. This is my fishing grounds and as a bottom fisherman I anchor around the island and cannot afford to move my boat for your launches since it is impossible to get back on my spot with accuracy. Also Keith mentioned future expansion of your projects which would conflict even more in the future. Shooting toward Kaula also endangers fishermen in that area and we will not tolerate anymore limited access into this area. Unless you pay us not to go fishing for a living once those missiles leave Niihau there everyones problem not just Niihau's.

Response 1: Prior to conducting operations, affected areas would be determined clear of non-participants. On Niihau, the maximum number of launches per year would not exceed eight. This leads to approximately 32 hours per year that fishermen might be affected..

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Unless you pay us not to go fishing for a living once those missiles leave Niihau there everyones problem not just Niihau's

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Greg Holzman
Street Address	PO Box 764
City	KEKAHA
State/ZIP	HAWAII 96752

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0063

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

S-W-064

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Carol Bann
PO Box 2320
Lihou, HI 96766

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

I Request an
1. "Open mic" forum held at Kawai War Memorial Convention Hall. Video tape, caption and place on local Gov. access TV, Hoike to run before final EIS. ~~open mic~~

2. Please list current (and potential if any known) government contractors, such as Sandia Labs, their key contact person and addresses. List contract amounts and brief description of services performed.

Thank you.

3. Send me "Preparation Notice For State of Hawaii Actions - Initial to Enhancing Capabilities of the PMRF". Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	Carol Bann
Street Address	PO Box 2320
City	Lihou HI
State/ZIP	96766

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

Independence Day is coming up

June 23, 1997
TO: The Forum

How many of us have seen the movie that was so hot last summer, "Independence Day"? With July 4 coming up soon I could not help but think of the allegory and hidden meanings of this science fiction (and recall my days of writing movie reviews for the Garden Island years ago).

When the handsome U.S. President asks the alien, "Why can't we co-exist together? What is it you want?" the alien states their mission is to travel from place to place taking all the natural resources and then move on. They owe no allegiance to anyone except their own greed, and only seek to expand their power aggressively by mass destruction of human population bases.

These aliens certainly were not interested in a diversified cultural exchange, were they? They did not come to share their music, or medical skills, or other technological benefits like how to recycle resources, create satisfying jobs, and solve other social problems of overpopulation.

They had nothing to offer, only wished to take. They wanted to make use the land and resources, and then move on.

All the people in the world united to drive the bad aliens away, in the movie. At first they hesitated and tried to reason with them. But, that did not work, so they shared information, communicated and then, most important, they acted. They knocked on the President's door at the White House, shared ideas, spoke out. With what little resources they had left, they worked together toward action. Sounds like a reasonable plan for a movie, or for anyone.

Perhaps, that is what our government needs. Dialogue and information resource sharing, and speaking out of ideas is what democracy is all about. All viewpoints should be voiced to allow consensus, or at least discourse, before decision making and action.

That is what was so bad about the recent PMRF military scoping meetings where no one could be "heard". When I went to the scope presentation, I was told that there was a possibility that even at the formal public hearing there may be no public speaking or "open mic" dialogue allowed.

What if we declared independence on Independence Day? Before July 7, write to PMRF, Vida Mossman, PO Box 128, Kekaha, HI 96752-0128 and insist the future public hearing for the PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS have open microphones and true public dialogue.

Let us have true dialogue on how to best "manage" of our land and marine resources. Malama 'aina.

Better yet, even if PMRF deigns to allow public discourse, let's have our own community dialogue on this and other issues about our future on Kauai. I challenge residents, organizations and government to take leadership and participate in an open forum opportunity where all can be heard, not the select few.

In the movie, Independence Day, there wasn't enough time for a public discourse, as we were under direct attack. But here, we have a little time left.

Within the next five months, let's publish our own description of "enhancement capability" for the entire County, not just military enhancement. We will call it the General Plan 1997 update. Hold this community-

8:38 AM June 23, 1997

Page 2

wide, accessible, open microphone forum so residents will be heard.

Show some independence by attending and participating when these public General Plan forums are held by the County of Kauai later this year. According to the Mayor's office, the public hearing could occur by late summer.

Let's not give up to what appears to be overpowering forces against us. Even a few people of action can change the world, or at least what happens on our small chunk of it. This is not science fiction fantasy, this is our real future at stake. Thank you for your consideration, and for allowing me this opportunity of allegory.

Mahalo pume hana,

Carol Bain 

Cc: news media, PMRF, County



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0222
11 March 1998

Ms Carol Bain
PO Box 2320
Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Ms Bain:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: I request an "open mic" forum held at Kauai War Memorial Convention Hall. Video tape, caption and place local gov. access TV, Hoiike to run before final EIS.
- Response 1: Public and agency comments on the Draft EIS will be sought at public hearings, which will include a public address system.
- Comment 2: Please list current (and potential if any known) government contractors, such as Sandia Labs, their key contact person and addresses. List contract amounts and brief description of services performed. Thank you.
- Response 2: A list of preparers of the Draft EIS, including contractors, is provided in Section 5 of the Draft EIS.
- Comment 3: Send me "Preparation Notice for State of Hawaiian Actions Related to Enhancing Capabilities of the PMRF."
- Response 3: A copy of the Preparation Notice was mailed on 30 June 1997.
- Comment 4: Dialogue and information resource sharing, and speaking out of ideas is what democracy is all about. All viewpoints should be voiced to allow consensus, or at least discourse, before decision making and action. This is what was so bad about the recent PMRF military scoping meetings where no one could be "heard." When I went to the scope presentation, I was told that there was a possibility that even at the formal public hearing there may be no public speaking or "open mic" dialogue allowed.
- Response 4: While not an open forum with the opportunity for public speaking, at each scoping meeting the public was encouraged to view the exhibit area which was staffed by technical personnel. The layout of the exhibit area was designed to facilitate an open and relaxed atmosphere for communication between the public and the technical representatives. Attendees were invited to make oral statements, which were recorded by a tape recorder at each meeting. Pre-formatted comment sheets were also available so attendees could either turn in a written comment during the meeting or mail the comment to the address printed on the form. Letters written in advance were also accepted.

A total of 47 comments (42 written and 5 oral) were received during the scoping meetings held at Waimea, Kilauea, Lihue, and Honolulu. The information meeting format at Niihau respected traditions of group communication.

S-W-0064

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J. A. BOWLIN
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

Scoping should include the potential health hazards to Kawai residents from existing and proposed electrical frequencies, low level and others, microwave, etc. that are emitted from land and sea operations.

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Ken Carlson</i>
Street Address	<i>P.O. Box 698</i>
City	<i>Kilauea HI 96754</i>
State/ZIP	

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

I filled out form at meeting



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0218
11 March 1998

June 19, 1997

Mr Ken Carlson
PO Box 698
Kilauea, HI 96754

PMRF Commander
via: Public Affairs Office
P.O. 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Dear Mr Carlson:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Scoping should include the potential health hazards to Kauai residents from existing and proposed electrical frequencies, low level and others, microwave, etc. that are emitted from land and sea operations.

Response 1: The potential effects of electromagnetic radiation are described in the Health and Safety sections for each location in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

This letter is being sent in response to requests to identify concerns that need to be addressed in the EIS for the TMD at PMRF.

The EIS should address the construction of fences and the impact of such fences upon existing wildlife and human activities. Where will the fences be constructed? What will they be like? How tall? What material? What area will they enclose? How will the fences affect wildlife in the area? Will the fences inhibit current hiking trails, scenic views, tourist areas, pig hunting trails, roads, fishing, snorkeling, surfing, or other activities currently in the areas that will be enclosed? How will access to the areas fenced in be made? Will there be manned stations? Where will the gates be? Will passes be necessary and how will they be obtained if they are? The impact of fencing in of current areas used by the public needs to be addressed in the EIS.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

It is of great concern when areas are cut off from public use. Fences will transform areas in many ways. There is no doubt fences will be part of the "enhanced capability" proposed for PMRF. How will they affect us, the residents?

E. Woodyard, Ph.D.
E. Woodyard, Ph.D.
P.O. 1986
Kapaa, HI 96746

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAMA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0219
11 March 1998

Dr E Woodyard
PO Box 1986
Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Dr Woodyard:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: The EIS should address the construction of fences and the impact of such fences upon the existing wildlife and human activities. Where will the fences be constructed? What will they be like? How tall? What material? What area will they enclose? How will access to the areas fenced in be made? Will there be manned stations? Where will the gates be? Will passes be necessary and how will they be obtained if they are?

Response 1: No new fences will inhibit any recreational activities or scenic views. Potential impacts to public access and recreation in each area are described in the Land Use section for each location in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

Comment 2: How will fences affect wildlife in the area?

Response 2: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 3: Will the fences inhibit current hiking trails, scenic views, tourist areas, pig hunting trails, roads, fishing, snorkeling, surfing, or other activities currently in the areas that will be enclosed?

Response 3: No new fences will inhibit any recreational activities or scenic views. Potential impacts to public access and recreation in each area are described in the Land Use section for each location in Section 4, of the Draft EIS.

Comment 4: (Will the fences inhibit) scenic views...

Response 4: Visibility issues are described in the Visual and Aesthetic Resources sections of Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Proposed Mitigations, of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 5: The impact of fencing in areas used by the public needs to be addressed in the EIS. It is of great concern when areas are cut off from public use. Fences will transform areas in many ways. There is no doubt fences will be part of the "enhanced capability" proposed for PMRF. How will they affect us, the residents?

Response 5: No new fences will inhibit any recreational activities or scenic views. Potential impacts to public access and recreation in each area are described in the Land Use section for each location in Section 4, of the Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Comment Sheet

Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)

Enhanced Capability

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Date July 5, 1997

The issues that should be studied in the environmental impact statement are:
The absolute Title of Ownership of the lands in question, The Island of Nihoa, part of the unconquered Sovereign estate of Ruling Chief Kaunualii, inherited from his ancestors Nihoa, Nihoa and Kauai

The historical back ground

Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii

by Samuel M. Kamakau

copy right 1961 by The Kanehameha School
Honolulu, 17 Hawaii

Kamakau page 196 line 21 to 24

Ruling Chief Kaunualii (passing of his estate) Grantor

"This is my gift at our meeting, the lands of Kauai, it's chiefs, it's men great and small, from mountain to sea, all above and below and myself to be yours."

King Kanehameha I Grantee

Kamakau page 196 line 24 to 26

King Kanehameha I Grantor

Kanehameha said, I shall not accept your land not the least portion of your domain, return and rule over it.

Ruling Chief Kaunualii Grantee

The rule of Liholiho King Kanehameha II

Kamakau page 252 line 34 to 42, page 253 line 1

Island of Kauai 24 July 1821 A. D., a council was held at the King's house at Papeaena at which Liholiho declared that "In accordance with the words

of Kanehameha I of Lanala Oahu, Kaunualii shall be the Ruling Chief of Kauai and occupy the place inherited from his ancestors, only the name King to belong to Liholiho, flesh and bones to be Kaunualii, Kanehameha I left no command in regards to the lands merely that I should be ruler and so the council ended.

Ruling Chief Kaunualii held his lands inherited from his ancestors also from Liholiho King Kanehameha II.

Ruling Chief Kaunualii

Grantor

Kauikeaouli King Kanehameha III

Kamakau page 255 line 38 to 40, page 256 line 1 to 3

Liholiho King Kanehameha II

I am about to sail to a foreign land and I place my younger brother Kauikeaouli to be your Chief (during my absence) I go, and if I return, I return, if not then you are to have my younger brother as your King and to Kauikeaouli he said, "Live in peace with the Chiefs, those lands which belong to me are yours, the lands given to the Chiefs shall be theirs."

Liholiho King Kanehameha II, died 13 July 1824 A. D. in England.

Kamakau page 256 line 10 to 13

It is a fact that during Liholiho's time all the larger tracts of lands were held by the Chiefs, and he received only what the Chiefs were willing to give him, and the government had received nothing, this was true.

Kamakau page 256 line 15 to 17

In 1831 tax collectors were assigned, one to each Island, but the right of collecting taxes did not belong to the King (it was the Chiefs' right)

Ruling Chief Kaunualii held his lands inherited from his ancestors, King Kanehameha I and King Kanehameha II Liholiho did not give any land rights belonging to the Chiefs to Kauikeaouli King Kanehameha III

page 3

Kanakau page 256 line 26 to 30

Ruling Chief Kamehameha became the husband of Kaahumanu before she had become interested in the Christian religion and lived with her at Pakaha, Honolulu 1822 A. D. to the time of his death in 1825 A. D. (he died intestate).

Kanakau page 266 line 2 to 4

Kauai and Niihau these Islands had not at that time become a part of Kamehameha's territory

Kanakau page 256 line 35 to 37

Who is to be your successor. ? he answered, our son "how about the lands? let the lands be as they are.

Kanakau page 268 line 40, page 269 line 1

The last will of Kamehameha, who had the real title to the lands, was not respected.

Ruling Chief Kamehameha, dies 1825 A. D. intestate and true the instrument of marriage of Chief Kamehameha and Kaahumanu, an estate of entirety the wife is entitled to the whole estate as her private estate. There can be no partition of lands held by the entirety nor are the children entitled to any interest in the real estate on the death of one of the parents.

Kaahumanu wife of Ruling Chief Kamehameha becomes the Grantor of his estate.

Kaahumanu		Grantor
	By Deed & Royal Patent	
Nawahana	(sister)	Grantee
Nawahana		Grantor
Lae		Grantee
Lae		Grantor
Kala		Grantee
Kala		Grantor

page 4

Pila	Grantee
Pila	Grantor
Manini	Grantee

Mrs K. Manini dies intestate

Mr Joseph Purilei Manini Sr Claimant of estate as Grantee relative heir and administrator of family estate.

You have being notified, by Deed & Royal Patent of these lands on it's international Sovereign Jurisdiction in Law. Whereby, the arrogance of the citizens of the United States and other foreign entities that are now operating illegally in concert with the United States and it's constituent agencies against the unconquered Sovereign estate of Chief Kamehameha and it's citizens as owners of these lands must cease.

Now Therefore, let this notice be a warning that any and all land transaction, sales, purchases, foreclosures, development and damages in conspiracy and fraud in any way to the Kamehameha estate are hereby declared illegal, by the Manini estate which claims ownership by Deed and Royal Patent this 5 day of July 1997 A. D.

Mrs. Uida Hossman
P. M. R. 9 Public Affairs Office
P. O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Sam Lee
cc: Mayor Puanani Gonsky

commenter name:
Joseph Purilei Manini Sr
P.O. Box 201
Nahawili, Kauai 96769



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0220
 11 March 1998

Mr Joseph P Manini
 PO Box 201
 Makaweli, HI 96769

Dear Mr Manini:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.


Comment 1: The issues that should be studied in the environmental impact statement are: The absolute Title of Ownership of the Lands in question, The Island of Niihau, Part of the unconquered Sovereign estate of Ruling Chief Kaunuuaii, inherited from his ancestors Nihoa, Niihau, and Kauai.

Now, Therefore, let this notice be a warning that any and all land transaction, sales, purchases, foreclosures, development and damages in conspiracy and fraud in any way to the Kaunuuaii estate are hereby declared illegal, by the Manini estate which claims ownership by Deed and Royal Patent this 5 day of July 1997 A.D.

Response 1: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



HAWAII MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
 1360 SOUTH BERETANIA STREET, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96814
 TELEPHONE (808) 536-7702 • FAX (808) 528-2376

S-W-070

JUN 24 12 53 PM '97

June 23, 1997

Department of Land and Natural Resources
 1151 Punchbowl Street
 Honolulu, HI 96813
 Attention: Gary Martin
 Fax: 587-0455

RE: PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE ENHANCED CAPABILITY

Dear Mr. Martin:

The Hawaii Medical Association would like to raise several concerns regarding the safety and health aspect of the proposed expansion of anti-ballistic missile testing on the islands of Kauai and Niihau. Unfortunately, we are not privy to the extent and mission of the project, so our comments are of a general rather than specific nature.

1. GENERAL SAFETY CONCERNS

- a. Is there any potential harm to populations residing in the areas adjacent to the test areas from off course missiles, falling debris, explosions or other direct damage?
- b. Is there any potential harm for ships at sea or commercial air travel as a result of misdirected missile firings, either incoming or outgoing?
- c. Are there any anticipated human health effects of chemicals used in missile propulsion, either during normal operations or as a result of accidents?

2. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

- a. Are there any environmental pollutants that are of concern to local flora and fauna?
- b. Are there any endangered species, either aquatic or terrestrial, that may be adversely affected by the project, both immediately and cumulatively?
- c. Will significant amounts of wilderness area be degraded in the developmental and operational stages of the project?
- d. Will there be mitigative and remedial measures undertaken by the Navy for damages to the environment, both during and after the project?
- e. Will groundwater be protected from contamination by fuels, solvents, and other pollutants from operations and accidents?

Department of Land of Natural Resources
 Attention: Gary Martin
 June 23, 1997
 page 2

3. ECONOMIC CONCERNS


- a. What will the effect of this project be on tourism on Kauai?
- b. Will fishing, agricultural and hunting practices be adversely affected by this project?
- c. What will the net effect of military jobs gained, and other livelihoods potentially lost, because of this project?
- d. Who will shoulder the costs of accidents, cleanups, and other adverse outcomes, should they occur?

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this important matter.

Sincerely,



Steven M. Moser, M.D., Chair
 Environmental Health Committee



John S. Spangler, M.D.
 President

/nk

cc: Approving Agency - Benjamin Cayetano, Governor, State of Hawaii
 Consultant - Vida Mossman, U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0227
 11 March 1998

Mr Steven Moser
 Hawaii Medical Association
 1360 South Beretania Street
 Honolulu, HI 96814

Dear Mr Moser:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: 1. General Safety Concerns

- a. Is there any potential harm to populations residing in the areas adjacent to the test areas from off course missiles, falling debris, explosions, or other direct damage?
- c. Are there any anticipated human health effects of chemicals used in missile propulsion, either during normal operations or as a result of accidents?

Response 1: The Draft EIS addresses public safety and health protection for each location evaluated. Sections 4.1.1.7 and 4.2.1.7 describe potential impacts to human health and safety. Sections 4.1.1.3 and 4.2.1.3 describe potential impacts to biological resources.

Comment 2: 2. Environmental Concerns

- a. Are there any environmental pollutants that are of concern to local flora and fauna?
- b. Are there any endangered species, either aquatic or terrestrial, that may be adversely affected by the project, both immediately and cumulatively?
- c. Will significant amounts of wilderness area be degraded in the developmental and operational stages of the project?
- d. Will there be mitigative and remedial measures undertaken by the Navy for damages to the environment, both during and after the project?

Response 2: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 3: 3. Economic Concerns

- a. What will the effect of this project be on tourism in Kauai?
- b. Will fishing, agricultural and hunting practices be adversely affected by this project?
- c. What will the net effect of military jobs gained, and other livelihoods potentially lost, because of this project?
- d. Who will shoulder the costs of accidents, clean ups, and other adverse outcomes, should they occur?

Response 3: The enclosed Draft EIS provides information on the economic impacts of the No-Action alternative and of the Proposed Action alternatives. Please see the Socioeconomics sections of Chapter 4. Cleanup and other related actions are described in the Health and Safety and

Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste sections of Chapters 3 and 4. The Navy would be responsible for the cost of cleaning up of any contamination resulting from accidents.


Comment 4: e. Will groundwater be protected from contamination from fuels, solvents, and other pollutants from operations and accidents?

Response 4: The Water Resources section in Section 4 for each area describes potential impacts to water quality for both the No-Action alternative (continuation of existing activities) and the Proposed Action.

Comment 5: b. Is there any potential harm for ships at sea or commercial air travel as a result of misdirected missile firings, either incoming or outgoing?

Response 5: The Health and Safety sections in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS describe the potential impacts of mishaps, as well as the safety measures taken to clear areas where debris would fall. Specific potential impacts to air traffic are described in the Airspace sections, and impacts to ships at sea are described in the Socioeconomics sections.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



NATIVE HAWAIIAN ADVISORY COUNCIL, INC.
'Aha kāko'o kōkōhōwai no ka na'auao, no ke kula'āhōi, no ka Hawai'i
A Non-Profit 501(c)(3) Corporation
417-H Ulukou Street, Kailua, Hawai'i 96734 • (808) 261-1151, Facsimile 261-3780
Administrative Office • (808) 261-6318, Facsimile 261-2012
Mala'āi o Pa'āla'āka'i o Waiāluā Project • (808) 637-6625, Facsimile 637-6275
E-mail: nhac@pixi.com • Homepage: <http://www.pixi.com/~nhac>

June 23, 1997

Gary Martin
Department of Land and Natural Resources
1151 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

RE: COMMENTS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PREPARATION NOTICE FOR THE STATE OF HAWAII ACTIONS
RELATED TO ENHANCING THE CAPABILITIES OF THE PACIFIC
MISSILE RANGE FACILITY, KAUA'I, HAWAII

Aloha:

The Native Hawaiian Advisory Council (NHAC), a native non-profit dedicated to assisting Hawaiians in the protection and preservation of their legal rights and the perpetuation of their traditions and customs, provides its comments and concerns on the above.

1. Given Ni'ihau's total available land mass (that is, land that is suitable for urban use, industrial use, commercial use, agricultural use, tradition and custom, etc.), what percentage of land is currently occupied, used, and/or held by the military to the exclusion of others (please include non-physical occupation)? How does this percentage change if the proposed uses are approved? The EIS must address island-wide impact of non-physical occupation of specific land areas contemplated by this proposal. Impacts may not be isolated to points of actual physical occupation.
2. The proposed action sites according to Figure 2-9 are spread throughout the entire island of Ni'ihau. Regardless of mitigation efforts, these proposed uses will inevitably have a significant and detrimental impact on the entire island. This underscores the fact that the proposed uses are not isolated uses.
3. Both the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative contemplate actions that may have a harmful effect on the residents, the environment, and Native Hawaiian culture. Why are there only two options: proposed expansion versus status quo?

- Why aren't other alternatives which support environmental protection and cultural integrity being considered?
4. The report says it will identify mitigation measures. How effective will the mitigation efforts be in reducing, containing, and preventing damage? How does one "mitigate" social, cultural harm?
 5. If the Robinsons negotiated some type of deal with the military, do Native Hawaiians living on Ni'ihau have the ability to participate in the negotiation? Although the island is privately owned, the rights of Native Hawaiians to perpetuate their culture are protected under the state constitution and statutes? The state's mandate to protect the traditional and customary rights of Native Hawaiians is set forth in Article XII, section 7 of the state constitution, statutes, and common law.
 6. What is the scope of the EIS report concerning cultural resources -- does it include burial grounds, traditional and customary practices of Native Hawaiians, socio-cultural impacts on the peoples (increase in military population, impact on the lifestyle, language, etc.)?
 7. The most recent cultural study of Ni'ihau is the 1989 report listed on page 7-1. This indicates that the information is at least 8 years old. A more updated survey should be conducted in order to accurately assess the impact of the proposed action.
 8. The most recent cultural resources survey of Ni'ihau was completed in 1987. This study was restricted to the northeastern part of the island. What about the rest of the island? Until a comprehensive survey is completed, impacts on cultural resources on Ni'ihau can not be accurately determined.
 9. The most recent archaeological study of Ni'ihau was conducted in 1912. A new and comprehensive study should be completed as part of the overall EIS investigation in order to accurately determine what archaeological sites might be impacted or destroyed by the proposed expansion.
 10. What exactly are "keep out zones"? According to Figure 2-9, "keep out zones" cover a significant part of Ni'ihau. What types of activities are currently taking place in those areas? To what extent are traditional and customary practices of Native Hawaiians exercised in these keep out zones? How will these activities and others be affected? Since the "keep out zones" are primarily located on the western shore of the island, it is very likely that fishing and gathering of ocean resources in those shoreline areas will be directly impacted. Again, it is important that these activities be included as part of the EIS assessment of cultural impacts.

11. According to the Preparation Notice, safety procedures have been established to protect persons and property. Under standard operating procedures, certain areas will be off-limits during military maneuvers until the area has been declared safe for re-entry. Consequently, people will be denied the right to hunt, gather, and fish in those regions. This ability to exclude may be an unreasonable restraint on protected activities.
12. On page 3-2 of the Preparation Notice, cultural resources is defined as: "prehistoric and historic sites, structures, grave sites, districts, artifacts, or any other physical evidence of human activity considered important to a culture, subculture, or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons." This understanding of cultural resources does not consider present and living experiences as an important aspect of Native Hawaiian culture. To fully understand the extent of potential harm to Native Hawaiian culture, the continuing sociological impact on the community must be evaluated. Consideration of the impact on physical structures does not go far enough.


Furthermore, many sites of religious and cultural importance to Native Hawaiians are not defined by the presence of buildings or structures. Instead, the sites are identified through legends and stories that are handed down throughout the generations. The existence of cultural and religious sites are evidenced through chants and stories, and not necessarily by the presence of structures. Imposing western concepts of culture is inappropriate and will result in a flawed EIS report.
13. On page 3-11, the Preparation Notice states that there are "no historic buildings or structures eligible for or listed on the National Register within the region of influence." Again, this statement assumes western concepts of culture. A site's cultural and spiritual importance to Native Hawaiians is not based on whether it meets the criteria for National Register listing.
14. How will the proposed expansion impact Native Hawaiian language and the dialect spoken on Ni'ihau? A large majority of the residents of Ni'ihau speak primarily Hawaiian. Given that Ni'ihau is one of the few communities where the Hawaiian language is spoken fluently and primarily, doesn't the proposed military expansion pose a serious threat to the culture and daily lifestyle of Ni'ihau's residents? Language is a fundamental component of Hawaiian culture. The impact on language must not be ignored or trivialized.
15. It is alleged that this project will present the people of Ni'ihau with employment opportunities. What will be required of applicants? Will they be required to understand and speak English? Will they be prohibited or discouraged, either directly or indirectly, from conversing in Hawaiian while on the job? What types of jobs are expected as a result of the proposed expansion? How many? What level of

- technical qualifications will be required? Will the residents of Ni'ihau benefit from these jobs, or are these assertions really empty promises? Will the residents of Ni'ihau be found ineligible for most jobs based on lack of technical knowledge or experience. Will off-island recruitment fill these jobs?
16. What are the qualifications of the independent contractors who were hired to evaluate the impact on cultural resources? Do their experiences include personal knowledge and understanding of Native Hawaiian culture that would enable them to accurately assess the impact on the culture?
 17. Often the state and military talk about the benefits of military presence, but what about the economic, environmental, and social costs? The EIS should calculate these costs to determine the real impact of this proposed action.
 18. Has a recent survey of Makaha Ridge area been done to determine if there are any endangered plants present? See 3-25.
 19. Page 3-30 notes that the last survey done at Koke'e was in 1992. Although the two native bird species observed at Koke'e are not presently in danger, this does not mean or guarantee that the threat to these wildlife is avoided. The EIS must evaluate the impact of proposed action on the wildlife whether they are presently in danger or not.
 20. For all practical purposes, the entire shoreline of Ni'ihau provides critical habitat for the endangered Hawaiian monk seal. See page 3-36, Figure 3-10. The proposed expansion will most likely have a detrimental impact on the habitat. What will the impacts be?
 21. Ocean resources are vital for a healthy environment. These resources also play a significant role in Hawaiian culture, traditions and customs. How will these resources and the environment and people who depend upon them be impacted by the proposed expansion?
 22. Page 4-8 notes that one of the possible environmental consequences of the proposal is the "[i]ncidental take of threatened and endangered species." "Incidental take" is a term of art which sanitizes and minimizes the irreversible loss of a species. Take suggests the possibility that what has been taken may be returned. Conversely, when considering negative impacts on threatened and endangered species, any loss, whether intentional or not, represents a significant decline in the population. It is difficult to comprehend how any taking could be considered "incidental", particularly when endangered species are involved.

23. Land use -- see page 3-13. Area is classified as ag and conservation land. So why may golf courses and golf-related activities be included? Is this a wise use of precious land and natural resources?
24. Has a thorough hydrogeologic study been done on both Ni'ihau and Kaua'i to determine actual impact of increased water needs?
25. The document provides a sustainable yield for Mana Shaft, but fails to indicate the expected amount of increased water consumption. What is the current and expected uses of water. Is there enough water to meet existing and future water needs?
26. How exactly will the presence of hazardous materials/waste affect the water systems of Ni'ihau and Kaua'i? According to the Preparation Notice, water on Ni'ihau is stored in ponds. Potable water is also a scarce resource on Ni'ihau. The impact from the proposed expansion on Ni'ihau's scarce water sources, highly susceptible to contamination, must be given serious consideration.
27. Page 3-22 notes that there are high levels of chloride in the Mana Pond. What is the cause of the increased salinity levels in the pond basin? How are marine waters affected by runoff near the mouth of the agricultural drain?

NHAC appreciates the opportunity to provide its comments and concerns. We request that we be placed on your mailing list to receive all notices of actions, hearings etc. in this matter. Please call or write to confirm receipt of our comments, our inclusion on your mailing list, or if you require further information. Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,
Native Hawaiian Advisory Council



Moses K. N. Haia, III
Kaulea Kānāwai Ho'ohoa Kaiāulu

cc: Governor, State of Hawai'i
U.S. Navy



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P O BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0278
12 March 1998

Mr Moses K N Haia III
Native Hawaiian Advisory Council Inc
417-H Ulunju Street
Kailua, HI 96734

Dear Mr Haia III:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: Given Niihau's total available land mass (that is, land that is suitable for urban use, industrial use, commercial use, agricultural use, tradition, and custom, etc.), what percentage of land is currently occupied, used, and/or held by the military to the exclusion of others (please include non-physical occupation)? How does this percentage change if the proposed uses are approved? The EIS must address island-wide impact of non-physical occupation of specific land areas contemplated by this proposal. Impacts may not be isolated to points of actual physical occupation.
- Response 1: The Land Use section for Niihau (Section 4.2.1.8) of the enclosed Draft EIS addresses changes to the current use of the land. Currently, less than one percent of the land is developed for military use. Under the Proposed Action, development of the land would still be below one percent of the island.
- Comment 2: Both the Proposed Action and the No-Action Alternative contemplative actions that may have a harmful effect on residents, the environment, and Native Hawaiian culture. Why are there only two options: proposed expansion versus status quo? Why aren't other alternatives which support environmental protection and cultural integrity being considered?
- Response 2: The Proposed Action complies with direction from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TMBD and other DOD TMD systems which are under development. The No-Action Alternative, defined as a continuation of current, ongoing activities, was included in the analysis as required and to provide a benchmark, enabling the public and decision makers to compare the magnitude of environmental effects of the action alternatives.
- Comment 3: The report says it will identify mitigation measures. How effective will the mitigation efforts be in reducing, containing, and preventing damage? How does one "mitigate" social, cultural harm?
- Response 3: Potential mitigation measures, if necessary, are described in each section of Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Mitigations committed by the Navy would be specified in the Record of Decision, a public document, and would be monitored to ensure their implementation. If unanticipated impacts are discovered once the expanded operations commence with implementation of the Proposed Action, the program would coordinate with the appropriate State and/or Federal agencies to determine appropriate actions.
- Comment 4: If the Robinsons negotiated some type of deal with the military, do Native Hawaiians living on

Niihau have the ability to participate in the negotiation? Although the island is privately owned, the rights of Native Hawaiians to perpetuate their culture are protected under the state constitution and statutes? The state's mandate to protect the traditional and customary rights of Native Hawaiians is set forth in Article XII, section 7 of the state constitution, statutes, and common law.

- Response 4: The enclosed Draft EIS incorporates information from a recent analysis of material and cultural circumstances on Niihau, developed by an independent expert working with the people of the island. That report has been translated into Hawaiian by residents of Niihau to facilitate groundtruthing. An information meeting was held on Niihau to obtain discussion and feedback from islanders, and a further meeting will be held on the island during the Draft EIS comment period.
- Comment 5: What is the scope of the EIS report concerning cultural resources -- does it include burial grounds, traditional and customary practices of Native Hawaiians, socio-cultural impacts on the peoples (increase in military population, impact on the lifestyle, language, etc.)?
- Response 5: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomic, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources. Also, the cultural resources section of each proposed location describes potential impacts to cultural resources and sites.
- Comment 6: The most recent cultural study of Niihau is the 1989 report listed on page 7-1. This indicates that the information is at least 8 years old. A more updated survey should be conducted in order to accurately assess the impact of the proposed action.
- Response 6: The EIS includes a detailed study of the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on the people of Niihau. (Sections 4.2.1 and 4.5.2) Chapters 3 and 4 also include discussions of potential impacts to cultural resources at each proposed site.
- Comment 7: The most recent cultural resources survey of Niihau was completed in 1987. This study was restricted to the northeastern part of the island. What about the rest of the island? Until a comprehensive survey is completed, impacts on cultural resources on Niihau can not be accurately determined.
- The most recent archeological study of Niihau was conducted in 1912. A new and comprehensive study should be completed as part of the overall EIS investigation in order to accurately determine what archeological sites might be impacted or destroyed by the proposed expansion.
- Response 7: A cultural resources reconnaissance of various facility siting locations for PMRF's enhanced capabilities study was undertaken in January and November 1997. Potential facility siting areas inland of the coastline were inspected for cultural resources. Potential impacts to cultural resources are described in the Cultural Resources section for each candidate location and support site in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 8: What exactly are "keep out zones?" According to Figure 2-9, "keep out zones" cover a significant part of Niihau. What types of activities are currently taking place in those areas? To what extent are traditional and customary practices of Native Hawaiians exercised in these keep out zones? How will these activities and others be affected? Since the "keep out zones" are primarily located on the western shore of the island, it is very likely that fishing and gathering of ocean resources in those shoreline areas will be directly impacted. Again, it is important that these activities be included as part of the EIS assessment of cultural impacts.
- Response 8: The "keep out zones" are areas where the non-residents are restricted from entering. Figure 2.3.4-6 of the enclosed Draft EIS illustrates the potential sites associated with the proposed action and

the keep out zones. Figure 3.2.1.8-1 illustrates existing land use on Niihau, and Section 4.2.1.8 describes potential land use impacts.

- Comment 9: According to the Preparation Notice, safety procedures have been established to protect persons and property. Under standard operating procedures, certain areas will be off-limits during military maneuvers until the area has been declared safe for re-entry. Consequently, people will be denied the right to hunt, gather and fish in those regions. This ability to exclude may be a restraint on protected activities.
- Response 9: Potential impacts to protected activities is addressed in Section 4.5, Environmental Justice.
- Comment 10: On page 3-2 of the Preparation Notice, cultural resources is defined as: "prehistoric and historic sites, structures, grave sites, districts, artifacts, or any other physical evidence of human activity considered important to a culture, subculture, or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons." This understanding of cultural resources does not consider present and living experiences as an important aspect of Native Hawaiian culture. To fully understand the extent of potential harm to the Native Hawaiian culture, the continuing sociological impact on the community must be evaluated. Consideration of the impact on physical structures does not go far enough. Furthermore, many sites of religious and cultural importance to Native Hawaiians are not defined by the presence of buildings or structures. Instead, the sites are identified through legends and stories that are handed down throughout the generations. The existence of cultural and religious sites are evidenced through chants and stories, and not necessarily by the presence of structures. Imposing western concepts of culture is inappropriate and will result in a flawed EIS report.
- Response 10: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources.
- Comment 11: On page 3-11, the Preparation Notice states that there are "no historic buildings or structures eligible for or listed on the National Register within the region of influence." Again, this statement assumes western concepts of culture. A site's cultural and spiritual importance through Native Hawaiians is not based on whether it meets the criteria for National Register listing.
- Response 11: The Environmental Justice section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.5) considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on minority populations. Potential environmental justice issues were analyzed in relation to the following resources: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Health and Safety, Land Use, Noise, Socioeconomics, Visual and Aesthetic Resources, and Water Resources.
- Comment 12: How will the proposed expansion impact Native Hawaiian language and the dialect spoken on Niihau? A large majority of the residents of Niihau speak primarily Hawaiian. Given that Niihau is one of the few communities where the Hawaiian language is spoken fluently and primarily, doesn't the proposed military expansion pose a serious threat to the culture and daily lifestyle of Niihau residents? Language is a fundamental component of Hawaiian culture. The impact on language must not be ignored or trivialized.
- Response 12: Military personnel's contact with the culture of Niihau is strictly controlled by a protocol between the Robinson family and PMRF. The action would follow the protocol to the letter, minimizing contact during construction activities and during testing. The Protection Protocol would be strengthened if and where that is required.
- Comment 13: It is alleged that this project will present the people of Niihau with employment opportunities. What will be required of applicants? Will they be required to understand and speak English? Will they be prohibited or discouraged, either directly or indirectly, from conversing in Hawaiian while

on the job? What types of jobs are expected as a result of the proposed expansion? How many? What level of technical qualifications will be required? Will the residents of Niihau benefit from these jobs, or are these assertions really empty promises? Will the residents of Niihau be found ineligible for most jobs based on lack of technical knowledge or experience. Will off-island recruitment fill these jobs?

- Response 13: It is outside the scope of this EIS to address the specific skill requirements of specific tasks associated with the Proposed Action. However, consideration will be given to use Niihau Ranch personnel, when appropriate, to accomplish necessary programs. PMRF has non-discriminatory hiring practices designed to fairly consider all qualified applicants.
- Comment 14: What are the qualifications of the independent contractors who were hired to evaluate the impact on cultural resources? Do their experiences include a personal knowledge and understanding of Native Hawaiian culture that would enable them to accurately assess the impact on the culture?
- Response 14: The Navy has conducted cultural resource assessments for PMRF and Niihau through contractors. A list of personnel involved in the preparation of the EIS and their qualifications are provided in Section 5.
- Comment 15: Often the state and military talk about the benefits of military presence, but what about economic, environmental, and social costs? The EIS should calculate these costs to determine the real impact of this proposed action.
- Response 15: Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures, describes potential economic, environmental, and social impacts of the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives.
- Comment 16: Has a recent survey of Mahaka Ridge area been done to determine if there are any endangered plants present? See 3-25.
- Response 16: Existing biological resources at Mahaka Ridge are described in Section 3.1.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 17: Page 3-30 notes that the last survey done at Kokee was in 1992. Although the two native bird species observed at Kokee are not presently in danger, this does not mean or guarantee that the threat to these wildlife is avoided. The EIS must evaluate the impact of proposed action on the wildlife whether they are presently in danger or not.
- Response 17: Potential impacts to biological resources at Kokee are described in Section 4.1.4.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 18: For all practical purposes, the entire shoreline of Niihau provides critical habitat for the endangered Hawaiian monk seal. See page 3-36, Figure 3-10. The proposed expansion will most likely have a detrimental impact on the habitat. What will the impacts be?
- Response 18: Potential impacts to monk seals and their habitat on Niihau are described in Section 4.2.1.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 19: Ocean resources are vital for a healthy environment. These resources also play a significant role in Hawaiian culture, traditions, and customs. How will these resources and the environment and the people who depend upon them be impacted by the proposed expansion?
- Response 19: Potential impacts to the ocean are discussed in Section 4.4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 20: Page 4-8 notes that one of the possible environmental consequences of the proposal is the "incidental take of threatened and endangered species." "Incidental take" is a term of art which sanitizes and minimizes the irreversible loss of a species. Take suggests the possibility that what has been taken may be returned. Conversely, when considering negative impacts on threatened and endangered species, any loss, whether intentional or not, represents a significant decline in the population. It is difficult to comprehend how any taking could be considered "incidental," particularly when endangered species are involved.

Response 20: "Incidental take" refers to the harassment or injury to an individual member of a species, not to the species as a whole. Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 21: Land use -- see page 3-13. Area is classified as ag and conservation land. So why may golf courses and golf-related activity be included? Is this a wise use of precious land and natural resources.

Response 21: The use of agricultural lands as a golf course is a state of Hawaii zoning classification. Because of the high productivity rating of the Mana Plain (A and B), golf courses are not permitted.

Comment 22: Has a thorough hydrogeologic study been done on both Niihau and Kauai to determine actual impact of increased water needs?

Response 22: The potential impacts to water supply on Niihau are described in Sections 4.2.1.12 and 4.2.1.14; impacts on Kauai are described in Sections 4.1.1.12 and 4.1.1.14.

Comment 23: The document provides a sustainable yield for Mana Shaft, but fails to indicate the expected amount of increased water consumption. What is the current and expected uses of water. Is there enough water to meet existing and future water needs?

Response 23: Water from the Mana Shaft would continue to be used by park visitors. The Proposed Action would not require the use of water on the restricted easement.

Comment 24: How exactly will the presence of hazardous materials/waste affect the water systems of Niihau and Kauai? According to the Preparation Notice, water on Niihau is stored in ponds. Potable water is also a scarce resource on Niihau. The impact from the proposed expansion on Niihau's scarce water sources, highly susceptible to contamination, must be given serious consideration.

Response 24: The Water Resources section in Section 4 for each area describes potential impacts to water quality for both the No-Action alternative (continuation of existing activities) and the Proposed Action.

Comment 25: Page 3-22 notes that there are high levels of chloride in the Mana Pond. What is the cause of the increased salinity levels in the pond basin? How are marine waters affected by runoff near the mouth of the agricultural drain?

Response 25: The high salinity of water in the Mana Pond Wildlife Sanctuary may be due to infiltration of saline groundwater or excessive evaporation.

An assessment of water quality in the nearshore marine environment was conducted in 1994. Water quality along the PMRF shoreline was within State of Hawaii Department of Health standards with the exception of two locations where sugarcane irrigation water, pumped from the sugarcane fields, is discharged to the ocean. In these areas DOH water quality criteria are exceeded within 50 meters (164 feet) of the shoreline. Mixing processes are sufficient to dilute the drainage water to near background levels within 50 to 100 meters (164 to 328 feet) from the shoreline.


Comment 26: The proposed action sites according to Figure 2-9 are spread throughout the entire island of Niihau. Regardless of mitigation efforts, these proposed uses will inevitably have a significant and detrimental impact on the entire island. This underscores the fact that the proposed uses are not isolated uses.

Response 26: The EIS addresses the environmental consequences of both the current, ongoing and proposed activities on Niihau. The sites proposed on Niihau are designated for possible utilization in the proposed action. The EIS evaluates all sites which are determined to be suitable. This does not mean that all sites will be developed. Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS depicts the two sites still under consideration.

Potential impacts of the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives are described in Section 4.2.1 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-072

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

I just want workers at PMRF to know that I support all the programs and all the workers. I thank you for letting me and my family be safe everyday we wake-up in the morning. From what I have observed in the past, The United States always backs the military in time of war. How in little time they forget that it takes technology, time, testing, lots of hard work and money to make sure everyone in the United States are safe and free. I also want to thank the Robinson Family for helping everyone sleep peacefully at night.

Thank You! - This goes to Government, Military, Government civilian workers, Contract Workers

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter Name	<i>Gayla H. Burns</i>
Street Address	<i>4483 Kawaihoa Street</i>
City	<i>Kekaha, Hawaii 96752</i>
State/ZIP	



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0221
11 March 1998

Ms Gayla Burns
4483 Kawaihoa Street
Kekaha, HI 96752

Dear Ms Burns:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I just want workers at PMRF to know that I support all the programs and all the workers. I thank you for letting me and my family be safe everyday when we wake up in the morning. From what I have observed in the past, the United States always backs the military in time of war. How in little time they forget that it takes technology, time, testing, lots of hard work and money to make sure everyone in the United States are safe and free. I also want to thank the Robinson family for helping everyone sleep peacefully at night. Thank you! - This goes to Government, Military, Government civilian workers, and Contract workers.

Response 1: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0072

24 June 1997

S-W-073

from INF treaty, Dec 1987

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

-8-

As a result of some discussions at yesterday's scoping meeting on Oahu, I want to raise one detailed issue that I think needs to be clarified in the PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS. The issue concerns INF treaty restrictions on launches of targets for possible TMD tests near Kauai.

I have enclosed a copy of the text of Article VII, paragraph 12 of the INF treaty and a copy of two pages of the START treaty. The START 29th Agreed Statement states that the STARS booster is subject to the provisions of paragraph 12 of Article VII of the INF treaty. This paragraph specifies conditions under which booster systems with ranges of shorter-range (500-1000 km) and intermediate-range (1000-5500 km) can be used for research and development of test objects. Of the 4 conditions that must be satisfied, item (d) states "the launchers for such booster systems are fixed, emplaced above ground and located only at research and development launch sites which are specified in the Memorandum of Understanding." The only Pacific-area launch sites listed in the Memorandum of Understanding are Poker Flats in Alaska, Roi Namur at Kwajalein, Barking Sands on Kauai, Western Test Range in California, and Wake Island. Therefore, the INF treaty seems to prohibit launches of target boosters with ranges of 500-5500 km at the following sites: Niihau, Kure Atoll, Tern Island in French Frigate Shoals, Midway Atoll, Johnston Atoll, and any floating launch platforms. I think the EIS should state explicitly whether the U.S. Government interprets the INF treaty provisions in this way.

One important reason to clarify the INF treaty restrictions is that an earlier document seems to indicate that sites other than PMRF were being considered for launches of targets using the STARS booster. I have enclosed a copy of page 3 of a 10 Jan. 1997 document "Draft PMRF Enhanced Capability Facility Siting/In-Field Considerations" which indicates potential new STARS launch facilities at Niihau, Tern, Midway, and Kure -- all of which appear to violate the INF treaty.

Michael Jones

Michael Jones
Physics Dept.
Univ. of Hawaii
2505 Correa Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

12. Each Party shall have the right to produce and use for booster systems, which might otherwise be considered to be intermediate-range or shorter-range missiles, only existing types of booster stages for such booster systems. Launches of such booster systems shall not be considered to be flight-testing of intermediate-range or shorter-range missiles provided that:

- (a) stages used in such booster systems are different from stages used in those missiles listed as existing types of intermediate-range or shorter-range missiles in Article III of this Treaty;
- (b) such booster systems are used only for research and development purposes to test objects other than the booster systems themselves;
- (c) the aggregate number of launchers for such booster systems shall not exceed 35 for each Party at any one time; and
- (d) the launchers for such booster systems are fixed, emplaced above ground and located only at research and development launch sites which are specified in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Research and development launch sites shall not be subject to inspection pursuant to Article XI of this Treaty.

Article VIII

1. All intermediate-range missiles and launchers of such missiles shall be located in deployment areas, at missile support facilities or shall be in transit. Intermediate-range missiles or launchers of such missiles shall not be located elsewhere.
2. Stages of intermediate-range missiles shall be located in deployment areas, at missile support facilities or moving between deployment areas, between missile support facilities or between missile support facilities and deployment areas.
3. Until their removal to elimination facilities as required by paragraph 2 of Article V of this Treaty, all shorter-range missiles and launchers of such missiles shall be located at missile operating bases, at missile support facilities or shall be in transit. Shorter-range missiles or launchers of such missiles shall not be located elsewhere.
4. Transit of a missile or launcher subject to the provisions of this Treaty shall be completed within 25 days.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P O BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0228
 11 March 1998

Dr Michael Jones
 Dept of Physics and Astronomy
 University of Hawaii at Manoa
 2505 Correa Road
 Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear Dr Jones:


Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: The START 29th Agreed Statement states that the STARS booster is subject to the provisions of paragraph 12 of Article VII of the INF treaty. This paragraph specifies conditions under which booster systems with ranges of shorter-range (500-1000 km) and intermediate-range (1000-5500 km) can be used for research and development of test objects. Of the four conditions that must be satisfied, item (d) states "the launchers for such booster systems are fixed, emplaced, above ground and located only at research and development launch sites which are specified in the Memorandum of Understanding." The only Pacific-area launch sites listed in the Memorandum of Understanding are Poker Flats in Alaska, Roi Namur at Kwajalein, Barking Sands on Kauai, Western Test Range in California, and Wake Island. Therefore, the INF treaty seems to prohibit launches of target boosters with ranges of 500-5500 km at the following sites: Niihau, Kure Atoll, Tern Island in French Frigate Shoals, Midway Atoll, Johnston Atoll, and any floating launch platforms. I think the EIS should state explicitly whether the US Government interprets the INF treaty provisions in this way.

Response 1: Launch sites may be changed or substituted upon proper notification. All testing at PMRF currently complies and will continue to comply with U.S. policy concerning existing treaties and international law.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waiimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-074

Carl M. Brandauer
1760 Sunset Boulevard
Boulder, CO 80304-4243



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0229
11 March 1998

June 23, 1997

Mr. Eric Dunn
Range Program Public Affairs Officer
Pacific Missile Range Facility
PO Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Dr Carl Brandauer
1760 Sunset Blvd
Boulder, CO 80304-4243

Dear Mr. Dunn,

Dear Dr Brandauer:

I am writing you to protest the U.S. Navy's plans for expanding the Pacific Missile Range Facility to accommodate testing of the Theater Missile Defense System. The reasons for my objections are:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- The idea of installing missile launch sites on the Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), Johnston Island NWR, and Midway Atoll NWR is reprehensible at best. These refuges were established after the species they contain nearly became extinct, and the construction and operation of the launch sites there is certain to reverse the recovery process.
- The expansion of the Navy's facilities on Niihau can only lead to the destruction of the only remaining native Hawaiian enclave in Hawaii.
- Expanding the facilities at Barking Sands should not be considered until the concerns of the Hawaii Ecumenical Coalition about native burial grounds are resolved.
- Finally, and as suggested by the Navy itself, none of these facilities are necessary for testing a system designed to defend naval operations from short range, i.e. submarine launched, missiles. Therefore, using U.S. Navy submarines as mobile launch platforms would reduce the cost of testing while increasing its realism and would provide valuable training for the submarine crews.

Comment 1: The idea of installing missile launch sites on the Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), Johnston Island NWR, and Midway Atoll NWR is reprehensible at best. These refuges were established after the species they contain nearly became extinct, and the construction and operation of the launch sites there is certain to reverse the recovery process.

In summary, it is not necessary to construct and operate new missile launch sites for the effective testing of the Theater Missile Defense System, activities which would cause severe cultural and environmental harm.

Response 1: Section 4.3.1.8 describes potential land use compatibility impacts on Tern Island. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities taking place, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained within this EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required on Tern Island.

Please include this letter in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you.

Comment 2: The expansion of the Navy's facilities on Niihau can only lead to the destruction of the only remaining native Hawaiian enclave in Hawaii.

Sincerely yours,

Carl M. Brandauer, Ph.D.

Response 2: The socioeconomic sections of the enclosed Draft EIS (Sections 4.2.1.10 and 4.5.2.9) examine the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on the economy and culture of Niihau. In addition, Section 4.5, Environmental Justice, describes potential impacts to Native Hawaiians on Kauai and Niihau.

cc:

Senator Wayne Allard
Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell
Representative David Skaggs

This Draft EIS has depended significantly on independent work that was already underway on Niihau prior to beginning this EIS process. That work has been groundtruthed by the people of Niihau, including its translation into Hawaiian by persons on the island. Relying on that work, and other available information, it is concluded that the Proposed Action would provide significant economic benefits to the people of the island and Niihau infrastructure, and that an existing Niihau Protection Protocol, appropriately strengthened, will minimize contact between military personnel and Niihau residents and protect Niihau's cultural circumstances.

Comment 3: Expanding the facilities at Barking Sands should not be considered until the concerns of the Hawaii Ecumenical Coalition about native burial grounds are resolved.

Response 3: Native burial grounds as well as other cultural resources on PMRF are addressed in Sections 3.1.1.4 and 4.1.1.4.

Comment 4: Finally, and as suggested by the Navy itself, none of these facilities are necessary for testing a system designed to defend naval operations from short range, i.e. submarine launched missiles. Therefore, using US Navy submarines as mobile launch platforms would reduce the cost of

S-W-10174

testing while increasing its realism and would provide valuable training for the submarine crews.

Response 4: Thank you for your suggestion. However, using submarines as mobile launch platforms would not comply with applicable treaty requirements or provide the range of testing conditions required.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



THE LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF HAWAII

S-W-075

League of Women Voters of Hawaii
49 South Hotel Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Ms Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, Hawaii 96752-0128

To Whom it may Concern

The League of Women Voters of Kava'i County (LWV-KC) wishes to express its concern regarding plans for the use of the Northern Pacific Basin and the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) for testing a new generation of anti-missile hardware.

Our apprehensions are based on two separate matters that will be expressed in this testimony.

Our main concern at this point in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) procedure is the lack of citizen participation in the process. We feel that the "scoping meetings" held on June 17, 19, 21, and 23 on the islands of Kava'i and O'ahu not only contained insufficient information to allow the public to make intelligent, informed testimony possible, but lacked the proper notification of community members as to the precise specifics of the Navy's plan.

At the "scoping" meetings mentioned above we were distressed at the lack of opportunity for the community to properly have input into the process. Rather than have a general meeting where the community members could discuss, interact and participate in the process, the Pacific Missile Firing Range officials chose to limit participation by allowing only written comments to be submitted and constructing the "meetings" whereby people were ushered to multiple "booths" where their questions and comments were directed to a series of military officials who were not taking down their comments in writing, but seemed engaged primarily in deflecting criticism and directing people to the "comments table" where they were required to write down their concerns. After the initial unfairness of this process was noted following the first meeting, there was an opportunity provided for a tape recorded message, to be transcribed at a later date, offered to those who felt they could not cogently express themselves in writing. In addition there were no provisions made for those with disabilities, for example interpreters for hearing or visually impaired individuals.

This process is wholly unacceptable, as it disallows public interaction and deliberation. By hearing the concerns of others- thereby allowing people to organize their thoughts as a "community" rather than force them to submit individual, isolated comments derived in the vacuum created by the aforementioned process- public participation in the process could be increased to an acceptable level.

But this is not the most egregious violation of the public's right to participate in the

process that has occurred.

The lack of specifics relating to the plans for military expansion disseminated to the public has thrown the whole "scoping" process into question. The public has been asked to comment on the plans for expansion of the military testing in the north Pacific without any specifics being presented to the public in general, much less to those that have expressed their concerns in the past.

Only a series of brief, one sheet handouts were generally available at the scoping meetings and none contained specifics on such things as launch sites, number of launches, types of missiles proposed, logistical data, exact type of propellants or any other specifics... no charts, no graphs, no maps, no specifications of any type. Only when questioned regarding these matters was the publication "Preparation Notice for State of Hawai'i Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the PMRF" produced from behind a desk and distributed to a select few. Even this document does not contain specifics as to the proposed operations, but instead contains areas that the military will try to "mitigate" during the EIS process.

The public cannot possibly give intelligent, informed and specific testimony when they are not given specifics about the plans. For instance, if there is an endangered species in the vicinity of a proposed launch site, how would we know if we don't know the exact site? How can one comment on a proposal if there is no proposal on which to comment?

Although the military claims that these matters will be addressed when the draft EIS is complete, we believe that this is too late in the process to allow for fully informed public participation in every step of the EIS process.

In addition, the "preparation notice" referred to above was not distributed to interested parties in the community. A short six years ago a similar series of EIS hearings were held on Kaua'i for the SDI/Polaris launches and many community members were on a mailing list and received copies of both the draft and final EIS. When questioned, officials said that none of these people received the "preparation notice" or were even notified of the scoping process, despite the interest they had exhibited only a few short years ago. We believe that this is, at best, an oversight, at worst an overt attempt to stifle debate in the community by denying us all pertinent information.

Due to these concerns, we request that the scoping process begin again, taking these matters into account.

Secondly, the move to protect the northern chain of atolls and islands from the north shore of Kaua'i to Midway Atoll by maintaining a bird and wildlife sanctuary and preserve is jeopardized by this potential military weapon proliferation and testing program. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife service has been moving to protect this area as a refuge and we support this effort. The LWV-US believes that natural resources should be managed as interrelated parts of life-supporting ecosystems. Pollution of these resources should be controlled in order to preserve the physical, chemical and biological integrity of ecosystems and to protect public health. We believe the military's proposal to be at odds with this position.

The league supports comprehensive long range planning and believes that wise decision making requires coordination of the federal government's responsibilities and activities and the resolution of inconsistencies and conflicts in basic policy among government agencies at all levels.

Therefore we would like to see extensive consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service to produce a comprehensive plan with maximal environmental protection for the whole area before an EIS process for missile launches goes any further.

The League believes that public understanding and cooperation are essential to the responsible and responsive management of our nation's natural resources, and the northern Pacific is one of the most precious and unique ecosystems in the world. We believe the public has a right to know about the potential pollution levels, dangers to health and the environment and proposed resource management policies and options, none of which are addressed, as yet, by the military as regards their plans.

The League contends that the public has a right to participate in decision making at each phase of the process. Officials should make a special effort to develop readily understandable procedures for public involvement and to ensure that the public has adequate information to participate effectively. Not only has this not occurred in this matter, but it would seem that the military has developed a strategy to thwart public participation.


We believe that the military should publicize, in an extensive and timely manner and in readily available sources, information about pollution levels, pollution-abatement programs, and resource management, policies and options. As yet, we have seen nothing of the sort. In addition we believe that hearings should be held in easily accessible locations, at convenient times and, when possible, in the area(s) concerned. The hearing procedures and other opportunities for public comment should actively encourage citizen participation in decision-making, something that has been glaringly absent during the process used at the "scoping" meetings.

We respectfully request a new "scoping" process be executed by the military before work begins on the draft EIS, with an eye toward fully informed citizen participation in the process. Only then can the concerns of the community be fully addressed.


Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Jean Aoki, President, League of Women Voters of Hawai'i and



A. F. Parks, Chair, Natural Resources and Environmental; Protection Committee, League of Women Voters of Hawai'i.





DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0230
11 March 1998

Ms Jean Aoki
League of Women Voters of Hawaii
49 South Hotel Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Ms Aoki:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Our main concern at this point in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) procedure is the lack of citizen participation in the process. We feel that the "scoping meetings" held on June 17, 19, 21, and 23 on the islands of Kauai and Oahu not only contained insufficient information to allow the public to make intelligent, informed testimony possible, but lacked the proper notification of community members as to the precise specifics of the Navy's plan.

At the "scoping" meetings mentioned above we were distressed at the lack of opportunity for the community to properly have input into the process.

This process is wholly unacceptable, as it disallows public interaction and deliberation. By hearing the concerns of others - thereby allowing people to organize their thoughts as a "community" rather than force them to submit individual, isolated comments derived in the vacuum created by the aforementioned process - public participation in the process could be increased to an acceptable level.

Response 1: While not an open forum with the opportunity for public speaking, at each scoping meeting the public was encouraged to view the exhibit area which was staffed by technical personnel. The layout of the exhibit area was designed to facilitate an open and relaxed atmosphere for communication between the public and the technical representatives. Attendees were invited to make oral statements, which were recorded by a tape recorder at each meeting. Pre-formatted comment sheets were also available so attendees could either turn in a written comment during the meeting or mail the comment to the address printed on the form. Letters written in advance were also accepted.

A total of 47 comments (42 written and 5 oral) were received during the scoping meetings held at Waimea, Kilauea, Lihue, and Honolulu. The information meeting format at Niihau respected traditions of group communication.

Comment 2: The public has been asked to comment on the plans for expansion of the military testing in the north Pacific without any specifics being presented to the public in general, much less to those who have expressed their concerns in the past.

Response 2: Chapter 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS, and especially Section 2.3 addresses the Proposed Action in considerable detail.

Comment 3: Secondly, the move to protect the northern chain of atolls and islands from the north shore of

Kauai to Midway Atoll by maintaining a bird and wildlife sanctuary and preserve is jeopardized by this potential military weapon proliferation and testing program. The US Fish and Wildlife Service has been moving to protect this area as a refuge and we support this effort. The LWV-US believes that natural resources should be managed as interrelated parts of life-supporting ecosystems. Pollution of these resources should be controlled in order to preserve the physical, chemical and biological integrity of ecosystems and to protect public health. We believe the military's proposal to be at odds with this position.

Therefore we would like to see extensive consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to produce a comprehensive plan with maximal environmental protection for the whole area before an EIS process for missile launches goes any further.

- Response 3:** Potential impacts to wildlife on Tern Island are discussed in Section 4.3.1.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Potential utilization of Tern Island as a target launch site has been and will continue to be closely coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (USNMFS). Consultation with USFWS and USNMFS under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act will be conducted on this proposal and is being initiated with transmittal of the Draft EIS.
- Comment 4:** We believe that the military should publicize, in an extensive and timely manner and in readily available sources, information about pollution levels, pollution abatement programs, and resource management, policies and options.
- Response 4:** The Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste sections for each location in Sections 3 and 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS address pollution levels, pollution abatement programs, and resource management, policies and options. PMRF has the appropriate hazardous materials and hazardous waste procedures and plans in place.
- Comment 5:** We respectfully request a new "scoping" process be executed by the military before work begins on the draft EIS, with an eye toward fully informed citizen participation in the process. Only then can the concerns of the community be fully addressed.
- Response 5:** The program fully complied with the scoping process outlined in the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1501.7).

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-078

Richard & Iona Kirby
5027B Puuwai Road
Kalaheo, HI 96741

July 9, 1997

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
Public Affairs Office
P. O. Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, HI 96752-0128

Dear Mr. Mossman:

I recently moved to Kauai from California to retire and spend the rest of my years in peaceful harmony with nature here in paradise. However, I no sooner settled in and planted my first garden crop when I became aware of the fiasco that the Navy is brewing up at the PMRF.


I am certainly no expert in Hawaii affairs, but I have lived long enough to realize that projects like the expansion of missile testing to Niihau and on down range will jeopardize someone or something that "we the people" will eventually see was far more important than weapons testing. Whether it is extinction of species, contamination of reefs, or death to humans when one missile unexpectedly explodes, the disaster will be irreversible and shameful. Please consider this letter as a plea for intelligence and caution to prevail over greed and war economics.

The corporate money grabbing mentality that drives the war machine must be rerouted toward feeding the people and preserving the planet. Let's make sure that Kauai and Niihau are remembered as the place where the change away from military might toward compassion begins, rather than have Kauai and Niihau remembered as the place where the Navy and Mr. Robinson destroyed a culture.

I wish to be added to your mailing list for all future publications, announcements and studies concerning this issue. Specifically I am requesting a copy of the Environmental Impact Study that the Navy is scheduled to publish later this summer.

Mahalo for reading the above and putting my name on your mailing list.

Sincerely,



Richard C. Kirby

Cc: The Forum, Garden Island



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0232
11 March 1998

Mr Richard Kirby
5027B Puuwai Road
Kalaheo, HI 96741

Dear Mr Kirby:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I am certainly no expert on Hawaii affairs, but I have lived long enough to realize that projects like the expansion of missile testing to Niihau and on down range will jeopardize someone or something that "we the people" will eventually see was far more important than missile testing. Whether it is extinction of species, contamination of reefs, or death to humans when one missile unexpectedly explodes, the disaster will be irreversible and shameful. Please consider this letter as a plea for intelligence and caution to prevail over greed and war economics. The corporate money grabbing mentality that drives the war machine must be rerouted toward feeding the people and preserving the planet. Let's make sure that Kauai and Niihau are remembered as the place where the change away from military might toward compassion begins, rather than have Kauai and Niihau remembered as the place where the Navy and Mr. Robinson destroyed a culture.

Response 1: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site are in Section 4.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,



J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-078

7-196

JUL-22-97 16:18 FROM: PHRF STARS
JUL-22-1997 18:59 CINCPACFLT N465

ID: 0083354266 PAGE 6
0084745494 P.02

JUL-22-97 16:17 FROM: PHRF STARS
JUL-22-1997 18:59 CINCPACFLT N465

ID: 0083354266 PAGE 5
0084745494 P.02

1314094

MAY 22 1997

S-W-079

DIANNE FEINSTEIN
CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND ADMINISTRATION

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-0044

Beverley Chanley
Corbin Cherry
245 Manning Sun Ave.
Mill Valley, CA 94941
17 May 1997

July 7, 1997

Senator Dianne Feinstein
1700 Montgomery St., Suite 305
San Francisco, CA 94111

ADM Robert Natter
Chief, Legislative Affairs
Department of the Navy
1300 Navy Pentagon, Room 5C760
Washington, D.C. 20350

Dear Senator Feinstein,

Dear Admiral Natter:

INQUIRY FROM: Beverley Chanley (Reference #: aks-53444)

We are sending you an article that we read regarding the Navy's plan to place rocket launching pads in sensitive wildlife areas. We are very disturbed by this invasive, destructive proposal, and wanted to alert you in the hopes that you can use your influence to stop this madness before it starts. While in Hawaii we were overwhelmed at how beautiful and graceful the large green sea turtles were as we snorkled among them. We want to do what we can to stop their habitat, and that of the other island creatures, from being destroyed. Surely we are not willing to kill off hundreds of thousands of endangered creatures in order to have a place to put more rockets. The real enemy here is not "out there" beyond our borders- it is our ignorance, as we destroy our precious Mother Earth.

RE: Missile testing site in Hawaii


I am forwarding the attached constituent inquiry for your review and consideration. I believe that my constituent would benefit from your direct response to the specific issues raised in the enclosed letter.

I would appreciate it if you would return your response, in duplicate, as quickly as possible so that I can share the information with my constituent.


Please do what you can to make sure that this project is not carried out.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely,

Beverley Chanley 
Beverley Chanley
Corbin Cherry

Sincerely yours


Dianne Feinstein
United States Senator

DF:ekr

UNCLAS
MAY 22 1997

JUL-22-1997 11:00

CINCPACFLT N465

8084745494 P.04



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
3043 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-3043

5090 IN REPLY REFER TO
SER N454C/70B94021

Beverly Chanley
Corbin Cherry
245 Morning Sun Ave.
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Dear Ms. Chanley and Mr. Cherry, .

Thank you for your letter concerning the Navy's proposal to enhance Pacific Missile Range Facility's (PMRF) sea range to accommodate Theater Ballistic Missile Defense (TBMD) testing.

The Navy is developing TBMD systems capable of operating in coastal areas. These systems will need to be integrated, tested, and evaluated. Congress recognized this requirement and stated in Senate Report 103-321 that the "PMRF air, surface, and subsurface ranges and associated test and exercise infrastructure provide the unique capability to conduct virtually unrestricted test and evaluation in ideal conditions in support of the Defense Department, the armed services, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and U.S. friends and allies." In the same report, the Senate directed that "PMRF be designated the primary test range for the completion of Navy lower tier and upper tier missile flight tests." The Conference Committee concurred in these findings (House Report 103-747).

The Navy is therefore proposing to enhance the capability of PMRF to test TBMD systems. It will consider the impacts of the enhancements and TBMD operations in an Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) required by the National Environmental Policy Act and Executive Order 12114 respectively. The EIS/OEIS will help decision makers by evaluating potential impacts to the area's threatened and endangered species, unique habitats and biological resources, air quality, public health and safety, noise, land use, socioeconomic, visual and aesthetic resources, cultural resources, and water quality. The preparation of the EIS/OEIS is a public process, and input such as yours is welcome.

I forwarded your letter to the EIS/OEIS project manager who will consider your comments as the document is developed. Your name will be included on the mailing list, and you will be provided with a copy of the Draft EIS/OEIS for review and comment.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. Please contact me at the letterhead address if you have further questions.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. WELCHING
Head, Environmental Planning
and Marine Resources Branch
Environmental Protection, Safety
and Occupational Health Division

7-198



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0233
11 March 1998

Ms Beverley Chanley
245 Morning Sun Avenue
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Dear Ms Chanley:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: We are sending you an article that we read regarding the Navy's plan to place rocket launching pads in sensitive wildlife areas. We are very disturbed by this invasive, destructive proposal, and wanted to alert you in the hopes that you can use your influence to stop this madness before it starts.
While in Hawaii we were overwhelmed at how beautiful and graceful the large green sea turtles were as we snorkled among them. We want to do what we can to stop their habitat, and that of the other island creatures, from being destroyed. Surely we are not willing to kill off hundreds of thousands of endangered creatures in order to have a place to put more rockets.

Response 1: Your comments have been considered and your letter included in the Draft EIS. Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

UL-22-97 16:18 FROM: PMRF STARS
JUL-22-1997 18:59 C INCPACFLT N465

ID: 8083354265 PAGE 6

8084745494 P.03
1314094
5744

MAY 22 1997
S-W-080

Beverley Chanley
Corbin Cherry
245 Morning Sun Ave.
Mill Valley, CA 94941
17 May 1997

Senator Dianne Feinstein
1700 Montgomery St., Suite 305
San Francisco, CA 94111

Dear Senator Feinstein,

We are sending you an article that we read regarding the Navy's plan to place rocket launching pads in sensitive wildlife areas. We are very disturbed by this invasive, destructive proposal, and wanted to alert you in the hopes that you can use your influence to stop this madness before it starts. While in Hawaii we were overwhelmed at how beautiful and graceful the large green sea turtles were as we snorkled among them. We want to do what we can to stop their habitat, and that of the other island creatures, from being destroyed. Surely we are not willing to kill off hundreds of thousands of endangered creatures in order to have a place to put more rockets. The real enemy here is not "out there" beyond our borders- it is our ignorance, as we destroy our precious Mother Earth.

Please do what you can to make sure that this project is not carried out

Sincerely,

Beverley Chanley
Corbin Cherry

DIANNE FEINSTEIN
Chairwoman

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
COMMITTEE ON THE ARMY
COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AND AIR FORCE MATTERS

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-0944

July 7, 1997

ADM Robert Mitter
Chief, Legislative Affairs
Department of the Navy
1300 Navy Pentagon, Room 5C760
Washington, D.C. 20350

Dear Admiral Mitter:

INQUIRY FROM: Beverly Chanley (Reference #: okr-53444)

RE: Missile testing site in Hawaii

I am forwarding the attached constituent inquiry for your review and consideration. I believe that my constituent would benefit from your direct response to the specific issues raised in the enclosed letter.

I would appreciate it if you would return your response, in duplicate, as quickly as possible so that I can share the information with my constituent.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

Dianne Feinstein
Dianne Feinstein
United States Senator

DF:okr

100-507100
JUL 9 2 04 PM '97



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
3003 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20380-5004

5090
Box M454C/70B9602L

Beverly Chanley
Corbin Cherry
245 Morning Sun Ave.
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Dear Ms. Chanley and Mr. Cherry,

Thank you for your letter concerning the Navy's proposal to enhance Pacific Missile Range Facility's (PMRF) sea range to accommodate Theater Ballistic Missile Defense (TBMD) testing.

The Navy is developing TBMD systems capable of operating in coastal areas. These systems will need to be integrated, tested, and evaluated. Congress recognized this requirement and stated in Senate Report 103-321 that the "PMRF air, surface, and subsurface ranges and associated test and exercise infrastructure provide the unique capability to conduct virtually unrestricted test and evaluation in ideal conditions in support of the Defense Department, the armed services, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and U.S. friends and allies." In the same report, the Senate directed that "PMRF be designated the primary test range for the completion of Navy lower tier and upper tier missile flight tests." The Conference Committee concurred in these findings (House Report 103-747).

The Navy is therefore proposing to enhance the capability of PMRF to test TBMD systems. It will consider the impacts of the enhancements and TBMD operations in an Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) required by the National Environmental Policy Act and Executive Order 12114 respectively. The EIS/OEIS will help decision makers by evaluating potential impacts to the area's threatened and endangered species, unique habitats and biological resources, air quality, public health and safety, noise, land use, socioeconomic, visual and aesthetic resources, cultural resources, and water quality. The preparation of the EIS/OEIS is a public process, and input such as yours is welcome.

JUL-22-1997 11:00

CINCPACFLT N465

8084745494 P.05

I forwarded your letter to the EIS/ORIS project manager who will consider your comments as the document is developed. Your name will be included on the mailing list, and you will be provided with a copy of the Draft EIS/ORIS for review and comment.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. Please contact me at the letterhead address if you have further questions.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. WHELING
Head, Environmental Planning
and Marine Resources Branch
Environmental Protection, Safety
and Occupational Health Division



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0234
11 March 1998

Mr Corbin Cherry
245 Morning Sun Avenue
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Dear Mr Cherry:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: We are sending you an article that we read regarding the Navy's plan to place rocket launching pads in sensitive wildlife areas. We are very disturbed by this invasive, destructive proposal, and wanted to alert you in the hopes that you can use your influence to stop this madness before it starts.
- While in Hawaii we were overwhelmed at how beautiful and graceful the large green sea turtles were as we snorkled among them. We want to do what we can to stop their habitat, and that of the other island creatures, from being destroyed. Surely we are not willing to kill off hundreds of thousands of endangered creatures in order to have a place to put more rockets.
- Response 1: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site are in Section 4.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

June 23, 1997

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Re: Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kaua'i, Hawai'i
Comments on EIS Preparation Notice

Dear Ms. Mossman,

This letter provides comments on issues that we believe the United States Navy and the State of Hawai'i should examine in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") for the Theater Missile Defense testing proposal of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kaua'i, Hawai'i, as described in the May 7, 1997 EIS Preparation Notice ("PN").

The information that needs to be included or questions that need to be answered are:


1. **Possible launch sites** - The PN is not specific about which sites would be located in National Wildlife Refuge areas or sanctuaries and whether or not more sites could be added at a later date. It is important to identify each of these areas specifically as each potential site contains various protected plants, birds, seals and turtles listed in the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts as well as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. This specific information is especially pertinent to Tern Island.
2. **Refuge Compatibility** - A critical issue that must be addressed in the draft EIS is how the Navy's proposal may be consistent or inconsistent with the purposes of the various State and Federal Wildlife Refuges that are potential sites. The compatibility issues must be addressed separately (i.e. specific to each unique refuge), as well as cumulatively (i.e. total effect).
3. **Refuge Studies** - What studies does the Navy intend to conduct regarding potential impacts on refuge wildlife? Who is doing these studies and when will they be completed?
4. **Clean Air Act Compliance** - The EIS should include any data concerning Halon 2402 and Freon and other emissions from any missile and must be in compliance with the statutory provisions, regulations and any guidelines of the Clean Air Act. Wildlife Refuge Areas are not exempt from the Act.
5. **Clean Water Act** - The EIS should indicate how monitoring and

subsequent testing of the water will take place near launch sites in compliance with the Clean Water Act. Again WRAs are not exempt from the act.

6. **Renewal of the Restrictive Easement** - Why is the Navy seeking an easement from the State through 2030? What is the basis, legally and factually, for this length of time? Would the easement be restricted to specific types of tests?
7. **Why separate these documents** - Why did the Navy segment the PN for the State easement and the Notice of Intent ("NOI") for the federal component of the program (e.g., use of federal refuge areas)? We understand that the draft and final EIS will be a joint state-federal document covering all potential sites; is this correct?
8. **Sugar Cane** - The references in the PN to sugar cane must be updated in the EIS as the industry is almost completely gone on Kaua'i. The Draft EIS must analyze how the demise of this industry affects the proposal (including lowering the levels of background air and soil contamination).
9. **Permits and approvals** - The draft EIS should contain a complete list of permits and approvals necessary for the proposal.
10. **Federal ESA/MMPA** - Has the Navy initiated Section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding likely impacts on protected species? If so, what is the status of this consultation for each species?
11. **State ESA** - How does the Navy intend to comply with the State Endangered Species Act, which currently prohibits "takes" of listed species?
13. **Missile reliability** - What is the actual reliability of the rockets and booster combinations that are potential targets under the Navy's proposal? All information regarding prior testing and any problems (e.g. explosions or aborted launches) must be disclosed. Will any STARS boosters be used for this program?
14. **NEPA /HEPA** - We request that public hearings be held on the DEIS and that you include our names separately on the mailing list for any future notices regarding this project.

Sincerely,


Denise Antolini
University of Hawaii at Manoa
William S. Richardson School of Law
2515 Dole St.
Honolulu, HI 96822


Melissa Vincenty
1721 A Mott Smith Dr.
Honolulu, HI 96822



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0280
12 March 1998

Ms Melissa Vincenty
1721 A Mott Smith Drive
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dear Ms Vincenty:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: Possible launch sites- The PN is not specific about which sites would be located in National Wildlife Refuge areas or sanctuaries and whether or not more sites could be added at a later date. It is important to identify each of these areas specifically as each potential site contains various protected plants, birds, seals and turtles listed in the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts as well as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. This specific information is especially pertinent to Tern Island.
- Response 1: Chapter 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS identifies the specific sites under consideration and evaluated in this EIS.
- Comment 2: Refuge Compatibility - A critical issue that must be addressed in the draft EIS is how the Navy's proposal may be consistent or inconsistent with the purposes of the State and Federal Wildlife Refuges that are potential sites. The compatibility issues must be addressed separately (i.e. specific to each unique refuge), as well as cumulatively (i.e. total effect).
- Response 2: The Land Use sections of the enclosed Draft EIS discuss compatibility in regards to State and Federal wildlife protected areas. Impacts to biological species are addressed under the Biological Resources sections. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities take place in a National Wildlife Refuge, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained within this EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required within a National Wildlife Refuge.
- Comment 3: Refuge Studies - What studies does the Navy intend to conduct regarding potential impacts on refuge wildlife? Who is doing these studies and when will they be completed?
- Response 3: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4. A list of the personnel responsible for the preparation of the EIS is provided in Section 5 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 4: Clean Air Act Compliance - The EIS should include any data concerning Halon 2402 and Freon and other emissions from any missile and must be in compliance with the statutory provisions, regulations and any guidelines of the Clean Air Act. Wildlife Refuge Areas are not exempt from the Act.
- Response 4: Halon and Freon are not exhaust components of newly proposed missiles. As such, no portion of

S-W-0081

the Proposed Action would result in an increase of Halon or Freon. Current emissions due to the STARS program are addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Strategic Target System.

- Comment 5: Clean Water Act - The EIS should indicate how monitoring and subsequent testing of the water will take place near launch sites in compliance with the Clean Water Act. Again, WRA's are not exempt from the act.
- Response 5: The Water Resources section in Section 4 for each area describes potential impacts to water quality for both the No-action alternative (continuation of existing activities) and the Proposed Action. There is no water deluge system planned as part of the Proposed Action; therefore, the only possible surface water contamination would be from the deposition of materials. Studies of deposition from a Strategic Target System launch revealed there was no measurable increment in surface contamination from that launch. The vehicles proposed to be launched as part of the Proposed Action would be much smaller than the STARS; therefore, no contamination is anticipated.
- Comment 6: Renewal of the Restrictive Easement - Why is the Navy seeking an easement from the State through 2030? What is the basis, legally and factually, for this length of time? Would the easement be restricted to specific types of tests?
- Response 6: The Navy is seeking a restrictive easement to cover foreseeable future missile launch activities at PMRF. Extensions to 2030 would be consistent with the leases of State lands on Kauai. The restrictive easement would be used for those types of missiles addressed in Section 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS and required for TBMD and TMD testing.
- Comment 7: Why separate these documents - Why did the Navy segment the PN for the State easement and the Notice of Intent ("NOI") for the federal component of the program (e.g., use of the federal refuge areas)? We understand that the draft and final EIS will be a joint state-federal document covering all potential sites; is this correct?
- Response 7: The separate documents, the Notice of Intent published in the Federal Register for the PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS, and the EIS Preparation Notice for the State of Hawaii Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of PMRF published in the Office of Environmental Quality Control's bulletin, The Environmental Notice, were necessary to comply with both Federal and State of Hawaii regulations. The Preparation Notice focused on activities involving State decisions while the NOI related to all aspects of the proposal to enhance PMRF's capability to conduct TBMD testing. However, the enclosed draft document is a joint State of Hawaii and United States Navy EIS that provides a comprehensive environmental analysis to support State and Federal decisions concerning the use of State, Federal and private lands to support range enhancements at the Pacific Missile Range Facility.
- Comment 8: Sugar Cane - The references in the PN to sugar cane must be updated in the EIS as the industry is almost completely gone on Kauai. The Draft EIS must analyze how the demise of this industry affects the proposal (including lowering the levels of background air and soil contamination).
- Response 8: The Socioeconomic section of the Draft EIS (Section 4.1.1.10) addresses the changing agricultural sector of the Kauai economy.
- Comment 9: Permits and approvals - The draft EIS should contain a complete list of permits and approvals necessary for the proposal.
- Response 9: The Draft EIS provides a complete list of all applicable State and Federal permits, licenses, and other entitlements which must be obtained in implementing the proposal. If it is uncertain whether a permit, license or other entitlement is necessary, the Draft EIS so indicates.
- Comment 10: Federal ESA/MMMPA - Has the Navy initiated Section 7 consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service or the National marine Fisheries Service regarding likely impacts on protected

S-W-0081

species? If so, what is the status of this consultation for each species?

Response 10: The Navy has consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service in the preparation of this Draft EIS. Section 7 consultation with both agencies is being initiated with the transmittal of the Draft EIS.

Comment 11: State ESA - How does the Navy intend to comply with the State Endangered Species Act, which currently prohibits "takes" of listed species?

Response 11: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 12: Missile reliability - What is the actual reliability of the rockets and booster combinations that are potential targets under the Navy's proposal? All information regarding prior testing and any problems (e.g. explosions or aborted launches) must be disclosed. Will any STARS boosters be used for this program?

Response 12: The missile systems proposed for use are current systems used by the Department of Defense. PMRF will establish safety areas from which the public will be excluded and where all debris from a flight termination would fall. The Strategic Target System would continue to be used under both the No-action Alternative and Proposed Action.

Specific risk analysis have not been conducted for each vehicle proposed to be launched as part of the Proposed Action. However, since Kauai Test Facility (KTF) first started operations in 1962, approximately 360 rocket systems have been launched from the KTF. During this period, there have been no ground or airborne failures that have caused injury, loss of life, damage or destruction of any facilities or the environment. Early in KTF history (1964), assembly procedural errors resulted in the premature ignition of the second stage on the launch pad coincident with booster ignition, resulting in a ground fire that spread to the brush adjacent to the facility. As a result, system-specific Safe Operating Procedures (SOPs) were modified, and their use in conjunction with safety checklists has prevented a recurrence. In 1974, in an effort to increase performance of the Strypi Rocket System, a system using a Castor II rocket motor was designed as the first stage versus the original Castor I. Two flight tests were conducted at KTF, with the first one ejecting a nozzle liner at ignition. The system landed within the ground hazard area and caused no injury or damage. The other system experienced burn-through in the casing and landed in the broad ocean area within the cleared hazard area. This system was not developed further and has not flown since.


The Navy expects to continue this excellent safety record in implementing the No-Action or Proposed Action Alternative.

Comment 13: NEPA/HEPA - We request that public hearings be held on the DEIS and that you include our names separately on the mailing list for any future notices regarding this project.

Response 13: Public and agency comments on the Draft EIS will be sought at public hearings which will include a public address system.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,



J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



HAWAII MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

1360 SOUTH BERETANIA STREET, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96814
TELEPHONE (808) 536-7702 • FAX (808) 528-2376

S-W-082

RECEIVED
JUN 24 12 58 PM '97

June 23, 1997

Department of Land and Natural Resources
1151 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
Attention: Gary Martin
Fax: 587-0455

RE: PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE ENHANCED CAPABILITY

Dear Mr. Martin:

The Hawaii Medical Association would like to raise several concerns regarding the safety and health aspect of the proposed expansion of anti-ballistic missile testing on the islands of Kauai and Niihau. Unfortunately, we are not privy to the extent and mission of the project, so our comments are of a general rather than specific nature.

1. GENERAL SAFETY CONCERNS

- a. Is there any potential harm to populations residing in the areas adjacent to the test areas from off course missiles, falling debris, explosions or other direct damage?
- b. Is there any potential harm for ships at sea or commercial air travel as a result of misdirected missile firings, either incoming or outgoing?
- c. Are there any anticipated human health effects of chemicals used in missile propulsion, either during normal operations or as a result of accidents?

2. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

- a. Are there any environmental pollutants that are of concern to local flora and fauna?
- b. Are there any endangered species, either aquatic or terrestrial, that may be adversely affected by the project, both immediately and cumulatively?
- c. Will significant amounts of wilderness area be degraded in the developmental and operational stages of the project?
- d. Will there be mitigative and remedial measures undertaken by the Navy for damages to the environment, both during and after the project?
- e. Will groundwater be protected from contamination by fuels, solvents, and other pollutants from operations and accidents?

Department of Land of Natural Resources
Attention: Gary Martin
June 23, 1997
page 2

3. ECONOMIC CONCERNS

- a. What will the effect of this project be on tourism on Kauai?
- b. Will fishing, agricultural and hunting practices be adversely affected by this project?
- c. What will the net effect of military jobs gained, and other livelihoods potentially lost, because of this project?
- d. Who will shoulder the costs of accidents, cleanups, and other adverse outcomes, should they occur?

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Steven M. Moser, M.D., Chair
Environmental Health Committee

John S. Spangler, M.D.
President

/nk

cc: Approving Agency - Benjamin Cayetano, Governor, State of Hawaii
Consultant - Vida Mossman, U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0235
11 March 1998

Dr John S Spangler MD
Hawaii Medical Association
1360 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, HI 96814

Dear Dr Spangler MD:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: 1. General Safety Concerns

- a. Is there any potential harm to populations residing in the areas adjacent to the test areas from off course missiles, falling debris, explosions, or other direct damage?
- b. Are there any anticipated human health effects of chemicals used in missile propulsion, either during normal operations or as a result of accidents?

Response 1: The Draft EIS addresses public safety and health protection for each location evaluated. Sections 4.1.1.7 and 4.2.1.7 describe potential impacts to human health and safety. Sections 4.1.1.3 and 4.2.1.3 describe potential impacts to biological resources.

Comment 2: 2. Environmental Concerns

- a. Are there any environmental pollutants that are of concern to local flora and fauna?
- b. Are there any endangered species, either aquatic or terrestrial, that may be adversely affected by the project, both immediately and cumulatively?
- c. Will significant amounts of wilderness area be degraded in the developmental and operational stages of the project?
- d. Will there be mitigative and remedial measures undertaken by the Navy for damages to the environment, both during and after the project?

Response 2: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 3: 3. Economic Concerns

- a. What will the effect of this project be on tourism in Kauai?
- b. Will fishing, agricultural and hunting practices be adversely affected by this project?
- c. What will the net effect of military jobs gained, and other livelihoods potentially lost, because of this project?
- d. Who will shoulder the costs of accidents, clean ups, and other adverse outcomes, should they occur?

Response 3: The enclosed Draft EIS provides information on the economic impacts of the No-Action alternative and of the Proposed Action alternatives. Please see the Socioeconomics sections of Chapter 4. Cleanup and other related actions are described in the Health and Safety and

Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste sections of Chapters 3 and 4. The Navy would be responsible for the cost of cleaning up of any contamination resulting from accidents.

Comment 4: b. Is there any potential harm for ships at sea or commercial air travel as a result of misdirected missile firings, either incoming or outgoing?

Response 4: The Health and Safety sections in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS describe the potential impacts of mishaps, as well as the safety measures taken to clear areas where debris would fall. Specific potential impacts to air traffic are described in the Airspace sections, and impacts to ships at sea are described in the Socioeconomics sections.

Comment 5: e. Will groundwater be protected from contamination from fuels, solvents, and other pollutants from operations and accidents?

Response 5: The Water Resources section in Section 4 for each area describes potential impacts to water quality for both the No-Action alternative (continuation of existing activities) and the Proposed Action.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BAWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor



THE LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF HAWAII

League of Women Voters of Hawaii
49 South Hotel Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Ms Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, Hawaii 96752-0128

To Whom it may Concern

The League of Women Voters of Kaua'i County (LWV-KC) wishes to express its concern regarding plans for the use of the Northern Pacific Basin and the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) for testing a new generation of anti-missile hardware.

Our apprehensions are based on two separate matters that will be expressed in this testimony.

Our main concern at this point in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) procedure is the lack of citizen participation in the process. We feel that the "scoping meetings" held on June 17, 19, 21, and 23 on the islands of Kaua'i and O'ahu not only contained insufficient information to allow the public to make intelligent, informed testimony possible, but lacked the proper notification of community members as to the precise specifics of the Navy's plan.

At the "scoping" meetings mentioned above we were distressed at the lack of opportunity for the community to properly have input into the process. Rather than have a general meeting where the community members could discuss, interact and participate in the process, the Pacific Missile Firing Range officials chose to limit participation by allowing only written comments to be submitted and constructing the "meetings" whereby people were ushered to multiple "booths" where their questions and comments were directed to a series of military officials who were not taking down their comments in writing, but seemed engaged primarily in deflecting criticism and directing people to the "comments table" where they were required to write down their concerns. After the initial unfairness of this process was noted following the first meeting, there was an opportunity provided for a tape recorded message, to be transcribed at a later date, offered to those who felt they could not cogently express themselves in writing. In addition there were no provisions made for those with disabilities, for example interpreters for hearing or visually impaired individuals.

This process is wholly unacceptable, as it disallows public interaction and deliberation. By hearing the concerns of others- thereby allowing people to organize their thoughts as a "community" rather than force them to submit individual, isolated comments derived in the vacuum created by the aforementioned process- public participation in the process could be increased to an acceptable level.

But this is not the most egregious violation of the public's right to participate in the

process that has occurred.

The lack of specifics relating to the plans for military expansion disseminated to the public has thrown the whole "scoping" process into question. The public has been asked to comment on the plans for expansion of the military testing in the north Pacific without any specifics being presented to the public in general, much less to those that have expressed their concerns in the past.

Only a series of brief, one sheet handouts were generally available at the scoping meetings and none contained specifics on such things as launch sites, number of launches, types of missiles proposed, logistical data, exact type of propellants or any other specifics... no charts, no graphs, no maps, no specifications of any type. Only when questioned regarding these matters was the publication "Preparation Notice for State of Hawai'i Actions Related to Enhancing the Capabilities of the PMRF" produced from behind a desk and distributed to a select few. Even this document does not contain specifics as to the proposed operations, but instead contains areas that the military will try to "mitigate" during the EIS process.

The public cannot possibly give intelligent, informed and specific testimony when they are not given specifics about the plans. For instance, if there is an endangered species in the vicinity of a proposed launch site, how would we know if we don't know the exact site? How can one comment on a proposal if there is no proposal on which to comment?

Although the military claims that these matters will be addressed when the draft EIS is complete, we believe that this is too late in the process to allow for fully informed public participation in every step of the EIS process.

In addition, the "preparation notice" referred to above was not distributed to interested parties in the community. A short six years ago a similar series of EIS hearings were held on Kaua'i for the SDI/Polaris launches and many community members were on a mailing list and received copies of both the draft and final EIS. When questioned, officials said that none of these people received the "preparation notice" or were even notified of the scoping process, despite the interest they had exhibited only a few short years ago. We believe that this is, at best, an oversight, at worst an overt attempt to stifle debate in the community by denying us all pertinent information.

Due to these concerns, we request that the scoping process begin again, taking these matters into account.

Secondly, the move to protect the northern chain of atolls and islands from the north shore of Kaua'i to Midway Atoll by maintaining a bird and wildlife sanctuary and preserve is jeopardized by this potential military weapon proliferation and testing program. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife service has been moving to protect this area as a refuge and we support this effort. The LWV-US believes that natural resources should be managed as interrelated parts of life-supporting ecosystems. Pollution of these resources should be controlled in order to preserve the physical, chemical and biological integrity of ecosystems and to protect public health. We believe the military's proposal to be at odds with this position.

The league supports comprehensive long range planning and believes that wise decision making requires coordination of the federal government's responsibilities and activities and the resolution of inconsistencies and conflicts in basic policy among government agencies at all levels.

Therefore we would like to see extensive consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service to produce a comprehensive plan with maximal environmental protection for the whole area before an EIS process for missile launches goes any further.

The League believes that public understanding and cooperation are essential to the responsible and responsive management of our nation's natural resources, and the northern Pacific is one of the most precious and unique ecosystems in the world. We believe the public has a right to know about the potential pollution levels, dangers to health and the environment and proposed resource management policies and options, none of which are addressed, as yet, by the military as regards their plans.

The League contends that the public has a right to participate in decision making at each phase of the process. Officials should make a special effort to develop readily understandable procedures for public involvement and to ensure that the public has adequate information to participate effectively. Not only has this not occurred in this matter, but it would seem that the military has developed a strategy to thwart public participation.

We believe that the military should publicize, in an extensive and timely manner and in readily available sources, information about pollution levels, pollution-abatement programs, and resource management, policies and options. As yet, we have seen nothing of the sort. In addition we believe that hearings should be held in easily accessible locations, at convenient times and, when possible, in the area(s) concerned. The hearing procedures and other opportunities for public comment should actively encourage citizen participation in decision-making, something that has been glaringly absent during the process used at the "scoping" meetings.

We respectfully request a new "scoping" process be executed by the military before work begins on the draft EIS, with an eye toward fully informed citizen participation in the process. Only then can the concerns of the community be fully addressed.


Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Jean Aoki, President, League of Women Voters of Hawai'i and



A. F. Parks, Chair, Natural Resources and Environmental; Protection Committee, League of Women Voters of Hawai'i.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0281
12 March 1998

Ms A F Parks
Chair
League of Women Voters
49 South Hotel Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Ms Parks:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Our main concern at this point in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) procedure is the lack of citizen participation in the process. We feel that the "scoping meetings" held on June 17, 19, 21, and 23 on the islands of Kauai and Oahu not only contained insufficient information to allow the public to make intelligent, informed testimony possible, but lacked the proper notification of community members as to the precise specifics of the Navy's plan.

At the "scoping" meetings mentioned above we were distressed at the lack of opportunity for the community to properly have input into the process.

This process is wholly unacceptable, as it disallows public interaction and deliberation. By hearing the concerns of others - thereby allowing people to organize their thoughts as a "community" rather than force them to submit individual, isolated comments derived in the vacuum created by the aforementioned process - public participation in the process could be increased to an acceptable level.

Response 1: While not an open forum with the opportunity for public speaking, at each scoping meeting the public was encouraged to view the exhibit area which was staffed by technical personnel. The layout of the exhibit area was designed to facilitate an open and relaxed atmosphere for communication between the public and the technical representatives. Attendees were invited to make oral statements, which were recorded by a tape recorder at each meeting. Pre-formatted comment sheets were also available so attendees could either turn in a written comment during the meeting or mail the comment to the address printed on the form. Letters written in advance were also accepted.

A total of 47 comments (42 written and 5 oral) were received during the scoping meetings held at Waimea, Kilauea, Lihue, and Honolulu. The information meeting format at Niihau respected traditions of group communication.

Comment 2: The public has been asked to comment on the plans for expansion of the military testing in the north Pacific without any specifics being presented to the public in general, much less to those who have expressed their concerns in the past.

Response 2: Chapter 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS, and especially Section 2.3 addresses the Proposed Action in considerable detail.

Comment Sheet
for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. Please use this sheet to write down issues that you think should be studied in the EIS. To ensure that your comments are addressed in the draft EIS, we must receive your comments by 7 July 1997.

Comment 3: Secondly, the move to protect the northern chain of atolls and islands from the north shore of Kauai to Midway Atoll by maintaining a bird and wildlife sanctuary and preserve is jeopardized by this potential military weapon proliferation and testing program. The US Fish and Wildlife service has been moving to protect this area as a refuge and we support this effort. The LWV-US believes that natural resources should be managed as interrelated parts of life-supporting ecosystems. Pollution of these resources should be controlled in order to preserve the physical, chemical and biological integrity of ecosystems and to protect public health. We believe the military's proposal to be at odds with this position. Therefore we would like to see extensive consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to produce a comprehensive plan with maximal environmental protection for the whole area before an EIS process for missile launches goes any further.

Response 3: The Land Use sections of the enclosed Draft EIS discuss compatibility in regards to State and Federal wildlife protected areas. Impacts to biological species are addressed under the Biological Resources sections. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities take place in a National Wildlife Refuge, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained within this EIS when it is determined that construction and operation would be required within a National Wildlife Refuge.

Comment 4: We believe that the military should publicize, in an extensive and timely manner and in readily available sources, information about pollution levels, pollution abatement programs, and resource management, policies and options.

Response 4: Information on current pollution levels, pollution abatement programs, and resource management policies are contained in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS.

Comment 5: We respectfully request a new "scoping" process be executed by the military before work begins on the draft EIS, with an eye toward fully informed citizen participation in the process. Only then can the concerns of the community be fully addressed.

Response 5: The program fully complied with the scoping process outlined in the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1501.7).

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

My greatest concerns are not for the development phases of the missiles but for the tremendous environmental impacts of later training sessions with these huge Navy vessels from the United States and allies are planning on using these waters for missile training.

The fuels, lubricants, products of combustion, and nuclear wastes from these vessels' engines combined with wastes from toilets and gray water and accidental spills, etc., should be concerns of an environmental study. Endangered species such as sea turtles, whales, monk seals, fish, and birds, and all of the flora & fauna (over)

Please place form in the drop box or mail to:

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii, 96752-0128

Commenter	
Name	MICHAEL S. POTTASSO
Street Address	P.O. Box 1323
City	HANALEI
State/ZIP	HI. 96714-1323

Please check this box if you DO NOT wish to receive a copy of the Draft EIS.

late seas and the lands are at risk from so many vessels using the area.

Thank you for considering my concerns,

Sincerely,
Michael S. Bottasso



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0241
11 March 1998

Mr Michael S Bottasso
PO Box 1323
Hanalei, HI 96714-1323

Dear Mr Bottasso:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: My greatest concerns are not for the development phases of the missiles but for the tremendous environmental impacts later training sessions will have. Huge Navy vessels from the United States and allies are planning on using these waters for missile training. The fuels, lubricants, products of combustion, and nuclear wastes from these vessels' engines combined with wastes from toilets and grey water and accidental spills, etc., should be concerns of an environmental study.


Response 1: Training is a part of the Proposed Action and impacts from these activities are addressed in Chapter 4.

Comment 2: Endangered species, such as sea turtles, whales, monk seals, fish, and birds, and all of the flora and fauna of the seas and the lands are at risk from so many vessels using the area.

Response 2: Potential impacts on biological resources are addressed in the Biological Resources sections for each candidate area, including the Ocean Area, in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waiimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

PUBLIC TESTIMONY FOR DRAFT EIS REGARDING THE PROPOSED TBMD
 FROM : GABRIELA TAYLOR
 5620 KEAPANA RD. KAPAA, HI. 96746

S-W-092

TO: Vida Mossman July 22, 1997
 PMRF Public Affairs Office
 PO128 Kekaha, Hi. 96752


I have been a resident of Kauai for 25 years. I am unhappy that the Navy is proposing an enhanced missile program, the TBMD. I feel that the Navy base should be used for activities that will not encroach on the life style and the natural environment of Kauai. I am not against the presence of the base, but believe that at this time in history, it should be used for innovative and productive projects.

We residents have a right to determine our future on Kauai. Niihau residents must speak for themselves. The public meeting held by the Navy last month was a sham. I agree with the League of Women Voters that you need to have a "new scoping process" before the military begins the draft EIS. We have nothing to respond to since the meeting/ public hearing did not give sufficient information, nor did it give the public the opportunity to respond verbally. I am one of a few among my friends who is even bothering to write testimony. Most people were so intimidated and disgusted with public hearing that they will not comment.

We need to know what this military expansion is going to do in terms of specifics, eg., launch sites, number of launches, range of launches, targets of launches, types of missiles, propellants, waste products, and restricted access to public areas. Where were the maps, charts, graphs and other informational material for clarity? What does the new PMRF chief, Bowlin, mean when he says the STARS mistakes won't happen again? I hope he sees this letter so that he will realize that he is already off to a bad start.

Again, I agree with the League of Women Voters that "we would like to see extensive consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to produce a comprehensive plan with maximal environmental protection for the whole area before an EIS process for missile launches goes any further." Please tell Captain Bowlin that he can get it right only by bringing the residents of Kauai into the forum and not forcing us to stand outside.

Sincerely, Gabriela Taylor




DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0262
 12 March 1998

Ms Gabriela Taylor
 5620 Keapana Road
 Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Ms Taylor:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I have been a resident of Kauai for 25 years. I am unhappy that the Navy is proposing an enhanced missile program, the TBMD. I feel that the Navy base should be used for activities that will not encroach on the lifestyle and the natural environment of Kauai. I am not against the presence of the base, but believe that at this time in history, it should be used for innovative and productive projects.

Response 1: Thank you.

Comment 2: We residents have a right to determine our future on Kauai. Niihau residents must speak for themselves. The public meeting held by the Navy last month was a sham. I agree with the League of Women Voters that you need to have a "new scoping process" before the military begins the draft EIS. We have nothing to respond to since the meeting/public hearing did not give sufficient information, nor did it give the public the opportunity to respond verbally. I am one of a few among my friends who is even bothering to write a testimony. Most people were so intimidated and disgusted with public hearing that they will not comment.

Response 2: The program fully complied with the scoping process outlined in the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1501.7).

Comment 3: We need to know what this military expansion is going to do in terms of specifics, e.g., launch sites, number of launches, range of launches, targets of launches, types of missiles, propellants, waste products, and restricted access to public areas. Where were the maps, charts, graphs and other informational material for clarity? What does the new PMRF chief, Bowlin, mean when he says the STARS mistakes won't happen again?

Response 3: The information you requested regarding the Proposed Action is contained in Chapter 2 of the enclosed Draft EIS. We have incorporated information from previous programs and analyses, including STARS, as much as possible during the preparation of this Draft EIS.

Comment 4: Again, I agree with the League of Women Voters that "we would like to see extensive consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to produce a comprehensive plan with maximal environmental protection for the whole area before an EIS process for missile launches goes any further."

- Response 4: Potential impacts to wildlife on Tern Island are discussed in Section 4.3.1.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Utilization of Tern Island as a target launch site would be closely coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Extensive consultation with the USFWS, the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service and other agencies has been conducted and will continue throughout the EIS process. Section 7 consultation is being initiated with the transmittal of the Draft EIS.
- Comment 5: Please tell Captain Bowlin that he can get it right only by bringing the residents of Kauai into the forum and not forcing us to stand outside.
- Response 5: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0092

CENTER FOR NON-VIOLENT EDUCATION AND ACTION, INC.

Vida Mossman
 PMRF Public Affairs Office
 Box 128
 Kekaha, HI 96752

July 22, 1997

I would like to receive a copy of the draft EIS regarding the crock of kukai entitled "Preparing the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability." I am strongly opposed to this project because of economic, social, cultural and religious concerns.

Economically: military spending creates the fewest jobs per dollar of any government spending. Let's create jobs cleaning up the environment rather than creating more environmental problems.

Socially: expanding a missile range is a terrible waste of precious resources that should be going to feed the hungry, shelter the homeless, etc. Tonight's TV news about a homeless man found dead in Kipapa gulch ammunition bunker 11 underscores this fact.

Culturally: it is a further step of colonial imposition and an affront to Hawaii's host people to expand U.S. military presence in Hawaii. In light of U.S. Public Law 103-150 known as the Public Apology Bill, the U.S. should be withdrawing from Hawaii. The U.S. committed an illegal act of war against Hawaii in 1893 and this project is a continuation of illegal action.

Spiritually: reliance on ballistic missiles for defense is an expression of our lack of religious faith. Jesus tells us to love our enemy and turn the other cheek. The spirit of aloha has no room for ballistic missiles.

With each step down the road of militarism we need to ask-- what is the spiritual impact upon our souls? Or have we already arrived at spiritual death resulting from military idolatry, and therefore incapable of taking such questions seriously?

Sincerely,



James V. Albertini
 President

WALUAINA FARM P.O. BOX AB KUNIASTOWN HI. 96760 (808) 966-7622



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0174
11 March 1998

Mr. James Albertini
Center for Non-Violent Education and Action, Inc.
Malu Aina Farm, PO Box AB
Kurtistown, HI 96760

Dear Mr. Albertini:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: I am strongly opposed to this project because of economic, social, cultural and religious concerns.

Response 1: Thank you.

Comment 2: Economically: military spending creates the fewest jobs per dollar of any government spending. Let's create jobs cleaning up the environment rather than creating more environmental problems.

Response 2: Thank you.

Comment 3: Socially: expanding a missile range is a terrible waste of precious resources that should be going to feed the hungry, shelter the homeless, etc. Tonight's TV news about a homeless man dead in Kipapa gulch ammunition bunker 11 underscores this fact.

Response 3: Thank you.

Comment 4: Culturally: it is a further step of colonial imposition and an affront to Hawaii's host people to expand U.S. military presence in Hawaii. In light of U.S. Public Law 103-150 known as the Public Apology Bill, the U.S. should be withdrawing from Hawaii. The U.S. committed an illegal act of war against Hawaii in 1893 and this project is a continuation of illegal action.

Response 4: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.


Comment 5: Spiritually: reliance on ballistic missiles for defense is an expression of our lack of religious faith. Jesus tells us to love our enemy and turn the other cheek. The spirit of aloha has no room for ballistic missiles.

With each step down the road of militarism we need to ask -- what is the spiritual impact our souls? Or have we already arrived at spiritual death resulting from military idolatry, and therefore incapable of taking such questions seriously?

Response 5: Thank you.

S-W-0093

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimoa on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0093

PMRF: Vida Mossman, Public Affairs Office
POBox 128 Kekaha, Kauai, Hi. 96752
SUBJECT: Proposed TBMD program

July 23, 1997

S-W-094



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0248
12 March 1998

I have recently moved to Kauai. As a new resident, I have learned about the proposed TBMD and am concerned about its effect on the environment and the quality of life on this island.

I read letters of protest in the local newspapers and would like to back them up. I am enraged that the military wants to encroach further on this sacred land and the surrounding ocean and Niihau. It appears to be serving greed and not benefiting the people of this island or of the United States in general. PMRF should be used to further peace on the planet with non invasive safe programs.

There was not enough information given at the public hearing. We demand to be given more specifics about the missile launches and their impact on this island as well as the ocean and atolls it will affect. We need you to address the safety factors for the animals and people on Kauai and Niihau. We want to know about the cultural impact on native lands and the restrictive use of Polihale and other public places. Please send me a copy of the draft EIS. Let it be known for public testimony that I do not want an extension of the missile launching or the TBMD program here.

Sincerely, Paula Goldsberry
5620 Keapana Rd. Kapaa, Hi. 96746

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paula Goldsberry".

Ms Paula Goldsberry
5620 Keapana Road
Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Ms Goldsberry:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: I am enraged that the military wants to encroach further on this sacred land and the surrounding ocean and Niihau.
- Response 1: Thank you.
- Comment 2: (The military) appears to be serving greed and not benefiting the people of this land or of the United States in general.
- Response 2: Thank you.
- Comment 3: There was not enough information given at the public hearing. We demand to be given more specifics about the missile launches and their impact on this island as well as the ocean and atolls it will affect.
- Response 3: The enclosed Draft EIS provides the specifics of the proposed missile launches and their impacts on land, the ocean and atolls in Chapters 2 and 4, respectively.
- Comment 4: We need you to address the safety factors to the animals and people on Kauai and Niihau.
- Response 4: The Draft EIS addresses public safety and health protection for each location evaluated. Sections 4.1.1.7 and 4.2.1.7 describe potential impacts to human health and safety. Sections 4.1.1.3 and 4.2.1.3 describe potential impacts to biological resources.
- Comment 5: We want to know about the cultural impact on native lands and the restrictive use of Polihale and other public places.
- Response 5: The Cultural Resources sections in the enclosed Draft EIS address traditional cultural resources for each area, and the Land Use sections address access to public places (see Section 4.1.2.7, Restrictive Easement Land Use).
- Comment 6: Let it be known for public testimony that I do not want an extension of the missile launching of the TBMD program here.
- Response 6: Thank you.

S-W-1024

7-214

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-095

MARY E NOONAN
P.O. BOX 3520-184
PRINCEVILLE HI
96722-352

July 30, 97

Dear ULDA et al,

FIRST, I WAS HOPING FOR A MORE OPEN + PUBLIC FORUM FOR DISCUSSION + EXPLANATION of concerns for the expansion of PMRF. IN A DEMOCRACY, I'M CONCERNED THAT your recent 'public' meetings to only written response into quelling the voice of the 'little people' who actually employ you to serve your interests + concerns + not allow the voice of the people to be heard - LITERALLY in a town hall meeting setting. TO ME IT SEEMS THAT you do NOT TRULY WANT TO KNOW HOW THE PEOPLE OF KAUAI TRULY FEEL + especially you do not want them to hear each other or inspire each other to think + question authority, or to answer detailed questions about your plans. SO FIRST I OBJECT to the need to even write this letter to voice my concerns.

Second - I ask for + (IF NECESSARY DEMAND) A PERSONAL + SPECIFIC RESPONSE to my specific questions - not a form letter. IF not responded to, I will lead your

S-W-0094

① WHAT PROOF CAN YOU PROVIDE TO DEMONSTRATE THAT YOUR CHOICE OF THE PERSON(S) TO DETERMINE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (REPORT) IS TRULY INDEPENDENT, IMPARTIAL & NOT GEARED TOWARD A REPORT OF APPROVAL FOR PMRF PLANS?

② WHAT IMPACT REPORT ADDRESSES THE HEALTH SAFETY OF THE PEOPLE OF KAUAI? THE POLLUTION OF & DISTURBANCE OF MARINE LIFE - REEF LIFE ETC? ③ ENDANGERED SPECIES?

③ WHAT RESTRICTIONS WILL BE IMPOSED ON USE OF POLIHAHAU STATE PARK?

④ WHAT KIND OF TRUCKING OF EXPLOSIVES ON OUR HIGHWAYS WILL BE OCCURRING? HONESTLY - THE TRUTH. WHAT KIND OF STORAGE OF EXPLOSIVES? STORAGE OF?

④ WHAT ARE THE PERIMETERS, NUMBERS, HEIGHT & RANGE OF MISSILE LAUNCHERS?

Please also send me a draft of the EIS. COUNT MY VOICE AS STRONGLY OBJECTING TO THE EXPANSION OF PMRF ON KAUAI

R.S.U.P.
ASAP.

Sincerely,
Mary E Noonan
826-4498



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Scr 00/0249
12 March 1998

Ms Mary E Noonan
PO Box 3500-184
Princeville, HI 96722-3500

Dear Ms Noonan:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: First, I was hoping for a more open & public forum for discussion & expression of concerns for the expansion of PMRF. In a democracy, I am concerned that your recent 'public' meeting to only written response is to quench the voice of the 'little people' who actually employ you to serve their interests & concerns & not allow the voice of the people to be heard - literally in a town hall meeting setting. To me it says that you do not truly want to know how the people of Kauai truly feel & especially you do not want them to hear each other or inspire each other to think & question authority or to answer detailed questions about your plans. So first I object to the need to even write this letter to voice my concerns.

Response 1: While not an open forum with the opportunity for public speaking, at each scoping meeting the public was encouraged to view the exhibit area which was staffed by technical personnel. The layout of the exhibit area was designed to facilitate an open and relaxed atmosphere for communication between the public and the technical representatives. Attendees were invited to make oral statements, which were recorded by a tape recorder at each meeting. Pre-formatted comment sheets were also available so attendees could either turn in a written comment during the meeting or mail the comment to the address printed on the form. Letters written in advance were also accepted.

A total of 47 comments (42 written and 5 oral) were received during the scoping meetings held at Waimea, Kilauea, Lihue, and Honolulu. The information meeting format at Niihau respected traditions of group communication.

Comment 2: Second, I ask for & (if necessary demand) a personal & specific response to my specific questions - not a form letter. If not responded to, I will call your superior.

Response 2: This letter is our response to your questions and comments.


Comment 3: What proof can you provide to demonstrate that your choice of the person(s) to determine the environmental impact (report) is truly independent, impartial & not geared toward a report of approval for PMRF plans?

Response 3: The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires U.S. Government Agencies to consider environmental effects in decisions on major federal actions with a potential to significantly affect the environment. NEPA requires an inter-disciplinary team approach to the analysis. Section 5 identifies both government officials and contractors who make up the team used for this EIS.

- Comment 4: What impact report addresses the health safety of the people of Kauai?
- Response 4: The Draft EIS addresses public safety and health protection for each location evaluated. Section 4.1.1.7 describes potential impacts to human health and safety on Kauai.
- Comment 5: (What impact report addresses) the pollution of & disturbance of marine life - reef life etc.?
- Response 5: Potential impacts on biological resources are addressed in the Biological Resources sections for each candidate area, including the Ocean Area, in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 6: (What impact report addresses) endangered species?
- Response 6: Potential impacts on biological resources are addressed in the Biological Resources sections for each candidate area, including the Ocean Area, in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 7: What restrictions will be imposed on use of Polihale State Park?
- Response 7: Restrictions on use of Polihale State Park under the Proposed Action will not change from those imposed under the current restrictive easement. Access to Polihale State Park is described in Sections 3.1.2 and 4.1.2.7 of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 8: What kind of trucking of explosives on our highways will be occurring? Honestly - the truth. What kind of storage of explosives? Storage of?
- Response 8: The Health and Safety section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.1.1.7) addresses the storage and transportation of explosives on the highways. These would be handled in accordance with existing safety procedures at PMRF.
- Comment 9: What are the perimeters, numbers, height & range of missile launches?
- Response 9: The information you requested regarding the Proposed Action is contained in Chapter 2, Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives, of the enclosed Draft EIS.
- Comment 10: Count my voice as strongly objecting to the expansion of PMRF on Kauai.
- Response 10: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-0095

Mimi Forsyth
P.O. Box 992
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

28 July 1997

To:
Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128
(fax: 808-335-4660)

Assessing information obtained only with great difficulty, I can see little positive to recommend PMRF expansion in the NW Hawai'ian chain. If PMRF is already "the world's largest instrumented multi-environment range...etc.", perhaps it's big enough.

The islands & atolls such as French Frigate Shoals, Midway, Kure, Johnston (and of course Ni'ihau, Kaua'i and the rest) have extremely fragile wildlife populations. No bird or seal or turtle needs 45 lbs of lead, per missile, dumped in its environment. (That is the figure for the Vandal, which, admittedly, may be obsolete soon. Will its replacement be cleaner?)

It does not inspire confidence that the U.S. military establishment will provide an environmental impact statement to legitimize its own purposes. It stretches credulity that the fox should be entrusted with the hens in their own house.

It similarly stretches credulity that one arm of the government—the Fish & Wildlife Service—would try to protect the flora & fauna of the islands while another, the DoD, would do the opposite.

Sincerely,





DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0250
 12 March 1998

Ms Mimi Forsyth
 PO Box 992
 Santa Fe, NM 87504

Dear Ms Forsyth:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Assessing information obtained only with great difficulty, I can see little positive to recommend PMRF expansion in the NW Hawaiian chain. If PMRF is already "the world's largest instrumented multi-environmental range. . . etc.", perhaps it's big enough.

Response 1: While PMRF is currently the world's largest instrumented multi-environment range, it is still not large enough to accommodate the new and improved combat systems and weapons under development. Thus, in order to comply with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense Theater Missile Defense (TMD) systems which are under development, the requirement exists to enhance the range's capability to support testing and training for these systems.

Comment 2: The islands & atolls such as French Frigate Shoals, Midway, Kure, Johnston (and of course Ni'ihau, Kauai and the rest) have extremely fragile wildlife populations. No bird or seal or turtle needs 45 lbs of lead, per missile, dumped in its environment. (That is the figure for the vandal, which, admittedly, maybe obsolete soon. Will its replacement be cleaner?)

Response 2: Hazardous materials and hazardous waste and their potential effects on wildlife are described in the enclosed Draft EIS in the Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Geology and Soils, and Biological Resources sections for each location in Section 4.

Comment 3: It does not inspire confidence that the U.S. military establishment will provide an environmental impact statement to legitimize its own purposes. It stretches credulity that the fox should be entrusted with the hens in their own house.

It similarly stretches credulity that one of the government-the Fish & Wildlife Service- would try to protect the flora & fauna of the islands while another, the DoD, would do the opposite.

Response 3: The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires U.S. Government Agencies to consider environmental effects in decisions on major federal actions with a potential to significantly affect the environment. NEPA requires an inter-disciplinary team approach to the analysis. Section 5 identifies both government officials and contractors who make up the team used for this EIS.

The Navy has consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service in the preparation of this Draft EIS. Consultation with these and other agencies is described in Section 7.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLÍN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

S-W-097

Cely M. Queiroz
357 View Street #4
Mountain View, CA 94041

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
Public Affairs Office
Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, HI 96752-0128

PMRF leaders -

July 25, 1997


I am writing you in regards to the proposed expansion of the Pacific Missile Range Facility. I'd also appreciate the inclusion of my input in the record of public discussions on the project, as well as to receive the draft EIS.

This past month, I had the lucky opportunity to visit Kauai, and as many other thousands of citizens from the main land as well as from further lands, I felt blessed to be able to enjoy the magnificent sights of this tropical island. At a time when so many natural ecosystems have already been permanently altered or destroyed worldwide, it was encouraging to read that some species which were considered endangered are making a come back.

Meanwhile, it troubled me to hear from local residents that some of the still protected environments, such as the island of Ni'ihau, might soon be opened up for military expansion. As much as any nation benefits from the protection afforded by its military, in a Democracy the military as any other of the government branches must enact the people's will. National polls consistently show that the majority of the American people is in favor of environmental protection. Further, by protecting natural habitats, the lives of all the nation's citizens are enriched be they civilians or military servants.

While it is also true that All American citizens need to be able to make a living, without a healthy environment in which to live, having jobs will not mean much. Further, protecting the Nation from foreign invasion looses meaning, if life as we know it becomes unbearable due to the never ending destruction of our sole home, the natural environment. Ultimately, the American military has not only the role of protecting this country from foreign invasion, but it can also take on the role of protector of the nation's natural resources. In a shrinking world, the US military can become a role model to the military establishments in other nations. It can commit to protecting our few remaining natural habitats by performing any necessary projects on lands already utilized for similar purposes, and by utilizing its technology also for the purpose of preserving the nation's natural patrimony.

Sincerely,


Cely M. Queiroz


DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0251
12 March 1998

Ms Cely M Queiroz
357 View Street #4
Mountain View, CA 94041

Dear Ms Queiroz:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: This past month, I had the lucky opportunity to visit Kauai, and as many other thousands of citizens from the main land as well as from further lands. I felt blessed to be able to enjoy the magnificent sights of this tropical island. At a time when so many natural ecosystems have already been permanently altered or destroyed worldwide, it was encouraging to read that some species which were considered endangered are making a come back.
- Response 1: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.
- Comment 2: Meanwhile, it troubled me to hear from local residents that some of the still protected environments, such as the island of Ni'ihau, might soon be opened up for military expansion.
- Response 2: Thank you.
- Comment 3: As much as any nation benefits from the protection afforded by its military, in a Democracy the military as any other of the government branches must enact the people's will. National polls consistently show that the majority of the American people is in favor of environmental protection. Further, by protecting natural habitats, the lives of all the nation's citizens are enriched be they civilians or military servants.
- While it is also true that All American citizens need to be able to make a living, without a healthy environment in which to live, having jobs will not mean much. Further, protecting the Nation from foreign invasion looses meaning, if life as we know it becomes unbearable due to the never ending destruction of our sole home, the natural environment. Ultimately, the American military has not only the role of protecting this country from foreign invasion, but it can also take on the role of protector of the nation's natural resources. In a shrinking world, the US military can become a role model to the military establishments in other nations. It can commit to protecting our few remaining natural habitats by performing any necessary projects on lands already utilized for similar purposes, and by utilizing its technology also for the purpose of preserving the nation's natural patrimony.
- Response 3: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Jim Bohn
Michelle Ota

TO: PMRF Public Affairs Office
attn: Vida Mossman
Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752

FROM: Jim Bohn & Michelle Ota
Seattle, WA

Dear Ms. Mossman,

We are writing this letter out of concern for the Navy's anticipated expansion of the missile testing range in Kaua'i and Ni'ihau. After recently having stayed on the island (Kaua'i) for a week this summer during our vacation, it came to our attention that an already large military facility was considering even further expansion, and in fact had already initiated an environmental impact study along these lines.

According to information in a local newspaper, the plan would increase the number of support structures on Ni'ihau, as well as increase the area of the Pacific Ocean that would be effected by missile test launches. Our concern with this part of the plan is the direct adverse effects these launches could possibly have on habitat in the state of Hawaii and beyond, including international waters which are home to many islands and atolls besides those which are U.S. protectorates. In addition, the structures to be built on Ni'ihau, one of the last islands in the Hawaiian chain that is in a somewhat pristine state compared with the rest, could further effect wildlife habitat that may never recover.

Our second and perhaps more urgent concern is with the people of Kaua'i themselves, and how this plan may effect their lives. We request specific answers, in addition to the environmental study should our questions not fall within the scope of the study, to these questions:

- How many family sustaining jobs will be created as a result of the expansion?
- Will the Navy train local Kaua'i residents for these jobs, or will they be filled by a rotating roster of Naval personnel from other locations?
- What types of disaster recovery training and public education will the Navy provide in order to prepare for inadvertent discharge of explosives as a result of storing dangerous missiles on a relatively small island?
- How will access to Polihale State Park be effected?

Please send a copy of the environmental impact study to us when available, to the address below.

Thank you for your response,
Jim Bohn & Michelle Ota



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0252
12 March 1998

Mr Jim Bohn
7303 14th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98117

Dear Mr Bohn:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: We are writing this letter out of concern for the Navy's anticipated expansion of the missile testing range in Kaua'i and Ni'ihau. After recently having stayed on the island (Kaua'i) for a week this summer during our vacation, it came to our attention that an already large military facility was considering even further expansion, and in fact had already initiated an environmental impact study along these lines.

Response 1: While PMRF is currently the world's largest instrumented multi-environment range, it is still not large enough to accommodate the new and improved combat systems and weapons under development. Thus, in order to comply with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense Theater Missile Defense (TMD) systems which are under development, the requirement exists to enhance the range's capability to support testing and training for these systems.

Comment 2: According to information in a local newspaper, the plan would increase the number of support structures on Ni'ihau, as well as increase the area of the Pacific Ocean that would be effected by missile test launches. Our concern with this part of the plan is the direct adverse effects these launches could possibly have on habitat in the state of Hawaii and beyond, including international water which are home to many islands and atolls besides those which are U.S. protectorates. In addition, the structures to be built on Ni'ihau, on of the last islands in the Hawaiian chain that is in a somewhat pristine state compared to the rest, could further effect wildlife habitat that may never recover.

Response 2: Potential impacts on biological resources are addressed in the Biological Resources sections for each candidate area, including the Ocean Area, in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 3: Our second and perhaps more urgent concern is with the people of Kaua'i themselves, and how this plan may effect their lives. We request specific answers, in addition to the environmental study should our questions not fall within the scope of the study, to these questions:

How many family sustaining jobs will be created as a result of the expansion?

Will the Navy train local Kaua'i residents for these jobs, or will they be filled by a rotating roster of Naval personnel from other locations?

What types of disaster recovery training and public education will the Navy provide in order to prepare for inadvertent discharge of explosives as a result of storing dangerous missiles on a relatively small island?

How will access to Polihale State Park be effected?

Response 3: Specific effects of the Proposed Action on the people of Kauai are addressed in Sections 4.1.1.7 (Health and Safety) and 4.1.1.10 (Socioeconomics). Noise and other impacts on Kauai are also addressed in Sections 4.1.

Comment 4: How many family sustaining jobs will be created as a result of the expansion? Will the Navy train local Kaua'i residents for these jobs, or will they be filled by a rotating roster of Naval personnel from other locations?

Response 4: We cannot predict who will be qualified for specific jobs requiring specific skills. There is no plan for a Kauai training program at this time. PMRF has non-discriminatory hiring practices designed to fairly consider all qualified applicants.

Comment 5: What types of disaster recovery training and public education will the Navy provide in order to prepare for inadvertent discharge of explosives as a result of storing dangerous missiles on a relatively small island?


Response 5: PMRF has been storing missiles on Kauai since the 1960's and has not had a mishap resulting from storage or transportation of these systems. PMRF has safety procedures in place to minimize the potential for any storage, transportation, or handling mishap. Since the types of missiles anticipated to be used under the Proposed Action would be similar to current systems at PMRF or used by the Department of Defense, established procedures would be used and no impacts would be anticipated. See Section 4.1.1.7.2 for the proposed procedures PMRF has developed to minimize the potential for any liquid propellant mishap on the Island of Kauai.

Comment 6: How will access to Polihale State Park be effected?

Response 6: Restrictions on use of Polihale State Park under the Proposed Action will not change from those imposed under the current restrictive easement. Access to Polihale State Park is described in Sections 3.1.2 and 4.1.2.7 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimoa on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Jim Bohn
Michelle Ota



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0253
12 March 1998

TO: PMRF Public Affairs Office
attn: Vida Mossman
Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752

FROM: Jim Bohn & Michelle Ota
Seattle, WA

Ms Michelle Ota
7303 14th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98117

Dear Ms Ota:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Dear Ms. Mossman,
We are writing this letter out of concern for the Navy's anticipated expansion of the missile testing range in Kaua'i and Ni'ihau. After recently having stayed on the island (Kaua'i) for a week this summer during our vacation, it came to our attention that an already large military facility was considering even further expansion, and in fact had already initiated an environmental impact study along these lines.

According to information in a local newspaper, the plan would increase the number of support structures on Ni'ihau, as well as increase the area of the Pacific Ocean that would be effected by missile test launches. Our concern with this part of the plan is the direct adverse effects these launches could possibly have on habitat in the state of Hawaii and beyond, including international waters which are home to many islands and atolls besides those which are U.S. protectorates. In addition, the structures to be built on Ni'ihau, one of the last islands in the Hawaiian chain that is in a somewhat pristine state compared with the rest, could further effect wildlife habitat that may never recover.

Our second and perhaps more urgent concern is with the people of Kaua'i themselves, and how this plan may effect their lives. We request specific answers, in addition to the environmental study should our questions not fall within the scope of the study, to these questions:

- How many family sustaining jobs will be created as a result of the expansion?
- Will the Navy train local Kaua'i residents for these jobs, or will they be filled by a rotating roster of Naval personnel from other locations?
- What types of disaster recovery training and public education will the Navy provide in order to prepare for inadvertent discharge of explosives as a result of storing dangerous missiles on a relatively small island?
- How will access to Polihale State Park be effected?

Please send a copy of the environmental impact study to us when available, to the address below.

Thank you for your response,
Jim Bohn & Michelle Ota

Comment 1: We are writing this letter out of concern for the Navy's anticipated expansion of the missile testing range in Kaua'i and Ni'ihau. After recently having stayed on the island (Kaua'i) for a week this summer during our vacation, it came to our attention that an already large military facility was considering even further expansion, and in fact had already initiated an environmental impact study along these lines.

Response 1: While PMRF is currently the world's largest instrumented multi-environment range, it is still not large enough to accommodate the new and improved combat systems and weapons under development. Thus, in order to comply with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense Theater Missile Defense (TMD) systems which are under development, the requirement exists to enhance the range's capability to support testing and training for these systems.

Comment 2: According to information in a local newspaper, the plan would increase the number of support structures on Ni'ihau, as well as increase the area of the Pacific Ocean that would be effected by missile test launches. Our concern with this part of the plan is the direct adverse effects these launches could possibly have on habitat in the state of Hawaii and beyond, including international water which are home to many islands and atolls besides those which are U.S. protectorates. In addition, the structures to be built on Ni'ihau, one of the last islands in the Hawaiian chain that is in a somewhat pristine state compared to the rest, could further effect wildlife habitat that may never recover.

Response 2: Potential impacts on biological resources are addressed in the Biological Resources sections for each candidate area, including the Ocean Area, in Section 4 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

Comment 3: Our second and perhaps more urgent concern is with the people of Kaua'i themselves, and how this plan may effect their lives. We request specific answers, in addition to the environmental study should our questions not fall within the scope of the study, to these questions:

- How many family sustaining jobs will be created as a result of the expansion?
- Will the Navy train local Kaua'i residents for these jobs, or will they be filled by a rotating roster of Naval personnel from other locations?
- What types of disaster recovery training and public education will the Navy provide in order to prepare for inadvertent discharge of explosives as a result of storing dangerous missiles on a relatively small island?

How will access to Polihale State Park be effected?

Response 3: Specific effects of the Proposed Action on the people of Kauai are addressed in Sections 4.1.1.7 (Health and Safety) and 4.1.1.10 (Socioeconomics). Noise and other impacts on Kauai are also addressed in Sections 4.1.

Comment 4: What types of disaster recovery training and public education will the Navy provide in order to prepare for inadvertent discharge of explosives as a result of storing dangerous missiles on a relatively small island?

Response 4: PMRF has been storing missiles on Kauai since the 1960's and has not had a mishap resulting from storage or transportation of these systems. PMRF has safety procedures in place to minimize the potential for any storage, transportation, or handling mishap. Since the types of missiles anticipated to be used under the Proposed Action would be similar to current systems at PMRF or used by the Department of Defense, established procedures would be used and no impacts would be anticipated. See Section 4.1.1.7.2 for the proposed procedures PMRF has developed to minimize the potential for any liquid propellant mishap on the Island of Kauai.

Comment 5: How many family sustaining jobs will be created as a result of the expansion? Will the Navy train local Kauai residents for these jobs, or will they be filled by a rotating roster of Naval personnel from other locations?


Response 5: We cannot predict who will be qualified for specific jobs requiring specific skills. There is no plan for a Kauai training program at this time. PMRF has non-discriminatory hiring practices designed to fairly consider all qualified applicants.

Comment 6: How will access to Polihale State Park be effected?

Response 6: Restrictions on use of Polihale State Park under the Proposed Action will not change from those imposed under the current restrictive easement. Access to Polihale State Park is described in Sections 3.1.2 and 4.1.2.7 of the enclosed Draft EIS.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

Andy Licht
357 View Street #4
Mountain View, CA 94041

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
Public Affairs Office
Box 128
Kekaha, Kaua'i, HI 96752-0128

PMRF leaders -

July 24, 1997


This letter concerns the proposed expansion of the Pacific Missile Range Facility and I'd like it to be included in the record in public discussions on the project.

As a recent visitor to the island of Kaua'i, I have a point of view to share with you concerning the expansion of the Navy's Pacific Missile Range Facility. We no longer live in a world where activities as profound as Theater Ballistic Missile Defense (TBMD) go unnoticed. I was on the island barely a week when the news and complexity of the issues were revealed in discussion with residents.

This is what I understood from these discussions. Kauai'ns are upset by the arrogance of the Navy's silence and treatment of civilians as ignorant Americans that don't know what's good for them. The Kauai'ns are the guardians of this island for now, and as with all of us, share a wisdom that must be part of any decision making process that will affect the PMRF, the greater ecosystem, the cultures of the residents and its economy.

As an American, I am saddened and once again ashamed to be part of the America that is blind to the enemy within, that idea that we must destroy in order to preserve. As a visitor and tourist here, I had the opportunity to climb one of the peaks surrounding Waimea Canyon with a spectacular view of the island of Ni'ihau. Lets not allow this pacific jewel to become another Kaho'olawe.

With Regards,



Andy Licht



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0254
12 March 1998

Mr Andy Licht
357 View Street #4
Mountain View, CA 94041

Dear Mr Licht:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Kauai'ns are upset by the arrogance of the Navy's silence and treatment of civilians as ignorant Americans that don't know what's good for them. The Kauai'ns are the guardians of this island for now, and as with all of us, share a wisdom that must be part of any decision making process that will affect the PMRF, the greater ecosystem, the cultures of the residents and it economy.


Response 1: Thank you.

Comment 2: As an American, I am saddened and once again ashamed to be part of the America that is blind to the enemy within, that idea that we must destroy in order to preserve. As a visitor and tourist here, I had the opportunity to climb one of the peaks surrounding Waimea Canyon with a spectacular view of the island of Ni'ihau. Let's not allow this pacific jewel to become another Kaho'olawe.

Response 2: Thank you.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

4855 Haleiilo Road
Kapaa, Kauai
Hawaii 96746

July 28, 1997

Ms. Vida Mossman
PMRF Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

Dear Ms. Mossman:

These are my questions/comments for inclusion in the draft EIS:

- ⊗ Is there a "no action alternative" to this proposed expansion? And if not, why not.
- ⊗ We were told after STARS that there would be not be any planned expansions at PMRF. Then what is this?
- ⊗ What will happen to the people of Niihau if this is allowed to proceed? What are your plans for their safety and total upheaval of their way of life.
- ⊗ If the base lease is not renewed in 2030, will you just move to Niihau and move the Kanaka Maole elsewhere? And if so, where?
- ⊗ Please explain what kind of jobs will be created by this expansion: job titles, approximate salaries, length of contract, requirements for the jobs, and what percentage of these jobs you think may be filled by local people, and what percentage of mainlanders you would import in?
- ⊗ Please explain what explosives, chemicals, weaponry, etc. would be transported on Kauai's roads, and by how much you estimate the expansion of your bomb storage cave?
- ⊗ What plans do you have for clean-up in case of major disaster of your explosives, chemicals, weaponry, etc. Which company would you use for clean up and how much would they make?
- ⊗ Please explain just who we are defending ourselves against to the tune of 265 billion, what difference this program would make, and how it would offset the almost definite destruction of endangered species and a delicate ecosystem that is unique to anywhere else in the world.
- ⊗ Please explain why we are ready to destroy this unique area for just one type of defense, when other very real threats are in germ warfare, terrorism, etc. (Example of the Japanese terrorist group flying to Zaire in an attempt to secure the Ebola virus for their use, the Oklahoma City and World Trade Center bombings seem more of a real threat to me.)
- ⊗ Kauai and the northern atolls have a unique ecosystem with many endangered species. If we even lose one endangered species to extinction due to this program, it is one too many for we can never get it back again. Even the fact of conducting an EIS in these areas may damage the flora and fauna.

Draft EIS Comments
from Carol A. Beardmore
Page 2

- ⊙ Some of these areas are wildlife refuges. Does your federal program therefore supersede and override these other federal programs? If so, why?
- ⊙ Where exactly do you plan your launch sites to be, and how many?
- ⊙ What type of missiles, with what type of propellants. Please provide copies of the Material Data Safety Sheets for each type of propellant you plan to use.
- ⊙ Please explain how much and what type of consultation you have carried out with the US Fish & Wildlife Service who wish to protect this delicate area.
- ⊙ What about the potential pollution, dangers to health of our population and ecosystem, and your disaster planning methods? If your expanded cave of explosives goes up with a bang, have you measured or anticipate just much of Kauai will go with it?
- ⊙ Please report how much you are paying the Robinsons to sell out their Kanaka Maole wards.
- ⊙ Have you considered using Bikini Atoll? It apparently is still not livable after 50 years and would therefore have less impact.

Mahalo,



Carol A. Beardmore



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P. O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
\$090
Ser 00/0255
12 March 1998

Ms Carol Beardmore
4855 Haleliio Road
Kapaa, HI 96746

Dear Ms Beardmore:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Is there a "no action alternative" to this proposed expansion? And if not, why not?

Response 1: There is a No-action alternative being considered, described in Section 2.2 of the enclosed Draft EIS. It is the continuation of existing PMRF activities.

Comment 2: We were told after STARS that there would be not be any planned expansions at PMRF. Then what is this?

Response 2: At any given time, only known or reasonably foreseeable programs can be documented or analyzed. As decisions were being made on the Strategic Target System program, the Navy's TBMD program had not been initiated. The viability of PMRF is dependent upon new programs being tested, evaluated and training conducted as older programs cease.

Comment 3: What will happen to the people of Niihau if this allowed to proceed? What are your plans for their safety and total upheaval of their way of life.

Response 3: The socioeconomic sections of the enclosed Draft EIS (Sections 4.2.1.10 and 4.5.2.9) examine the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on the economy and culture of Niihau. In addition, Section 4.5, Environmental Justice, describes potential impacts to Native Hawaiians on Kauai and Niihau.

This Draft EIS has depended significantly on independent work that was already underway on Niihau prior to beginning this EIS process. That work has been groundtruthed by the people of Niihau, including its translation into Hawaiian by persons on the island. Relying on that work, and other available information, it is concluded that the Proposed Action would provide significant economic benefits to the people of the island and Niihau infrastructure, and that an existing Niihau Protection Protocol, appropriately strengthened, will minimize contact between military personnel and Niihau residents and protect Niihau's cultural circumstances.

Comment 4: If the base lease is not renewed in 2030, will you just move to Niihau and move the Kanaka Maole elsewhere? And if so, where?

Response 4: Decisions relative to lease renewal in 2030 are outside the scope of Draft EIS.

Comment 5: Please explain what kind of jobs will be created by this expansion: job titles, approximate salaries, length of contract, requirements for the jobs, and what percentage of these jobs you think may be filled by local people, and what percentage of mainlanders you would import in?

Response 5: We cannot predict who will be qualified for specific jobs requiring specific skills. There is no plan for a Kauai training program at this time. PMRF has non-discriminatory hiring practices designed to fairly consider all qualified applicants.

Comment 6: Please explain what explosives, chemicals, weaponry, etc. would be transported on Kauai's roads, and by how much you estimate the expansion of your bomb storage cave?

Response 6: The Health and Safety section of the enclosed Draft EIS (Section 4.1.1.7) addresses the storage and transportation of explosives on the highways. These would be handled in accordance with existing safety procedures at PMRF. Potential expansion of Kamokala Magazines is illustrated on Figure 2.3.4-3, and potential impacts are described in Section 4.1.5.

Comment 7: What plans do you have for clean-up in case of major disaster of you explosives, chemicals, weaponry, etc. Which company would you use for clean up and how much would they make?

Response 7: PMRF has existing plans in place to handle any mishap that could occur during routine operations. These plans include procedures for managing the mishap and clean-up. The Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste and Health and Safety sections of the enclosed Draft EIS (Sections 3.1.1.6 and 3.1.1.7) provide an overview of these plans. Which company that will be used and the cost of the clean-up would be based on the type of the mishap.

Comment 8: Please explain just who we are defending ourselves against to the tune of 265 billion, what difference this program would make, and how it would offset the almost definite destruction of endangered species and a delicate ecosystem that is unique to anywhere else in the world.

Response 8: The Proposed Action complies with guidance from Congress to enhance the capability of PMRF to support testing and evaluation of the congressionally directed Navy TBMD and other Department of Defense TMD systems which are under development.

Comment 9: Please explain why we are ready to destroy this unique area for just one type of defense, when other very real threats are in germ warfare, terrorism, etc. (Example of the Japanese terrorist group flying to Zaire in an attempt to secure the Ebola virus for their use, the Oklahoma City and World Trade Center bombings seem more of a real threat to me.)

Response 9: The need for TBMD testing is described in the enclosed Draft EIS in Section 1.2, Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action.

Comment 10: Kauai and the northern atolls have a unique ecosystem with many endangered species. If we even lose one endangered species to extinction due to this program, it is one too many for we can never get it back again. Even the fact of conducting an EIS in these areas may damage the flora and fauna.

Response 10: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

Comment 11: Some of these areas are wildlife refuges. Does your federal program therefore supersede and override these other federal programs? If so, why?

Response 11: Section 4.3.1.8 describes potential land use compatibility impacts on Tern Island. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities taking place, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained within this EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required on Tern Island.

Comment 12: Where exactly do you plan your launch sites to be, and how many?

Response 12: A description of the location and number of launch sites is provided in Chapter 2, Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives. Launch sites were evaluated for PMRF, Niihau, Tern Island, and Johnston Atoll.

Comment 13: What type of missiles, with what type of propellants. Please provide copies of the Material Data Safety Sheets for each type of propellant you plan to use.

Response 13: Chapter 2, Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives, and the health and safety sections of the Draft EIS provide information about the types of missiles and propellants anticipated to be used under the No-action Alternative and the Proposed Action. The Health and Safety sections of Section 4 address potential impacts from a missile or propellant mishap given the types of materials expected to be used in each missile system. The information provided in the Draft EIS contains data from Material Safety Data Sheets.

Comment 14: Please explain how much and what type of consultation you have carried out with the US Fish & Wildlife Service who wish to protect this delicate area.

Response 14: Potential impacts to wildlife on Tern Island are discussed in Section 4.3.1.3 of the enclosed Draft EIS. Utilization of Tern Island as a target launch site would be closely coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Extensive consultation with the USFWS, the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service and other agencies has been conducted and will continue throughout the EIS process. Section 7 consultation is being initiated with the transmittal of the Draft EIS.

Comment 15: What about the potential pollution, dangers to health of our population and ecosystem, and your disaster planning methods? If your expanded cave of explosives goes up with a bang, have you measured or anticipate just much of Kauai will go with it?

Response 15: The proposed storage magazines would have an explosive safety quantity distance (ESQD) established within which all debris from a mishap would fall. This area would be contained within the existing ESQD for the current ordnance storage magazines. This area is shown on Figure 2.3.4-3, and safety issues and potential impacts are described in Section 4.1.5.6, Kamokala Magazines-Health and Safety. Chapter 4 also contains analysis of potential efforts to air and water quality.

Comment 16: Please report how much you are paying the Robinsons to sell out their Kanaka Maole wards?


Response 16: Navy activities on Niihau are conducted through a subcontract with the Niihau Ranch. Terms and conditions for services are defined by this contract.

Comment 17: Have you considered using Bikini Atoll? It apparently is still not livable after 50 years and would therefore have less impact.

Response 17: Bikini Atoll did not have one of the principal prerequisites, namely an existing airfield, and is too far removed from PMRF for Navy Area TBMD testing.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waiimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

ELIZABETH ANNE FREEMAN

S-W-102

July 31, 1997

Vida Mossman
Pacific Missile Range Facility
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, HI 96752-0128

Dear Vida,

Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion on PMRF's enhanced Capability Program for Theatre Missile Defense. Although I recognize the need to test new TMD equipment, I strongly oppose military usage of any portion of the Northwest Hawaiian Chain of Islands. I believe these islands should be considered "treasures too valuable to touch." This pristine natural habitat, home to so many endangered birds and animals, should be closely held and protected by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service without the threat of military expansion.

I had the rare pleasure of visiting Midway in Spring of '97. I saw firsthand the largest Laysan Albatross colony in the world, the second largest Blackfooted Albatross colony in the world and at least 13 other species of migratory seabirds as well as Spinner Dolphins and Green Sea Turtles. The endangered Short Tailed Albatross (golden gooney) and the Hawaiian monk seal, both species facing possible extinction, utilize the atoll.

Considering that visitors are now being allowed to visit the only accessible refuge in the Northwest Hawaiian Islands I was pleased that guests were asked to adhere to strict guidelines to minimize the impact on the fragile ecosystem. I gladly kept over 100 feet away from the "golden gooney," at least 100 yards away from a monk seal and pup and our tour group spoke in hushed tones as we approached other rare nesting birds on Eastern Island as our guide had indicated that noise can disturb the nesting birds. Our Midway biologist also informed us that Tern Island, a part of French Frigate Shoals, is home to the endangered Hawaiian Monk seals, to 80% of the nesting areas for the Hawaiian green sea turtle and to over 17 species of seabirds with a resident population of over a quarter of a million. He described at great length how the few visiting biologists who do research on Tern endeavor to limit their impact on the environment.

Please consider my shock and dismay upon my return to Kauai when I read in the March 24, 1997 *Aviation Week and Space Technology* that not only Kauai but also, "Nihoa and outlying islands" were under consideration for expanded TMD missile test programs. I also reviewed a copy of PMRF's Captain Daniels' testimony on Jan. 7, 1997 to the Kauai County Council stating that Midway and Tern Island were under consideration as missile testing sites. Launch pads, ground hazard areas, hazardous fuels and emissions are inconsistent with "hushed tones," respectful distances, and rare and endangered creatures. Although I am aware that in the Enhanced Capability Program for PMRF currently under review Midway was excluded as a test site, I do not feel that Tern should be under consideration either.

Additionally, I was deeply concerned about the tone in the *Aviation Week and Space Technology* press. The 10 page article begins by noting concern that the capability of the test ranges in the


S-W-0101

continental U.S. are, "in trouble." The article state that the encroachment of, "urban sprawl," and other "environmental restrictions" are limiting the type of aerospace technology that can be tested. The piece states that the Pentagon is worried that the "problem" will grow worse with the "need to test longer range cruise missiles, hypersonic weapons and a whole spectrum of ballistic missile defense weapons" over the next decade. The Aviation Week and Space Technology author goes on to say that relief from these pressures can be found on Kauai at the Pacific Missile Range, a facility which can offer "largely unrestricted missile firing and flight test space."

The implications in both the tone and in the statements presented in the Aviation Week and Space Technology article give great cause for public concern particularly on Kauai. I guess it comes down to the fact that 'trust' is a big issue in the minds of many. Perhaps this is inevitable due to the vast size and power of the Pentagon and its Defense Industry Bureaucracy and the ongoing disclosure of evidence of questionable policy and political interest at these highest levels when it comes to issues of "defining the enemy," "safety" and "fiscal responsibility." (For example, many Americans are still waiting to find out about the whereabouts of the 200+ pages missing from the Pentagon's Gulf War records relating to chemical exposure of American soldiers. These same pages were found to be mysteriously missing from all three top secret locations where copies of the records were stored).

In conclusion I would like to say that I for one have the greatest respect and appreciation for those who labor and who have labored to protect America and I certainly believe in the goodness of all the Pacific Missile Range Facility staff and employees. Yet at the same time I am concerned about the *true* need to expand into the Northwest Hawaiian chain. Nor do I believe this expansion could be done without compromising the safety of the rare and endangered creatures that our government has gone to such expense to protect and preserve all these years. For these reasons I would like to register my opposition to the proposed expansion as described and suggest that alternative locations such as Johnson atoll, etc. be explored.

With Kind Regards,




Elizabeth Anne Freeman

P.S. As an addendum I would like to submit the text from Susan Jeffer's Brother Eagle, Sister Sky, a beautifully illustrated children's edition of Chief Seattle's famous address. I believe Seattle's words are profoundly important for all of us to remember when considering decisions which impact the environment, and therefore, our lives and well being now and in the future.

In a time so long ago that nearly all traces of it are lost in the prairie dust, an ancient people were a part of the land that we love and call America. Living here for thousands of years, their children became the great Indian civilizations of the Choctaw and Cherokee, Navaho, Iroquois and Sioux, among many others. Then white settlers from Europe began a bloody war against the Indians, and in the span of a single lifetime claimed all the Indians' land for themselves, allowing them only small tracts of land to live on.


When the last of the Indian wars were drawing to a close, one of the bravest and most respected chiefs of the Northwest Nations, Chief Seattle, sat at a white man's table to sign a paper presented by the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the Territory. The government in Washington, D.C., wished to buy the lands of Chief Seattle's people.

With a commanding presence and eyes that mirrored the great soul that lived within, the Chief rose to speak to the gathering in a resounding voice.




How can you buy the sky? Chief Seattle began.
How can you own the rain and the wind?

My mother told me,
Every part of this earth is sacred to our people.
Every pine needle. Every sandy shore.
Every mist in the dark woods.
Every meadow and humming insect.
All are holy in the memory of our people.




My father said to me,
I know the sap that courses through the trees
as I know the blood that flows in my veins.
We are part of the earth and it is part of us.
The perfumed flowers are our sisters
the bear, the deer, the great eagle,
these ~~one~~ are our brothers.
The rocky crags, the meadows,
the ponies — all belong to the
same family.

The voice of my ancestors said to me,
The shining water that moves in the streams and rivers is
not simply water, but the blood of your grandfather's grandfather.
Each ghostly reflection in the clear waters of the lakes tells
of memories in the life of our people.
The water's murmur is the voice of your great-great-grandmother.
The rivers are our brothers. They quench our thirst.
They carry our canoes and feed our children.
You must give to the rivers the kindness you would give
to any brother.




The voice of my grandfather said to me,
The air is precious. It shares its spirit with all
the life it supports. The wind that gave me my first
breath also received my last sigh.
You must keep the land and air apart and sacred,
as a place where one can go to taste the wind that
is sweetened by the meadow flowers.






When the last Red Man and Woman have vanished with their wilderness,
and their memory is only the shadow of a cloud moving across
the prairie, will the shores and forest still be here?
Will there be any of the spirit of my people left?
My ancestors said to me, This we know:
The earth does not belong to us. We belong to the earth.



The voice of my grandmother said to me,
Teach your children what you have been taught
The earth is our mother.
What befalls the earth befalls all the sons and daughters
of the earth.

Hear my voice and the voice of my ancestors,
Chief Seattle said:
The destiny of your people is a mystery to us.
What will happen when the buffalo are all slaughtered?
The wild horses tamed?
What will happen when the secret corners of the forest are
heavy with the scent of many men?



When the view of the ripe hills is blotted by talking wires?
Where will the thicket be? Gone.
Where will the eagle be? Gone!
And what will happen when we say good-bye to the swift pony
and the hunt?
It will be the end of living, and the beginning of survival.



This we know: All things are connected like the blood that unites us.
We did not weave the web of life,
We are merely a strand in it.
Whatever we do to the web, we do to ourselves.



We love this earth as a newborn loves its mother's heartbeat
If we sell you our land, care for it as we have cared for it.
Hold in your mind the memory of the land as it is when you
receive it.
Preserve the land and the air and the rivers for your
children's children and love it as we have loved it.





DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
P.O. BOX 128
KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser 00/0256
12 March 1998

The origins of Chief Seattle's words are partly obscured by the mists of time. Some call his words a letter and some a speech. What is known is that Chief Seattle was a respected and peaceful leader of one of the Northwest Indian Nations. In the mid-1850s when the government in Washington, D.C., wanted to buy the lands of his exhausted and defeated people, he responded in his native tongue, with a natural eloquence stemming from his oral tradition.

We have come late to environmental awareness, but there was a thundering message delivered a century ago by many of the great Native American chiefs, among them Black Elk, Red Cloud, and Seattle.

To all of the Native American people, every creature and part of the earth was sacred; it was their belief that to waste or destroy nature and its wonders is to destroy life itself. Their words were not understood in their time. Now they haunt us. Now they have come true, and before it is too late we must listen.

Susan Jeffers

Ms Elizabeth Anne Freeman
PO Box 298
Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Ms Freeman:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: Although I recognized the need to test new TMD equipment, I strongly oppose military usage of any portion to the Northwest Hawaiian Chain of Islands. I believe these islands should be considered "treasures too valuable to touch." This pristine natural habitat, home to so many endangered birds and animals, should be closely held and protected by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service without the threat of military expansion.

Response 1: Thank you.

Comment 2: Please consider my shock and dismay upon my return to Kauai when I read in the March 24, 1997 Aviation Week and Space Technology that not only Kauai but also, "Nihoa and outlying islands" were under consideration for expanded TMD missile test programs. I also reviewed a copy of PMRF's Captain Daniels' testimony on Jan. 7, 1997 to the Kauai County Council stating that Midway and Tern Island were under consideration as missile testing sites. Launch pads, ground hazard areas, hazardous fuels and emissions are inconsistent with "hushed tones," respectful distances and rear and endangered creatures. Although I am aware that in the Enhanced Capability Program for PMRF currently under review Midway was excluded as a test site, I do not feel that Tern should be under consideration either.

Response 2: Thank you.

Comment 3: In conclusion I would like to say that I for one have the greatest respect and appreciation for those who labor and who have labored to protect America and I certainly believe in the goodness of the Pacific Missile Range Facility staff and employees. Yet at the same time I am concerned about the true need to expand into the Northwest Hawaiian chain.

Response 3: Thank you.


Comment 4: Nor do I believe this expansion could be done without compromising the safety of the rare and endangered creatures that our government has gone to such expense to protect and preserve all these years.

Response 4: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

S-W-0102

7-234

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. BOWLIN
Captain, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Copy to:
CINCPACFLT
COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

7-30-97

S-W-103

Vida Mossman
Pacific Mobile Range Facility
Public Affairs
Office
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Kauai, HI 96752-0128

Dear Vida,

We want to protest against the PMRF expansion. It stands to reason that any unfriendly nation would want to destroy the source of all their missile activity. I don't think anyone wants our island to be the target of destruction. We've got enough problems on Kauai without asking for more.

Please have the draft EIS sent to us.

Thank you,

Mrs. Clyde Sussex
P.O. Box 3568
Princeville, HI 96722

S-W-0102



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO:
 5090
 Ser 00/0257
 12 March 1998

Mr and Mrs Clyde Sussex
 PO Box 3568
 Princeville, HI 96722

Dear Mr and Mrs Sussex:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

Comment 1: It stands to reason that any unfriendly nation would want to destroy the source of all this missile activity. I don't think anyone wants our island to be the target of destruction. We've got enough problems on Kauai without asking for more.

Response 1: The TBMD program would be similar to current testing activities at PMRF. Potential impacts to health and safety are described for each location in Section 4, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

J.A. Bowlin
 J.A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

POD
8/13/97

S-W-105
 AUG 13 1997

From nobody@www1.whitehouse.gov Mon Jul 28 04:35:00 1997
 Date: Mon, 28 Jul 1997 04:30:31 -0400
 From: Liz Randol <lizbrie@gte.net>
 Subject: Inbound-White_House WWW_MAIL => PRESIDENT
 Apparently-to: president@WhiteHouse.GOV
 To: president@WhiteHouse.GOV
 Errors-to: The Postmaster <postmaster@www1.whitehouse.gov>
 Reply-to: Liz Randol <lizbrie@gte.net>
 Message-id: <199707280830.EAA16383@www1.whitehouse.gov>
 Comments: This message scanned by SCAN version 0.1 jma/960226

[Connection Information]

CLIENT: lihul33007.pac.gte.net [207.115.133.7]
 BROWSER: Mozilla/2.0 (compatible; MSIE 3.02; Update a; AK; Windows 95)
 URL: http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/Mail/html/Mail_President.html

[Sender Information]

PERSONAL-NAME: Liz Randol
 EMAIL-ADDRESS: lizbrie@gte.net
 ORGANIZATION:
 RELATIONSHIP:
 STREET-ADDRESS: po box 685
 CITY: Kilauea
 STATE-PROVINCE: HI
 ZIP-CODE: 96754
 COUNTRY:

SN

[Message Information]

PURPOSE: Offer neutral commentary, advice, or a suggestion
 TOPIC: Local or State Issues
 AFFILIATION: No Answer
 SUBJECT: Military expansion in Hawaii - my home state

[Message]

Dear President Clinton;
 I have written you a couple of letters over the years - about Bosnia and a few other things, and you have invariably ended up doing the right thing. I campaigned for you, I voted for you, I laugh publically and poke fun at at the Republicans' petty, obvious efforts to skewer you and your family whenever I get the chance.. I am a fan. I hope you won't let me down on this one.

PMRF is the name of the military base here on Kauai. (as I'm sure you know). It is run in old-style colonial fashion by some cowboys who now want a bigger playground. In fact, they want to start shooting their big expensive toys (rockets) from and over Niihau The island, as you probably know, is the PRIVATE PROPERTY (-can you imagine, another colonial

7-236

hangover-there are a lot of them still, here..) of the Robinsons, an old family from missionary days, and it is where most of the traditional Hawaiians, those who are left, are living, still pursuing the old ways, still speaking Hawaiian as a first language.

Can you imagine what it means to start shooting rockets- for some fantasized war that only exists in the feverish brain of some general who needs to get a real life, over Niihau, just so the rich Robinsons can milk the Feds for a huge tax break??

I and plenty of my neighbors don't want this kind of Federal "aid". Yes, we are still in the process of recovering from Iniki, and it's a long slow process, and we could use some kind of Federal help-- but this is a desecration of our lands and water and our airspace that we just don't need!! The native Hawaiians don't need or want it either. Only the old-style political hacks like Inouye who were fresh out of new ideas about ten years ago are pushing this garbage down the throats of those of us here on Kauai, and pretending that the people here want it! We don't.

And it's not just Hawaiian sovereignty activists who oppose this disastrous move, as the divisive Robinsons would have you believe, with their racist rhetoric. The military has very shallow support on Kauai. Mostly from its employees and their families. A lot of people on Kauai would like some support in becoming self-supporting. We'd like to wean ourselves from the Federal feeding trough and develop small scale, diversified, low-pesticide agriculture so we can at least feed ourselves, and some help in marketing ourselves as a tropical paradise for eco-tourism.

All we'd need is some knowledgeable assistance in marketing ourselves on the Internet, in setting up programs that showcase our history and culture, things like that. (we could also use some help with the schools, which are completely losing the students, and with the enormous rate of teen pregnancy, drugs, etc- but I guess those are really local issues now.) All we have here is Green Harvest trying to wipe out the marijuana crop- meanwhile, the place is flooded with heroin, cocaine & "ice" --very scary stuff, and we're beginning to have the serious crime that accompanies it-- not to complain, we know the problem is nationwide and much better here than most places.

Anyway- I support you and think you are doing a GREAT job trying to get constructive things done under ridiculous circumstances, with active and venal opposition dogging you every step of the way. I appreciate you guys tremendously--but would you please take a look at what is a BIG issue for the people of Kauai-- we really don't want military expansion here- we want to be an eco-tourism site-- could you help us

with that? if anything?

It's a lot cheaper than throwing money at the tax-pig military!! and the results would be far more long lasting. And you could save a bunch of money by closing these bases altogether. I've probably gone on too long but it's a passionate issue- hope you understand. I'd like to hear from you on this one.

(M.S.)

Mahalo nui loa-- Liz Randol



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
 PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 P.O. BOX 128
 KEKAHA, HAWAII 96752-0128

IN REPLY REFER TO
 5090
 Ser 00/0259
 12 March 1998

Ms Liz Randol
 PO Box 685
 Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Ms Randol:

Thank you for your comments during the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process. We are responding to your comments in accordance with the State of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343, and the State of Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title III, Chapter 200. Your comments have been considered and your letter and this response letter have been included in the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft EIS.

- Comment 1: The idea of installing missile launch sites on the Hawaiian Islands National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), Johnston Island NWR, and Midway Atoll NWR is reprehensible at best. These refuges were established after the species they contain nearly became extinct, and the construction and operation of the launch sites there is certain to reverse the recovery process.
- Response 1: Section 4.3.1.8 describes potential land use compatibility impacts on Tern Island. Prior to any of the Proposed Action construction and operation activities taking place, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must first determine if the use is compatible with the Hawaiian National Wildlife Refuge. The Navy will request a determination based on the analysis contained within this EIS if it is determined that construction and operation would be required on Tern Island.
- Comment 2: The expansion of the Navy's facilities on Niihau can only lead to the destruction of the only remaining native Hawaiian enclave in Hawaii.
- Response 2: The socioeconomic sections of the enclosed Draft EIS (Sections 4.2.1.10 and 4.5.2.9) examine the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on the economy and culture of Niihau. In addition, Section 4.5, Environmental Justice, describes potential impacts to Native Hawaiians on Kauai and Niihau.

This Draft EIS has depended significantly on independent work that was already underway on Niihau prior to beginning this EIS process. That work has been groundtruthed by the people of Niihau, including its translation into Hawaiian by persons on the island. Relying on that work, and other available information, it is concluded that the Proposed Action would provide significant economic benefits to the people of the island and Niihau infrastructure, and that an existing Niihau Protection Protocol, appropriately strengthened, will minimize contact between military personnel and Niihau residents and protect Niihau's cultural circumstances.

- Comment 3: Expanding the facilities at Barking Sands should not be considered until the concerns of the Hawaii Ecumenical Coalition about native burial grounds are resolved.
- Response 3: Thank you.
- Comment 4: Finally, and as suggested by the Navy itself, none of these facilities are necessary for testing a system designed to defend naval operations from short range, i.e. submarine launched missiles. Therefore, using US Navy submarines as mobile launch platforms would reduce the cost of testing while increasing its realism and would provide valuable training for the submarine crews.

Response 4: Thank you.

Comment 5: As my letter points out, the proposed facilities not only are not needed, and thus are a waste of money at a time when serious efforts at reducing the federal budget are being made...

Response 5: Thank you.

Comment 6: ...(proposed facilities) also could endanger many at risk species of tropical marine birds, seals, and turtles.

Response 6: Potential impacts to wildlife, including endangered species, and wildlife habitats are described in the Biological Resources and Land Use sections for each candidate site and each potential support site in Section 4.

We invite you to our Draft EIS public meetings, scheduled for Saturday, April 25 in Waimea on Kauai, and Tuesday, April 28 in Honolulu on Oahu. Specific times and locations will be announced prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,


 J. A. BOWLIN
 Captain, U.S. Navy
 Commanding Officer

Copy to:
 CINCPACFLT
 COMNAVBASE Pearl Harbor

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

8.0 Public Hearing Transcripts, Comments, Responses, and Petitions

8.0 PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS, COMMENTS, RESPONSES, AND PETITIONS

Public hearings were announced on 8 April 1998 in the Office of Environmental Quality Control's bulletin and on 10 April 1998 in the *Federal Register*. Two public hearings in Waimea, Kauai and Honolulu, Oahu were held on 25 and 28 April, respectively. In addition, an information meeting was also held with the residents of Niihau on 23 April 1998.

This chapter contains lists of people who spoke at each public hearing (tables 8-1 and 8-2), followed by tables outlining the response to each comment (tables 8-3 and 8-4), followed by the transcripts of the hearings. In addition, the response tables indicate whether a written comment was submitted by the same person. Written comments and responses can be found in chapter 9.

**Table 8-1: Public Hearing on PMRF Enhanced Capabilities,
April 25, 1998, Waimea, Kauai**

Speaker Name	Transcript Page
Alvarez, Patrick	28
Anthony, James	39
Baptist, Brian	30
Beniamina, Ilei	75
Beniamina, Jim	238
Bennett, Dave	126
Benton, Wendy	138
Bulatao-Franklin, Barbara	171
Bullock, Gene	72
Cannon, Hilda	52
Chandler, Betty	122
Chandler, Jeff	110
Chandler, Linda	113
Corregadore, Michael	82
Daley, Richard	102
Dalton, Judy	204
Dawson, Jim	105
Diamond, Karen	209
Fernandez, William	226
Gardiner, Gregg	151
Georgi, William	166
Greff, Clarence by R. Daley	103
Honjiyo, William	239
Hopman, Arius	140
Hughes, Tom	130
Hull, Monte	212
Irwin, Richard	42
Isobe, John	93
Kagawa, Ross	205
Kali, Sr., Benjamin	175
Kanahele Jr., Malaki	102
Kanahele, Douglas	74
Kanahele, Mileka	187
Kaohelaulii, Enoka	79
Kaohelaulii, Leiala	79
Kaohelaulii, Luano	75
Kaohelaulii, Paul	75
Kawamura, Edward	234
Kelly, Healani	78
Kouchi, Ron	26
Kusaka, Maryanne	23

**Table 8-1: Public Hearing on PMRF Enhanced Capabilities,
April 25, 1998, Waimea, Kauai (Continued)**

Speaker Name	Transcript Page
Lawshe, Jim	162
Lemke, Paul	201
Lloyd, Alan	145
Loo, Michael	124
MacDonald, Ron	178
Makanani, Attwood	230
Makuaole, Sandra	198
Marston, Nani	116
McGregor, Davianna	85
Measel, Jr., Robert	194
Mildwater, Chris	211
Miyamoto, Alton	100
Mullins, Robert	45
Naumu-Stewart, Judy	236
Naya, Saiji	58
Neering, Hana	221
Nekomoto, David	35
Niheu, Welokiheiakeaeloa	61
Nizo, Thomas	183
Nunes, Wendall	158
Papke, Lana	107
Partida, Alberto	154
Peay, Bill	95
Prince, Jennifer	163
Robinson, Keith	242
Rogers, Nani	55
Shook, Dan	189
Sihvola, Pamela	118
Stokes, Ken	66
Sullivan, Patrick	49
Taguma, George	224
Taylor, Gabriela	134
Tokioka, James	32
Trask, Arthur	216
White, Emmaline	185
Yoshida, Laurie	90

**Table 8-2: Public Hearing on PMRF Enhanced Capabilities,
April 28, 1998, Honolulu, Oahu**

Speaker	Transcript Page
Aleck, Nancy	42
Bombard, Shawn	66
Ching, Jr, Val	27
Guard, Tim	24
Irwin, Richard	29
Jones, Michael	31
Kajihiro, Kyle	53
Kanahele, Chief Petty Officer	64
Kelly, Marian	47
Kihune, Robert	35
Lins, Fred	37
Marston, Nani	39
Mullins, Bob	61
Niheu, Kalamaoka'aina	45
Nizo, Thomas	59
Pearle, Clyde	44
Pitton, Jim	39
Pollock, Ed	52
Pollock, Marilyn	49
Rothschild, James	19
Teale, Laulani	57
Turlington, Dick	22

PUBLIC HEARING ON PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY TAKEN ON APRIL 25, 1998

PAGE 1 TO PAGE 248

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS

(808) 524-2090

CONDENSED TRANSCRIPT AND CONCORDANCE
PREPARED BY:

*RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC.
1001 BISHOP STREET
SUITE 2460, PACIFIC TOWER
HONOLULU, HI 96813
Phone: (808) 524-2090
FAX: (808) 524-2596*

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

[1] PUBLIC HEARING ON
 [2] PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY
 [3] ENHANCED CAPABILITIES
 [4] DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
 [5]
 [6]
 [7]
 [8]
 [9] Held on April 25, 1998 at the Waimea United
 [10] Church of Christ Education Hall, Waimea, Kauai,
 [11] commencing at 10.00 a.m.
 [12]
 [13]
 [14]
 [15]
 [16] Before: WILLIAM T. BARTON, RPR, CSR NO. 391
 [17] Court Reporter, State of Hawaii
 [18]
 [19]
 [20]
 [21]
 [22]
 [23]
 [24]
 [25]

[1] PROCEEDINGS
 [2] THE MODERATOR: Okay. We were
 [3] going to get started now, if I could have your
 [4] attention.
 [5] Aloha and welcome to today's public
 [6] hearing on the Pacific Missile Range Facility's
 [7] Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact
 [8] Statement.
 [9] My name is Louis Michaelson, and I
 [10] have been asked by the Navy to moderate today's
 [11] meeting.
 [12] Before I go over the agenda and
 [13] ground rules, the former bishop, Tom Takahashi
 [14] (phonetic), will say a few words.
 [15] TOM TAKAHASHI: Aloha -
 [16] THE MODERATOR: Tom, why don't you
 [17] come up and use this microphone.
 [18] (Discussion off the record.)
 [19] TOM TAKAHASHI: I want to speak a
 [20] few words about the facility that we built that
 [21] could be benefit not for Hawaiian's benefit only
 [22] but for everyone in the state of Hawaii. And I
 [23] know that my hometown - I came from Niihau and I
 [24] hope that my whole family, this will be a benefit
 [25] for themselves too.

[1] (Inaudible.)
 [2] (Extended remarks in the Hawaiian
 [3] language.)
 [4] And I'll offer the prayer.
 [5] (Whereupon, the proceedings commenced
 [6] following prayer.)
 [7] THE MODERATOR: To start the
 [8] hearing, I would like to take minute to briefly
 [9] outline the purpose of today's meeting.
 [10] Today's public hearing has three
 [11] essential purposes. The first is to describe to
 [12] you the nature of the program that is being
 [13] examined in the Environment Impact Statement; in
 [14] this case, the Pacific Missile Range Facility
 [15] Enhanced Capability proposal.
 [16] The second is to briefly describe
 [17] the Environmental Impact Statement process and the
 [18] findings of the Environmental Impact Statement, or
 [19] EIS as it is known by its initials.
 [20] These first two items will be
 [21] covered by Captain James Bowlin immediately after
 [22] my introductory remarks.
 [23] The third and primary purpose of
 [24] this hearing is to listen to your concerns and
 [25] comments on the draft EIS.

[1] The last item on the agenda, the
 [2] public comment portion, is really the most
 [3] important.
 [4] Remember that the draft EIS is just
 [5] that, a draft. This is your opportunity to tell
 [6] the Navy how it could improve its analysis of
 [7] potential environmental impacts before the
 [8] document is finalized and before the decision on
 [9] whether or not to proceed with the proposed action
 [10] is made.
 [11] Now a few administrative points on
 [12] making comments today. If you've already signed
 [13] up to speak, that's great. I have approximately
 [14] fifty cards already. So I know we'll have a good
 [15] turnout on that. If you have not and you would
 [16] like to speak today, please go to the registration
 [17] table outside this door here and sign up.
 [18] Everyone is welcome to speak. But
 [19] it makes the process run more smoothly if I can
 [20] call on people from a signup list. We will also
 [21] have a reserved area up here of six seats which
 [22] will be for upcoming speakers so we can move
 [23] through the process efficiently.
 [24] Everyone who came up today and
 [25] anyone who signed up to speak should have received

[1] a handout that says how you can be heard.
 [2] In terms of speaking, the specific
 [3] hearing rules that apply to that are that
 [4] individuals must sign up to speak in person at the
 [5] hearing. Five minutes is the maximum speaking
 [6] time for each individual. Each individual may
 [7] speak only once.
 [8] Combining or yielding speaking
 [9] times to other people is not permitted. Elected
 [10] officials will be given the courtesy of speaking
 [11] first. And all other speakers will be called on
 [12] in the order they signed up.
 [13] There is a Court Reporter here
 [14] today seated to my right. He making a verbatim
 [15] transcript of the hearing so that all of your oral
 [16] comments will be recorded accurately.
 [17] And as a part of preparing that
 [18] transcript, an audio and video recording is being
 [19] made of today's hearing as well.
 [20] You may also make your comments in
 [21] writing, if you wish to. And there are three ways
 [22] to do that.
 [23] First, you may hand in written
 [24] comments that you brought with you today, either
 [25] to me or the person at the registration table.

[1] Second, you can use the written
 [2] comment sheets that are available at the
 [3] registration table to write down any comments you
 [4] wish to make and turn them in today.
 [5] Or, third, you may mail written
 [6] comments to the name and address which appear on
 [7] the "How You Can Be Heard" handout.
 [8] Whichever option you choose, your
 [9] written comments will be entered into the formal
 [10] record of public comments on the Draft EIS, and
 [11] they will be given the same consideration as oral
 [12] comments offered here today.
 [13] If you choose to mail in comments,
 [14] please be sure to send them by May 26, 1998, which
 [15] is the closing date for the comment period on the
 [16] Draft EIS.
 [17] Also, if you would like to receive
 [18] a copy of the Final EIS when it becomes available,
 [19] there are three ways you can do that. If you've
 [20] already received a Draft EIS in the mail, you are
 [21] already on the list and will automatically receive
 [22] the Final EIS, unless you tell us otherwise.
 [23] Second, if you are not on the list,
 [24] there's a signup sheet at the registration table.
 [25] If you'll fill that out, you will be placed on the

Page 7

[1] list to receive the Final EIS.
 [2] Or, finally, you can mail in a
 [3] written request to receive the Final EIS. Also,
 [4] copies of the EIS will be placed in the
 [5] information repositories. A list of those
 [6] repositories is available at the registration
 [7] table and can also be found in section 9 of the
 [8] Draft EIS.
 [9] Finally, it is important for you to
 [10] understand that the Navy representatives are not
 [11] here today to make any decision. Their main
 [12] purpose in being here today is to listen to your
 [13] suggestions and concerns firsthand.
 [14] With that, we will begin with
 [15] Captain Bowlin's presentation.
 [16] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Thank you, Mr.
 [17] Michaelson. Good morning to all of you. Before I
 [18] go any further, I'd like to know if the people in
 [19] the back of the room can hear me and understand
 [20] me. I think it's very important that everybody
 [21] hear and understand what's said here today.
 [22] I'm Captain Jim Bowlin, the
 [23] commanding officer of the Navy's Pacific Missile
 [24] Range Facility. Welcome to this public hearing on
 [25] our Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact

Page 8

[1] Statement.
 [2] The purpose of an Environmental
 [3] Impact Statement is to assist government officials
 [4] in making decisions about a major action that has
 [5] been proposed. And we need your help. We need
 [6] your comments, your concerns. I really appreciate
 [7] all of you taking time from your busy lives to
 [8] participate in this democratic process and help us
 [9] with our decision making.
 [10] I would like to take a moment to
 [11] thank the elected officials who are present today
 [12] and also participating in this democratic process.
 [13] Of course, we will give them the courtesy to allow
 [14] them to speak first.
 [15] I hope I don't miss anybody. But I
 [16] saw Mayor Mamiye Kusaka; Ron Kouchi, who is a
 [17] council member; and other council members, Brian
 [18] Baptist, Jimmy Togioka, and Kaijo Asin (phonetic).
 [19] Welcome. We are glad you could come today.
 [20] I would also like to thank Tom
 [21] Takahashi for beginning our public hearing today
 [22] with opening prayer. Thank you, Tom.
 [23] Now I'd like to introduce Mr. Ave
 [24] Sato who is at the table sitting next to me. Ave
 [25] has managed the preparation of this Environmental

Page 9

[1] Impact Statement, and he's a member of the PMRF
 [2] Range Operations staff.
 [3] Also at the table is Ms. Vida
 [4] Mossman, the public affairs officer for PMRF.
 [5] You've probably seen Vida's name around at a lot
 [6] of places because she has been the focal point for
 [7] your comments and opinions and your inquiries.
 [8] We also have with us in the
 [9] audience commander John Ailes from the Navy's
 [10] Theater Air Defense Program. John?
 [11] All of us will be listening closely
 [12] to your comments and your concerns about these
 [13] important decisions to be made. Your comments
 [14] will be recorded verbatim so they will become a
 [15] part of the Final EIS.
 [16] I've arranged for staff members to
 [17] remain available to you outside the meeting, and
 [18] they are down the hall in the back room. They
 [19] will provide any clarification you might need on
 [20] the proposal or the environmental analysis. Feel
 [21] free to visit with them as you need to throughout
 [22] the meeting. But please do it in a way that's not
 [23] disruptive to the meeting.
 [24] PMRF is the world's largest ocean
 [25] range, with instrumentation that can create and

Page 10

[1] monitor training and testing environments for
 [2] military and advanced technology systems that
 [3] operate on the sea, under the sea, in the air, in
 [4] space, and on shore. For over 35 years PMRF has
 [5] served not only all the U.S. Armed Forces, but
 [6] nondefense agencies and commercial industry, as
 [7] well. Counting testing and training evaluations,
 [8] we support approximately 1,000 individual
 [9] operations a year.
 [10] Federal and Hawaii state laws
 [11] require that the Navy and the State of Hawaii look
 [12] at the environmental consequences of our actions
 [13] before we take them. This process assures that
 [14] both the public and the decision makers know what
 [15] is being proposed and the proposal's potential
 [16] impact on the environment. Our Draft EIS is a
 [17] joint document for the Navy and the State of
 [18] Hawaii, and it satisfies both Federal and State
 [19] requirements.
 [20] Many of you first contributed to
 [21] this decision making process at the public scoping
 [22] meetings we held in June of last year. You helped
 [23] us identify the issues we should analyze in our
 [24] Environmental Impact Statement. The comments
 [25] provided by the 430 attendees at the scoping

Page 11

[1] meetings are addressed in the Draft EIS.
 [2] Earlier this month we distributed
 [3] copies of our Draft EIS to everyone who had
 [4] requested them and also made them available at
 [5] libraries throughout Hawaii. We asked you to
 [6] review the document. Our purpose here today is to
 [7] again collect your comments on the Draft EIS. We
 [8] want to be sure that the Final EIS is thorough and
 [9] complete.
 [10] Your comments at this meeting may
 [11] be either oral or in writing or both. Your oral
 [12] comments will be recorded by Bill Barton, the
 [13] Court Reporter. You may hand in prepared comments
 [14] at the registration desk manned outside by Shar
 [15] Castor (phonetic) and Gail Larburns (phonetic).
 [16] Both types of comments will receive full
 [17] consideration.
 [18] After the meeting we will continue
 [19] to receive written comments through the 26th of
 [20] May. Any later than that, we can't promise their
 [21] consideration in the Final EIS.
 [22] Now let me tell you a little about
 [23] missile defense. The single most deadly
 [24] aggressive act against Americans in the Gulf War
 [25] came from one of the SCUD missiles fired by that

Page 12

[1] Iraq struck a barracks in Riyadh and killed 28
 [2] Americans.
 [3] By the year 2001 forty nations are
 [4] expected to have built or bought missile forces.
 [5] Future conflicts will likely have missiles on both
 [6] sides. Under the Ballistic Missile Defense
 [7] Organization, all the U.S. Armed Forces are
 [8] involved in developing an effective theater
 [9] missile defense for the United States. It will be
 [10] used to defend U.S. forces overseas and our
 [11] friends and allies, including civilians.
 [12] The Navy's program is called
 [13] Theater Ballistic Missile Defense or TBMD. It
 [14] uses the ship-based aegis combat system and the
 [15] standard missile. TBMD would protect not only
 [16] Navy ships but other U.S. and friendly forces in
 [17] coastal areas.
 [18] However, before we can rely on Navy
 [19] TBMD or other Navy theater defense missiles, we
 [20] must test them and train on them with the greatest
 [21] realism possible. One key requirement for testing
 [22] the defensive system is for multiple targets
 [23] launched from several different directions.
 [24] Another requirement is for realistic distances
 [25] between the target missile, launch point, and the

Page 13

[1] interceptor launch point. That's why a large area
 [2] is needed for tests like the area north and west
 [3] of Kauai.
 [4] While PMRF is very well-equipped
 [5] and operated by many of your highly trained
 [6] neighbors and, perhaps, family members, no
 [7] existing range can currently meet all of the Navy
 [8] TBMD training and testing requirements.
 [9] Therefore, the need exists to enhance the
 [10] acknowledged capabilities of PMRF.
 [11] These enhancements will result in
 [12] only small increases in the customary activities
 [13] of PMRF. Like most activities at PMRF, the
 [14] missile intercept test would take place offshore
 [15] and go virtually unnoticed.
 [16] The enhancements proposed include
 [17] upgrading existing radar and communications
 [18] facilities. These upgrades consist primarily of
 [19] replacing electronic components, but they also
 [20] include replacing an existing radar dish and
 [21] construction of small buildings to replace
 [22] trailers. Additionally, the proposed action
 [23] includes the construction and operation of some
 [24] new missile launch sites and some new sensors and
 [25] instrumentation facilities.

Page 14

[1] I hope it's been made clear to you
 [2] already by the document itself, by the press
 [3] coverage and our earlier meetings that not
 [4] everything we are evaluating is necessarily going
 [5] to happen. We are required by law to evaluate all
 [6] the reasonable alternatives.
 [7] Areas considered for the new sites
 [8] are Niihau and Kauai. And, in addition, we are
 [9] considering launching targets from aircraft or
 [10] floating platforms. Since the preferred options
 [11] of air launch and sea-based targets are still
 [12] being developed, we are also considering Tern
 [13] Island and Johnston Atoll as possible fall-back
 [14] target launch locations if the other two options
 [15] don't work out.
 [16] The proposed action would also
 [17] modify an existing easement over state land to
 [18] allow continued testing of a variety of missiles.
 [19] The easement term is proposed to be extended 28
 [20] years, to end in the year 2030, making it
 [21] consistent with other existing PMRF leases that
 [22] expire during the same time.
 [23] There would be no change in the
 [24] number of missile launches per year, the length of
 [25] time the area would be cleared of people, or the

Page 15

[1] number of acres involved. Similarly, the EIS
 [2] proposes amending an existing State lease to add
 [3] no more than 50 acres to accommodate two
 [4] additional earth-covered storage facilities at the
 [5] existing Kamokala Magazine storage site. The
 [6] State land board will make that decision.
 [7] The Navy, on the other hand, must
 [8] decide whether to enhance the capabilities of PMRF
 [9] to conduct testing and training for theater
 [10] missile defense programs. If that decision is
 [11] yes, the second Federal decision is which remote
 [12] sites, if any, to develop to support the programs.
 [13] Let me emphasize that I am not the
 [14] decision maker. The Federal decision maker is the
 [15] Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations
 [16] and Environment, Mr. Duncan Holiday. It's
 [17] important to remember that the Environmental
 [18] Impact Statement is only one of the factors that
 [19] the secretary will consider in making a decision.
 [20] Others include the program's importance, the
 [21] schedule and cost, and guidance from Congress.
 [22] To assist in their decision making,
 [23] we evaluated the potential environmental
 [24] consequences at each of 15 locations against a set
 [25] of 15 different environmental factors. And we did

Page 16

[1] it twice.
 [2] First, through the no-action
 [3] alternative, to be sure our baseline data were up
 [4] to date. And, second, for the proposed action to
 [5] determine any potential changes in environmental
 [6] consequences. So out of 450 potential
 [7] consequences evaluated, only 9 were determined to
 [8] have any adverse impact. And they're all
 [9] addressed in the Draft EIS.
 [10] Let me tell you briefly what we
 [11] found. At Kokee and Makaha Ridge a water shortage
 [12] presently exists. This would not get worse under
 [13] the proposed action. And we believe the shortage
 [14] will be relieved with a new State well in one or
 [15] two years.
 [16] We acknowledge that our
 [17] long-standing use of just ten acres of the
 [18] southwest end of Kaula Island for aerial and naval
 [19] gunnery training creates an adverse impact on rock
 [20] and soil there. The proposed action would not
 [21] increase the activity or the impact.
 [22] PMRF has existing instrumentation
 [23] sites on Niihau. All activities are conducted
 [24] with the agreement of Niihau's residents and
 [25] owners and are governed by an existing protocol

Page 17

[1] designed to protect the lifestyle of the
 [2] residents.
 [3] The proposed action would provide
 [4] for possible future establishment of the northern
 [5] and the southern concrete slab which could be
 [6] caused used for portable missile launches. Also a
 [7] small building and a possible air strip could
 [8] constructed as well as a graded site for operation
 [9] of tethered instrumentation known as aerostat
 [10] which would require restricted air space.
 [11] Activating a proposed area of
 [12] restricted air space over Niihau would have the
 [13] potential to adversely impact low altitude airways
 [14] that cross the middle of the island.
 [15] A second adverse impact potential
 [16] at Niihau involves landing craft operation. They
 [17] could on occasion temporarily disturb Monk Seals
 [18] hauled out on the sandy beach areas or Green Sea
 [19] Turtle nesting sites. In any case, this potential
 [20] impact does not effectively affect the viability
 [21] to jeopardize the continued survival of either of
 [22] these two sensitive species.
 [23] At Tern Island proposed
 [24] construction of launch pads has the potential to
 [25] temporarily disturb nesting sea birds, and

Page 18

[1] migratory shore birds, Monk Seals, and Green Sea
 [2] Turtles. Dredging could temporarily increase
 [3] ciguatoxins in fish in the area.
 [4] Neither impact would be expected to
 [5] jeopardize the survival of sensitive species. And
 [6] I want to emphasize that we are working closely
 [7] with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the
 [8] National Marine Fisheries Service to ensure that
 [9] they are involved in the decision making process.
 [10] As far as beneficial impacts, our
 [11] evaluations have determined that both alternatives
 [12] would continue to benefit the economy of Kauai and
 [13] the state, which includes over \$100 million a year
 [14] in direct PMRF expenditures and over \$7 million
 [15] dollars from official visitors. The proposed
 [16] enhancements could also contribute to keeping
 [17] PMRF's ranges and staff fully employed,
 [18] technically current, and viable.
 [19] In a declining economy and
 [20] downsizing military environment, we are all aware
 [21] of the truth of the statement that job
 [22] preservation is as important as job creation. The
 [23] proposed action would have potential beneficial
 [24] impacts on Niihau's economy with jobs.
 [25] The island's transportation

Page 19

[1] infrastructure would benefit from grading an
 [2] resurfacing existing roads and from clearing and
 [3] grading of a runway if those uses were chosen.
 [4] The runway could also be used as a water catchment
 [5] area to supplement Niihau's water supply.
 [6] I hope you found this information
 [7] helpful. Thank you very much for your patience
 [8] and your courteous attention. And thank you again
 [9] for coming to participate in this important
 [10] decision making process. Again, our purpose today
 [11] is to listen to your comments, your concerns, and
 [12] your opinions.
 [13] As we each express our various
 [14] opinions on this important issue, I ask that we
 [15] all treat each other with respect and give each
 [16] speaker the opportunity to make his or her
 [17] statement uninterrupted. We want to make this
 [18] decision making process meaningful and beneficial.
 [19] I have a few more comments if
 [20] you'll bear with me. That was the end of my
 [21] prepared comments. That was the things that I was
 [22] officially obligated to tell you this morning.
 [23] We had a short press conference
 [24] this morning where I made a few points, and I
 [25] thought I might summarize some of those important

Page 20

[1] points for you. And I've already touched on some
 [2] of them in the official presentation.
 [3] The first point is we've been doing
 [4] testing and training operations at PMRF involving
 [5] ships, aircraft, missiles, and ordnance for over
 [6] 35 years. It's been done safely and without
 [7] adverse impact to citizens or the environment.
 [8] For the most part activity at PMRF goes unnoticed.
 [9] The second point. The EIS document
 [10] is large. But the actual proposed activity is
 [11] fairly small. It's an incremental increase over
 [12] what we're doing now at PMRF.
 [13] Third point. This is not a done
 [14] deal. The scope of the EIS is broad. But all the
 [15] items evaluated won't necessarily be implemented.
 [16] We need to help the decision makers choose wisely.
 [17] Fourth point. The future of PMRF
 [18] is at stake. The enhancements to PMRF in the TBMD
 [19] program will keep PMRF technically current and
 [20] viable for the future.
 [21] And my last point is that this
 [22] project is to be done safely without impact to our
 [23] children and our environment. But the decision
 [24] makers need your inputs.
 [25] Like all of you, I want them to

Page 21

[1] make good decisions. I'm obviously a career Naval
 [2] officer. But like most of you, I'm also a parent
 [3] and a taxpayer. Thank you.
 [4] THE MODERATOR: Okay. We are ready
 [5] to start calling on the names of those of you who
 [6] indicated you would like to make comments today.
 [7] As I indicated earlier elected officials will be
 [8] given the courtesy of speaking first.
 [9] We have a reserved area which are
 [10] the first six seats up here. Those elected
 [11] officials who plan on speaking, if they would
 [12] begin making their way up there and occupying
 [13] those seats, I'd appreciate it.
 [14] I have a list of people signed up
 [15] so far. I will be calling on you in the order in
 [16] which you signed up. I will start out by calling
 [17] the first several names so you can get ready to
 [18] come up front here to use the podium.
 [19] Because we want to record your
 [20] comments fully and accurately, we ask that you
 [21] speak clearly into the microphone. Because of the
 [22] type of acoustics in a hall like this, it will be
 [23] especially important that you speak clearly in
 [24] order to make sure that the Court Reporter can
 [25] capture everything you say. And please state your

Page 22

[1] name for the Court Reporter at the beginning of
 [2] your speaking time.
 [3] We kindly request that you observe
 [4] the five-minute time limit for oral comments. We
 [5] use the five-minute limit at these hearing to give
 [6] everyone a fair and equal chance to give their
 [7] comments.
 [8] To aid you in knowing when the five
 [9] minutes are up, I have a simple method for
 [10] indicating times. After four minutes, I will put
 [11] my index finger up like this, indicating that you
 [12] have one minute left.
 [13] This should help you find a
 [14] comfortable place to wrap up your comments. At
 [15] the end of five minutes, I will put up my closed
 [16] hand like this, indicating it is time to finish
 [17] your comments. So it's important to look up from
 [18] your paper occasionally to see if you are being
 [19] given a signal.
 [20] We greatly appreciate your
 [21] cooperation and understanding in observing the
 [22] five-minute limit. Also keep in mind that oral
 [23] comments are only one way to share your thoughts
 [24] and concerns with the Navy regarding of EIS. You
 [25] can also hand in written comments today or mail

Page 23

[1] them in by May 26, 1998. As I mentioned, written
 [2] comments are given the same consideration as oral
 [3] comments offered here today.
 [4] I have a list of elected officials
 [5] that are here. It's not completely clear to me
 [6] all of whom of them have indicated they would
 [7] actually like to speak. So I will go ahead and
 [8] call the names. And if they don't come forward, I
 [9] will know what their election was.
 [10] Mayor Mariane Kusaka. Go ahead
 [11] then.
 [12] MARRIANE KUSAKA: Good morning.
 [13] Aloha. The County of Hawaii recognizes that PMRF
 [14] has grown over the last half of this century to
 [15] become a valuable asset to Kauai.
 [16] It is one of our largest employers,
 [17] presently providing over 800 jobs for civilian
 [18] workers. Its employees, both Federal Civil
 [19] Service and contractors, are important members in
 [20] this community.
 [21] The Navy and its contractors have
 [22] also been good neighbors. Their response to the
 [23] island's needs in the wake of natural disasters
 [24] and their participation in community activities is
 [25] very much appreciated.

Page 24

[1] PMRF is also a valuable asset to
 [2] the Navy, with air, surface, and subsurface ranges
 [3] allowing technical and support infrastructure.
 [4] Enhancements are being proposed to accommodate
 [5] development, testing, evaluation and training for
 [6] Department of Defense Theater Missile Defense and
 [7] Navy Theater Ballistic Missile Defense programs.
 [8] Part of the enhancements involve
 [9] modifying leases with the State of Hawaii. The
 [10] Draft EIS is submitted to identify and address
 [11] potential impacts to the proposed enhancements.
 [12] Our concerns already appear to be
 [13] addressed in the Draft EIS; protection of
 [14] archeological sites, protection of recreational
 [15] fishing rights of our west side fisherman,
 [16] protection of ecosystems, and preservation of the
 [17] culture of the Hawaiian people on Niihau. We
 [18] trust that the mitigation measures proposed will
 [19] be successful.
 [20] PMRF is a partner in our plan to
 [21] launch the community of Kauai into the 21st
 [22] century as we move into high technology. We have
 [23] worked long and hard to arrive at this quadrant in
 [24] our economy.
 [25] Like any effective business, PMRF

Page 25

[1] is in need to upgrade and enhance its capability.
 [2] And if we are to judge by the history of impacts
 [3] over the last 35 years, then PMRF has been an
 [4] excellent neighbor and friend to Kauai.
 [5] Let us allow the residents of
 [6] Waiimea and Niihau to speak for themselves. They
 [7] live here daily, and they speak from the heart.
 [8] The County of Kauai supports the enhancements
 [9] proposed in the Draft EIS. And we urge the
 [10] Department of Defense to move forward with their
 [11] plans that will allow PMRF to improve upon its
 [12] unique assets in order to support its defense
 [13] mission and to solidify its future in our
 [14] community.
 [15] I thank you, Mahalo nui loa for
 [16] this opportunity to comment.
 [17] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Thank you, Mayor
 [18] Kusaka.
 [19] THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much
 [20] for holding your applause. If you would keep that
 [21] up throughout the rest of the hearings. It
 [22] interrupts the speakers and counts against their
 [23] five-minute time limit. So if you have any
 [24] expressions of favor or disapproval, if you would
 [25] just wait until they finish their five minutes, we

Page 26

[1] would greatly appreciate it. The next speaker is
 [2] counsel member Ron Kouchi.
 [3] RON KOUCHI: Good morning. I asked
 [4] if it was possible to use the mike there and was
 [5] informed that that's not part of the rules. And
 [6] so the audience gets to see my best side, which I
 [7] didn't want to make happen.
 [8] I know that everyone who's here
 [9] this morning has sacrificed a lot because this is
 [10] important to be here. In my case, I'm missing for
 [11] only the third time in four soccer seasons my
 [12] eight-year-old's game that is going on in Koloa.
 [13] And it's difficult to explain to an eight-year-old
 [14] that his ability to enjoy the pursuit of life,
 [15] liberty, and happiness is not just words on a
 [16] paper that they learn in school and that the only
 [17] way that you can ensure that they enjoy those
 [18] rights is by having a strong and healthy country.
 [19] And part of that is having the greatest defense
 [20] system in the world. It will be important to his
 [21] future for me to be here to speak this morning.
 [22] The second thing that I firmly
 [23] believe is that if he wants to have the
 [24] opportunity like I did to come back home and raise
 [25] a family, a healthy Pacific Missile Range will

Page 27

[1] make a lot of opportunities possible for him to
 [2] choose that option.
 [3] In my written testimony I need to
 [4] make a correction. My staff got overzealous, and
 [5] I didn't catch the error. They said I was both
 [6] born and raised here. I was raised here, not born
 [7] on the west side. For 12 years I lived a stone's
 [8] throw from Koloa, so I know what a good neighbor
 [9] the Pacific Missile Range has been.
 [10] Seeing Captain Mullins here, he and
 [11] I worked hand in hand after Hurricane Iniki. And
 [12] those of us living on this end know the kind of
 [13] community support you've shown and how important
 [14] you've been here.
 [15] Most importantly I am here to tell
 [16] you this morning that at Wednesday's council
 [17] meeting the County Council passed a resolution
 [18] stating our support for the enhancement of the
 [19] Pacific Missile Range.
 [20] We did have one dissenting vote,
 [21] and that dissent was about procedure because the
 [22] member who cast the vote against the resolution's
 [23] procedure has always been a supporter and has
 [24] always voted in favor of the Pacific Missile Range
 [25] and its activities.

Page 28

[1] I would like to thank you for
 [2] giving me an opportunity to come forward and lend
 [3] my voice of support. Thank you.
 [4] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Thank you, Mr.
 [5] Kouchi.
 [6] THE MODERATOR: Patrick Alvarez,
 [7] speaking on behalf of Representative Abercrombie,
 [8] I believe.
 [9] PATRICK ALVAREZ: My name is
 [10] Patrick Alvarez. I am reading this statement from
 [11] Congressman Neil Abercrombie for the public
 [12] hearing on the Pacific Missile Range Facility
 [13] Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact
 [14] Statement.
 [15] As a member of the House Committee
 [16] on National Security, I have been carefully
 [17] considering and examining the proposed action to
 [18] place additional assets at the Pacific Missile
 [19] Range and off-range location to support the PMRF
 [20] activities.
 [21] I appreciate the opportunity to
 [22] comment on the Draft Environmental Impact
 [23] Statement which will assess the potential impacts
 [24] associated with enhancing the capabilities of
 [25] PMRF. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Page 29

[1] provides the opportunity for all concerned
 [2] citizens to be included in the process.
 [3] The PMRF is the cornerstone for
 [4] Naval testing and training in the Pacific. The
 [5] PMRF is essential to the future of the military's
 [6] presence in Hawaii. Enhancing the capabilities
 [7] with the upgrading of instrumentation and
 [8] technology at the PMRF means maintaining the
 [9] Navy's presence here well into the 21st century.
 [10] I understand that the EIS will also
 [11] consider the use of other additional sites,
 [12] including Niihau, for launch and/or
 [13] instrumentation. The residents of Niihau have
 [14] indicated to me their willingness to explore such
 [15] opportunities, provided their environmental,
 [16] cultural, and economic concerns are fully
 [17] considered in the implementation of such projects.
 [18] For me the support of the residents of Niihau is
 [19] paramount.
 [20] In addition, the expansion of the
 [21] PMRF will ensure that the United States has a
 [22] primary theater missile defense testing and
 [23] training range to help our nation defend against
 [24] future missile threats.
 [25] Some nations are currently

Page 30

[1] developing advanced naval missile systems. As
 [2] Desert Storm showed us, the need to protect our
 [3] troops is real.
 [4] The proposed action in the EIS
 [5] provides an opportunity for Hawaii to continue to
 [6] be a major player in the national defense of this
 [7] country as world events begin to center on the
 [8] Asian American region.
 [9] I will review the presentation and
 [10] comments made during the public hearing and take
 [11] these matters into consideration as the process
 [12] moves forward. Thank you.
 [13] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Thank you, Mr.
 [14] Alvarez.
 [15] THE MODERATOR: Council member
 [16] Brian Baptist.
 [17] BRIAN BAPTIST: I don't have a
 [18] prepared statement. I think when I was walking
 [19] here from the parking lot it really hit me how
 [20] important PMRF is.
 [21] My best friend from kindergarten on
 [22] is standing outside, and he works at PMRF, and
 [23] he's worked there 20 some odd years.
 [24] And it seems to me that the destiny
 [25] of the west side of the island and Niihau should

Page 31

(1) have the louder voice. And that destiny should be
 (2) the people that are affected directly, which are
 (3) the people of Niihau and the people of the west
 (4) side.
 (5) And talking to the people of the
 (6) west side and the few people I've gotten to talk
 (7) to from Niihau, they are fully in favor of this.
 (8) In talking about concerns about
 (9) Tem Island and some of the North Pacific Islands,
 (10) I've been assured that you will be working very
 (11) closely with the Department of Fish and Wildlife
 (12) and taking that into account.
 (13) In the concerns of Niihau, the
 (14) economy needs some help there. And I really feel
 (15) - and I guess I'd like to take this point to
 (16) thank the Robinsons for keeping that island what
 (17) it's been for all these years and to help them -
 (18) to help allow them to keep that island the way
 (19) it's been all these years.
 (20) It's not something as simple as
 (21) black and white. It's not something as simple as
 (22) a global answer for how this works. It's taking
 (23) into consideration the concerns that the people
 (24) have talked to you about, mitigating those
 (25) situations, and then coming up with solutions for

Page 32

(1) those situations that will allow this to go
 (2) forward.
 (3) We need PMRF. We need the jobs.
 (4) The people here should be allowed to make that
 (5) decision. I want to thank you for the time. And
 (6) I want to thank the people on the west side for
 (7) their support of this project. And I want to
 (8) thank the Niihauns for coming out today. I see a
 (9) lot of them out here in support of PMRF. Thank
 (10) you.
 (11) CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Thank you, Mr.
 (12) Baptist.
 (13) THE MODERATOR: Council member
 (14) Jimmy Togioka.
 (15) JAMES TOGIOKA: Aloha and good
 (16) morning. My name is James Togioka. And I would
 (17) like to take this opportunity to thank all the
 (18) people from the west side and for PMRF for giving
 (19) me this opportunity to speak on this issue that's
 (20) so important to this west side community.
 (21) The military is consolidating all
 (22) over the country, and bases are closing. We are
 (23) fortunate that PMRF is seen as strategically
 (24) important and does not seem to be in danger of
 (25) closing at any time soon.

Page 33

(1) As elected officials we are asked
 (2) to make tough decisions. And my conclusion to
 (3) this decision that I have to make is that when I
 (4) walk the neighborhoods campaigning for my council
 (5) position, I've spoken to many people from Weimea,
 (6) Kekaha, and Eleele, and people from Niihau about
 (7) what they thought about PMRF prior to this issue.
 (8) And the strong voices that I heard were we are so
 (9) lucky that PMRF is here from these people that
 (10) I've spoken to.
 (11) If we look back at Hurricane Iniki,
 (12) and how fortunate the west side was that PMRF was
 (13) here to help with the recovery of such a
 (14) devastation that happened to this island. We are
 (15) extremely lucky as an island, and especially the
 (16) west side, that PMRF is here.
 (17) Just this morning I called a good
 (18) friend of mine, Ms. Mary Bligataro (phonetic),
 (19) who has a big family here and is very close to
 (20) people from Niihau to ask her what she felt the
 (21) sentiment of the people were. She said, Jimmy,
 (22) it's a hard issue. It's tough because not
 (23) everybody agrees. But the majority of the people,
 (24) and strongly the majority of the people, are in
 (25) support of the enhancements at PMRF.

Page 34

(1) When I look around this room, a lot
 (2) of the concerns that the people have is what is
 (3) going to happen to the culture and the
 (4) environment.
 (5) And when I talk about PMRF being a
 (6) good neighbor, you know, I look in front of me,
 (7) and I look to the side of me, and I see Captain
 (8) Mullins and I see Captain Bowlin, and I know that
 (9) they have been good neighbors to the community
 (10) just through their efforts and their support of
 (11) the projects that they helped within our
 (12) community. And I thank you very much for that.
 (13) In closing, the last comment I
 (14) would like to make is that I would like to ask
 (15) PMRF to continue and proceed with caution and
 (16) always be sensitive to the culture and the
 (17) environment when you continue with these
 (18) enhancements on PMRF. And I am in strong support
 (19) of whatever you are doing at this point. Thank
 (20) you very much.
 (21) CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Thank you, Mr.
 (22) Togioka.
 (23) THE MODERATOR: Okay. I'm ready to
 (24) start calling the names of those of you who signed
 (25) up early this morning.

Page 35

(1) The first for names I have here are
 (2) David Nekomoto, Dr. Jim Anthony, Richard Irwin,
 (3) and Bob Mullins. I see Bob Mullins already seated
 (4) in the reserved area. If everyone would start the
 (5) comments by stating your name, I would appreciate
 (6) it.
 (7) DAVID NEKOMOTO: My name is David
 (8) Nekomoto, and I'd like to thank you for the
 (9) opportunity to present my comments this morning.
 (10) For the record, I've also submitted written
 (11) testimony to back up the things I cannot say in
 (12) four minutes.
 (13) First of all, I would like to start
 (14) off by saying that I fully am in support of PMRF's
 (15) proposed enhancements in order to accommodate
 (16) Theater Ballistic Missile Defense for the Navy and
 (17) possibly for other agencies.
 (18) I want to start off by emphasizing
 (19) the importance of jobs. There are a lot of people
 (20) in our community who would like to deemphasize the
 (21) importance of jobs. But I work at PMRF, and I
 (22) also work for the Robinson family. I work for the
 (23) people of Niihau, as well as the Navy. So I'm -
 (24) I've kind of got a view on both sides of the
 (25) fence.

Page 36

(1) But jobs are very important,
 (2) especially for the people of Niihau. They are
 (3) also important for the people here on Kauai.
 (4) My salary goes to Ishihara Market,
 (5) it goes to Big Save, it goes to Taga Brothers
 (6) (phonetic), it goes to a lot of different local
 (7) businesses. And my salary becomes their salary.
 (8) So the importance of jobs - I
 (9) mean, my salary alone is one salary. But if you
 (10) start adding up the 800 salaries that are involved
 (11) at PMRF, you end up with a very, very significant
 (12) factor.
 (13) Excuse me if I start jumping around
 (14) but I - I'd like to hit the important things,
 (15) what I feel is important.
 (16) As I said, I've worked with the
 (17) Robinsons. I've worked with them for almost
 (18) fifteen years. And I am the principal point of
 (19) contact at PMRF for everything that goes on at
 (20) Niihau with relationship to the PMRF programs and
 (21) projects.
 (22) And I would like to say and I'd
 (23) like to emphasize that every project that goes to
 (24) Niihau has to pass a number of scrupulous
 (25) protocols. First of all, the project comes to me.

Page 37

[1] I watch the project. I look at it. I evaluate
 [2] it. And I make recommendations.
 [3] The project then gets proposed to
 [4] Mr. Robinson who will take a look at it with a
 [5] very critical eye. And his next step from there
 [6] is to speak to the people in the village. The
 [7] project must pass all of these tests before it
 [8] comes out to PMRF.
 [9] All of the people that participate
 [10] in the project from the government's side are
 [11] fully aware of this protocol that was mentioned
 [12] earlier.
 [13] And in the 15 years of doing
 [14] business between the Robinsons and PMRF and the
 [15] people of Niihau, there has not been a single
 [16] adverse incident. Again, I would like to say that
 [17] again. In fifteen years there has not been a
 [18] single adverse incident.
 [19] Captain Bowlin mentioned that the
 [20] EIS is not a - is not a done deal. Well, we've
 [21] been involved in the STARS process. We went
 [22] through a long hard struggle with that EIS.
 [23] And in the STARS process it was
 [24] spelled out that there could be a possibility of
 [25] forty launches, four per year over a period of ten

Page 38

[1] years. And as people know here at PMRF there have
 [2] been four launches. This is another important
 [3] example of the fact that just because an EIS
 [4] states a number of things, it's not a done deal.
 [5] I'd like to say also that we took a
 [6] hundred Niihauns out to the launch site last week
 [7] Friday. They launched the Talescaster (phonetic).
 [8] We took a hundred people out there before the
 [9] launch to see the rocket on the pad. They came to
 [10] see the launch itself. And immediately after the
 [11] launch, we went into the launch site to view what
 [12] it does to the earth.
 [13] And I'm happy to report what they
 [14] saw was very enlightening. With their own eyes
 [15] they saw there was very, very minimal disturbance
 [16] to the area.
 [17] Lastly, I would like to say that I
 [18] feel a personal commitment to do my very best for
 [19] the people of Niihau and also for my own family.
 [20] I have a son that wears that white uniform. So I
 [21] want to make sure that I do my best to provide the
 [22] best possible systems for him to use. Thank you.
 [23] THE MODERATOR: By the way, the
 [24] next speakers after Bob Mullins will be Patrick
 [25] Sullivan, Hilda Cannon, Nani Rogers.

Page 39

[1] JAMES ANTHONY: For the record, I
 [2] am Dr. Jim Anthony, and I am speaking against this
 [3] project.
 [4] A public hearing on a Draft EIS,
 [5] Captain Bowlin, is not an opportunity to assist
 [6] the government. That is not what the law says,
 [7] and you are factually incorrect on that issue.
 [8] A public hearing on a Draft EIS is
 [9] about the law. And the law, as you know, Captain
 [10] Bowlin, stands above you. It stands above me. It
 [11] stands above the president of this country. And
 [12] it stands above all of the people who are in this
 [13] meeting room this morning.
 [14] A public hearing on a Draft EIS,
 [15] Captain Bowlin, is not a popularity contest. Even
 [16] if you were to - and I'm not saying that you are,
 [17] even if you were to stack this meeting with 5,000
 [18] people and all of them said they wanted it, if it
 [19] were against the law, this Draft EIS would not
 [20] survive.
 [21] Under the law you are required as
 [22] the applicant on behalf of the Navy to disclose
 [23] all of the impacts that are relevant for
 [24] intelligent public review.
 [25] Environmental law, including the

Page 40

[1] National Environmental Protection Act as well as
 [2] HRS 343, are laws that are designed to hold an
 [3] applicant responsible and accountable to what the
 [4] law says.
 [5] When you say, as you did in your
 [6] opening remarks, that we are here to assist you, I
 [7] want to assure you that I am not here to assist
 [8] you. I am here to hold you accountable so that
 [9] you meet the strict and stringent requirements of
 [10] the law.
 [11] This public hearing is about the
 [12] law, the National Environmental Protection Act,
 [13] and HRS 343. The fundamental major underlying
 [14] requirement by both these laws is that they
 [15] require an applicant to fully disclose all
 [16] relevant impacts, all of the relevant impacts that
 [17] are likely to occur if this project goes forward.
 [18] And the EIS, in short, is fundamentally an
 [19] instrument of disclosure.
 [20] In volume II of the Draft EIS, as
 [21] you well know, you wrote a number of letters in
 [22] reply to issues that were raised with you. In
 [23] thirty-four of those letters under your signature
 [24] you evaded your legal responsibility to adequately
 [25] disclose what those people were asking you to

Page 41

[1] disclose.
 [2] Let me provide you with but one
 [3] glaring example. A Dr. Woody Art (phonetic) asked
 [4] about human impacts in the event of an attack on
 [5] the proposed TMB and TBMD systems. Nowhere, but
 [6] nowhere, in your reply and in the entire two
 [7] volumes, despite the fact that you referred him to
 [8] section 4.1.1.7, did you disclose human impacts in
 [9] the event of an enemy attack upon this base.
 [10] Nowhere in the entire EIS is that
 [11] issue addressed, not that it is the only issue
 [12] that is relevant for you to have addressed.
 [13] There are many other disclosure issues which you,
 [14] Captain Bowlin, failed to make. And you are,
 [15] therefore - in my judgment, you have failed
 [16] yourself, you have failed this community, and
 [17] you've failed the requirements of the law.
 [18] Because I believe that this DEIS
 [19] has failed to meet proper standards of disclosure,
 [20] I am hereby giving you notice of my intention to
 [21] take this matter to court, which is the other
 [22] branch of government in which I can get a hearing,
 [23] and hopefully there have you testify under oath.
 [24] I am going to ask for a contested case hearing in
 [25] the event that you don't make proper disclosure

Page 42

[1] that is required under the law.
 [2] I want finally to remind you about
 [3] this, Captain Bowlin. The Navy in these islands
 [4] has a tattered and unfortunate record. Many of us
 [5] who are present in this hall this morning do not
 [6] forget the Navy's obstinacy and the Navy's
 [7] unfortunate tendency to operate behind a veil of
 [8] secrecy as the Navy did operate on Kahoolawe. We
 [9] do not forget Kahoolawe.
 [10] I am not here to convince many
 [11] people who want jobs. This review is not about
 [12] jobs. This review is not about how good this
 [13] project is. This review is about your obligation
 [14] to meet the requirements of the law. And you have
 [15] miserably failed to do that in this particular
 [16] Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you.
 [17] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Thank you, doctor.
 [18] Thank you for your comments, Dr. Anthony.
 [19] THE MODERATOR: Richard Irwin.
 [20] RICHARD IRWIN: Good morning,
 [21] Captain Bowlin, ladies and gentlemen. My name is
 [22] Richard Irwin. I'm here today offering testimony
 [23] on behalf of the 125 combat veterans that are
 [24] members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars,
 [25] Cordoza-DeFries Post 3855, Kapaa, Hawaii.

Page 43

[1] We speak from personal experience
 [2] on the battlefield. The experiences of combat
 [3] have led us to believe that a strong defense is
 [4] the best way to prevent war.
 [5] We strongly support the proposed
 [6] action in the EIS for the PMRF enhanced capability
 [7] and a theater missile defense program and believe
 [8] it being in the nation's best interest to proceed
 [9] as soon as possible.
 [10] Furthermore, we feel that the
 [11] proposed action will have a minimal impact to the
 [12] environment and wildlife because of careful
 [13] oversight by PMRF.
 [14] Some here today will undoubtedly
 [15] address these issues with hype and distortion.
 [16] But the facts are clear and speak for themselves.
 [17] PMRF has a proven track record of launching
 [18] missiles for over thirty years with absolute
 [19] safety to personnel, the community, and the
 [20] environment.
 [21] Some here may remember the hysteria
 [22] associate with the STARS program. The successful
 [23] four STARS launches and environmental monitoring
 [24] showed the facts to be as stated in the record of
 [25] decision; that is, minimal impact. The island was

Page 44

[1] not covered with toxic gases or showered with
 [2] burning debris and rocket fuel. In fact, most
 [3] residents were not even aware of the launches.
 [4] The facts are clear that PMRF and
 [5] the dedicated folks who work there are better
 [6] protectors of the environment than most. Just
 [7] take a walk down the pristine beaches and look for
 [8] yourself. The land and wildlife are well cared
 [9] for. Endangered species thrive under the Navy's
 [10] protection.
 [11] Some may say the Cold War is over
 [12] and missile defense is not needed. Just ask
 [13] yourself about the twenty countries that possess
 [14] or are developing nuclear, biological, and
 [15] chemical weapons and the ballistic missile
 [16] delivery systems. A defense is needed. And it is
 [17] needed now.
 [18] The real benefit of the Theater
 [19] Ballistic Missile Defense program at PMRF is to
 [20] better protect our armed forces that are sent in
 [21] harm's way. Our neighbors, nieces, and nephews,
 [22] brothers, and sisters, sons, and daughters.
 [23] Would you send them into battle
 [24] ill-prepared without the proper equipment? Would
 [25] you send them to fight without the best possible

Page 45

[1] protection against attacks from ballistic
 [2] missiles? I think not.
 [3] The fact of the matter is that we
 [4] cannot adequately protect them today. We do not
 [5] have an effective defense against short-range
 [6] ballistic missiles. The Theater Ballistic Missile
 [7] Defense Program at PMRF will result in systems
 [8] that will protect our troops, the ones who lay it
 [9] on the line for each and every one of us, our sons
 [10] and daughters, neighbors, and friends.
 [11] I ask each and every one of you to
 [12] support this program and the dedicated men and
 [13] women of the Pacific Missile Range facility.
 [14] Thank you.
 [15] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker is
 [16] Bob Mullins.
 [17] ROBERT MULLINS: Good morning,
 [18] Captain Bowlin, Mr. Michaelson, and aloha. I am
 [19] Robert Mullins president of the Local Council, the
 [20] Kauai Council, of the United States Navy League.
 [21] And I'm here this morning to speak on behalf of
 [22] our 432 members, many of whom are in the audience
 [23] right now. And I would like to ask them to stand
 [24] briefly and be recognized. Members?
 [25] (Pause.)

Page 46

[1] ROBERT MULLINS: Thank you. And I
 [2] would tell you, Captain Bowlin, that on behalf of
 [3] all of our 432 members we speak in favor of this
 [4] proposed action, and we certainly concur with the
 [5] finding of the EIS of no significant impact of its
 [6] elements.
 [7] Since the captain has done a good
 [8] job of explaining the national importance and the
 [9] background of this particular action, I would like
 [10] to take the time allotted to put a local face on
 [11] it.
 [12] Today, this morning, right now, as
 [13] we stand here and talk about the impacts of this
 [14] action and its various elements, there are over
 [15] 100 U.S. Navy ships at sea in the oceans of the
 [16] world trying to maintain a fragile peace.
 [17] On board those ships are 45,000
 [18] young American sailors, men and women who right
 [19] now are standing watch for us in places that we
 [20] can't even pronounce the names of. All set to go
 [21] into harm's way for us if the need should arise.
 [22] Those numbers are hard to get your
 [23] arms around, so I will try to put an even more
 [24] personal local face on it for you.
 [25] Those of us who were here in

Page 47

[1] September 1992 can certainly think back to the
 [2] events of those days, especially the events after
 [3] the hurricane that swept through this island, the
 [4] worst hurricane to ever hit the Hawaiian chain.
 [5] We remember, especially the people
 [6] of the west side, the actions of the young sailors
 [7] out at Barking Sands along with the soldiers and
 [8] the airmen who followed them several days later,
 [9] the members of the Joint Task Force to help this
 [10] island get back on its feet and, in particular, to
 [11] make this island whole again in the days, weeks,
 [12] and months after the hurricane.
 [13] I dare say there isn't a single
 [14] person in this audience if you are a west sider
 [15] who was there during those days that does not
 [16] recall seeing young Navy sailors from Barking
 [17] Sands out here helping to clear roads, helping to
 [18] deliver those luscious MREs, helping to get the
 [19] water systems back up, and generally helping to
 [20] get the island back up on its feet. I would also
 [21] say that I'll bet you most of you worked side by
 [22] side with most of those young men and women.
 [23] The question I would ask you is
 [24] where are they now? The question I would ask you
 [25] is where are they now? I'll tell you where they

Page 48

[1] are now. They're on board those Navy ships at sea
 [2] sanding watch for us right now, ready to go into
 [3] harm's way.
 [4] What kind of harm are they going to
 [5] face in the future? The same sort of harm, the
 [6] same sort of threat that we saw demonstrated by
 [7] watching the Gulf War on CNN back in 1991, theater
 [8] missiles, short and medium range, like the SCUDs
 [9] launched by Iraq.
 [10] That is why Congress has mandated
 [11] that Theater Missile Defense testing be done, to
 [12] find a technically capable, cost-effective
 [13] alternative to this threat. And that is why they
 [14] recognized that the broad open ocean areas to the
 [15] north and west of Kauai are the perfect places to
 [16] do this sort of testing safely, because of the
 [17] track record of PMRF at Barking Sands
 [18] So you might say that things have
 [19] come full circle in five and a half years. The
 [20] very people, the very sailors who helped us five
 [21] and a half years ago ask for our help today in
 [22] coming up with meaningful testing that will
 [23] determine whether a cost-effective, technically
 [24] capable alternative and a defense to theater
 [25] missiles may be struck in 1998 and the years

Page 49

[1] beyond.
 [2] Therefore, Captain Bowlin, I would
 [3] tell you again that on behalf of the 432 members
 [4] of the Kauai Council of the Navy League, we urge
 [5] you full speed ahead in prosecuting this program.
 [6] God bless all our active duty
 [7] forces in the field who are already deployed. God
 [8] bless the good people of this Garden Island,
 [9] cherished land that God has made. And God bless
 [10] the United States which is still, as Abraham
 [11] Lincoln once observed, the last best hope of
 [12] earth. Aloha.

[13] PATRICK SULLIVAN: Good morning.
 [14] My name is Pat Sullivan, and I'm here to testify
 [15] and provide comment on the EIS in concurrence with
 [16] its finding of no significant impact.
 [17] My personal background and training
 [18] is I have a PhD in engineering and I'm a licensed
 [19] engineer in the state of Hawaii. I'm also the
 [20] president of Oceanit Laboratones, which is a
 [21] Hawaii-based company that does environmental and
 [22] coastal engineering, as well as research and
 [23] development.
 [24] And the three areas that I wanted
 [25] to bring up or speak to with regard to the

Page 50

[1] proposed action is one area dealing with defense
 [2] requirements.
 [3] What's interesting is that
 [4] technology keeps changing. And probably fifteen
 [5] years ago we were sort of joking that with an
 [6] antique rocket, a bag of fertilizer, some diesel,
 [7] a GPS, and a computer you could make a rocket or a
 [8] missile. And what's happening is the cost for
 [9] these types of things continues to increase. They
 [10] are proliferating and there is certainly a need
 [11] that I won't begin to address, but it's definitely
 [12] there. And I think it's one of the most critical
 [13] issues facing the United States today.
 [14] The second thing I wanted to speak
 [15] to was the issue of economic impact. Oceanit
 [16] employs approximately fifty people. And we do
 [17] support one of the research activities at the
 [18] base. Our area is in the research and development
 [19] tests and valuation side of things.
 [20] I think you will hear today, and
 [21] it's pretty easy to understand, the impact of
 [22] jobs. But the thing that's perhaps overlooked is
 [23] the opportunity, especially for local-based
 [24] companies, to take those investments into jobs and
 [25] turn them into other things.

Page 51

[1] And just as an example, one of the
 [2] things that we do at Oceanit is we produce the
 [3] Ciguatera test kit called Ciguatest. And you can
 [4] buy it at your local stores to deal with Ciguatera
 [5] issues in fish.
 [6] To do that type of development
 [7] requires investments and research infrastructure.
 [8] That is the kind of thing that comes from this
 [9] sort of investment into PMRF.
 [10] The third issue is the environment.
 [11] We at Oceanit produce Environmental Impact
 [12] Statements as part of our job. We weren't
 [13] involved in this EIS preparation. But I think
 [14] they did a marvelous job in identifying the
 [15] issues, to reasonably disclose the risks.
 [16] The thing about risks though to the
 [17] environment that's hard to get your arms around is
 [18] that there's risks with almost everything that we
 [19] do. Any type of man-made activity presents risk.
 [20] One of the legacies that we deal
 [21] with is the risk of extensive agriculture in the
 [22] state of Hawaii And resultant impact to the ground
 [23] water. If we knew today what we knew then, that
 [24] probably wouldn't have occurred.
 [25] One of the things we have today

Page 52

[1] which is part of the EIS process is through this
 [2] process there's much greater awareness to disclose
 [3] and to identify issues. We have more technology
 [4] today than ever before to deal with those issues.
 [5] And it's through these actions that we are able to
 [6] minimize risk.

[7] And from that standpoint, I think
 [8] the proposed actions here for the - as discussed
 [9] in the EIS presents a unique opportunity for not
 [10] just the U.S. military, not just for Kauai, but
 [11] for the entire state of Hawaii.

[12] And so I'd like to just thank you
 [13] for the opportunity to present my views and
 [14] provide testimony on the - in favor of the EIS.
 [15] Thanks.

[16] THE MODERATOR: Again, so that you
 [17] can get ready to come up to the reserved seating
 [18] and be ready to go, after Nani Rogers, it will be
 [19] Dr. Saiji Naya with the office of Business and
 [20] Economic Development, Welokihaikeoeloa Niheu, Ken
 [21] Stokes, A.E. Gene Bullock, and Douglas Kanahale.

[22] HILDA CANNON: Good morning. My
 [23] name is Hilda Cannon. And I am a Kauai resident
 [24] as well as the Kauai District Coordinator for
 [25] Catholic Charities. I am here to speak on behalf

Page 53

[1] of the pending enhancement of the Pacific Missile
 [2] Range Facilities project.

[3] This proposed extension should have
 [4] positive results for our island people and our
 [5] island economy. We expect that there will be
 [6] additional job opportunities for many who
 [7] presently have no hope for survival unless
 [8] projects such as these can happen on Kauai.

[9] And it is without question in my
 [10] mind that PMRF has taken into consideration all
 [11] the ramifications of this project. And how it
 [12] will affect our island people.

[13] This had been the pattern of
 [14] thought for this facility. PMRF has demonstrated
 [15] its caring for this island through critical times.
 [16] Specifically, after Hurricane Iniki's attack on
 [17] us, PMRF was here for us in a multitude of ways.
 [18] Catholic charities received several
 [19] grants to aid the victims of Iniki. PMRF
 [20] volunteered their time, their expertise to precut,
 [21] construct storage units needed throughout the
 [22] island for people to place their household goods
 [23] until their homes could be repaired.
 [24] They assisted the elderly by going
 [25] to their home sites to construct these desperately

Page 54

[1] needed units. They covered rooftops for dwellings
 [2] which were still standing so people could at least
 [3] have shelter in their own homes.

[4] They brought blankets, pillows,
 [5] water, and ice for all ages. They delivered food.
 [6] They cleared roadways. They were a vital
 [7] life-line to the people on Kauai. And gave us
 [8] hope and encouragement.

[9] I am here to support their efforts
 [10] to let us be involved in the high technology
 [11] demands of our high tech society. They have been
 [12] there for us, and we needed their support. Let us
 [13] please do the same for them. They deserve this
 [14] and more.

[15] Let us recognize the fact that PMRF
 [16] are good neighbors. Thank you.

[17] THE MODERATOR: I also want to
 [18] mention that if you have brought written comments
 [19] that you are speaking from and you want to hand
 [20] those in to me, I can see that they get to the
 [21] Court Reporter. It makes it easier for him to
 [22] make sure we get an accurate record.
 [23] We will have a problem if you try
 [24] to address from that side. You get feedback from
 [25] the microphone. I appreciate if you speak out in

Page 55

[1] front of the microphone.
 [2] NANI ROGERS: Sorry, but I think
 [3] it's rude to turn my back on the people here. I
 [4] would rather face this way -
 [5] THE MODERATOR: As long as I can
 [6] hear you.
 [7] NANI ROGERS: (Hawaiian statement.)
 [8] For the record, my name is Puanani (phonetic)
 [9] Rogers. I was born and raised and still live in
 [10] the ahupuaa on this island.
 [11] (Hawaiian statement.) And I want
 [12] to preface my statement with how it is that I am
 [13] standing here before you this morning.
 [14] It is not a very easy thing for me
 [15] to be here and to stand here to speak to you,
 [16] especially before such a huge gathering and
 [17] because I know that there is a level of emotions
 [18] that this issue does bring to the surface.
 [19] And I do feel it very much so in my
 [20] naau right now. It makes me very nervous. And I
 [21] want to preface my statement also by saying that I
 [22] come with no malice and no anger to any of you. I
 [23] respect everyone's opinion. It is your human
 [24] right to express it in the way you feel is right.
 [25] And you sit and stand where you choose to be.

Page 55

[1] Maikai no.
 [2] It is also hard for me to stand here
 [3] before you because five years ago I was doing the
 [4] same thing. We were at the Kauai War Memorial
 [5] hall, and many of us were there to bear testimony
 [6] to express our sincere feelings. And what
 [7] happened as a result, the missiles were launched
 [8] anyway.
 [9] So it was kind of a defeating
 [10] feeling. I still feel like this new EIS has not
 [11] changed anything. It's like I feel like a flea
 [12] standing in front of an elephant. I feel very
 [13] overpowered by their power and their money. But
 [14] aole pili kia, you can eat an elephant one bite at
 [15] a time.
 [16] For days have been going through my
 [17] mind many words, many things, that I thought I
 [18] would want to say. And as of last night there was
 [19] nothing that I had done on paper yet. So I went
 [20] to bed. And at 12:00 midnight I got out of bed, I
 [21] went into the living room, and I sat down and
 [22] pulled this tablet out, and I started writing.
 [23] And that is what I am going to read to you today.
 [24] (Hawaiian statement.) Please
 [25] forgive me if I offend anyone. But it is not my

Page 57

[1] intention.
 [2] I wrote PMRF equals war. War
 [3] equals to kill. Ke Akua's law says thou shalt not
 [4] kill. PMRF does not follow Ke Akua's law. If you
 [5] support PMRF, if you work for PMRF, then you
 [6] support war. Then you support killing. Then you
 [7] are against Ke Akua's law.
 [8] PMRF sits on sacred lands. PMRF
 [9] sits on stolen lands. Ke Akua's law says thou
 [10] shalt not steal. If you support PMRF, if you work
 [11] for PMRF, you are against Ke Akua's laws.
 [12] Many of the words of PMRF is -
 [13] THE MODERATOR: Nani, you have one
 [14] minute left.
 [15] NANI ROGERS: Mahalo. They say we
 [16] are safe. There will be no harm to living things
 [17] in our ocean. And yet they test weapons that will
 [18] kill all these things. Ke Akua's law says we must
 [19] not harm anything or anyone. PMRF ignores Ke
 [20] Akua's law of harm.
 [21] Ke Akua says we must pule. We must
 [22] have faith in our pule, our faith and pule will
 [23] protect us. PMRF says they are protection. But
 [24] we need to be protected from them. They are the
 [25] evil doers.

Page 58

[1] We pray for the mana, the mana will
 [2] take care of us. But I say use your mana akamia.
 [3] Beware of those who will suck our money and try to
 [4] weaken our strength. We must kua, resist. We
 [5] must ho'omau, persist. We must hoopaa in the
 [6] truth, The oiaio.
 [7] We must be nonviolent. We must be
 [8] ho'o ikahi (phonetic), stand together as one for
 [9] peace, not war.
 [10] THE MODERATOR: Sorry, your time is
 [11] up. Nani, thank you very much for your comments.
 [12] NANI ROGERS: Mahalo.
 [13] THE MODERATOR: Dr. Saiji Naya.
 [14] SAJI NAYA: Aloha. And thank you
 [15] very much for holding this hearing.
 [16] My name is Dr. Saiji F. Naya. I'm
 [17] a State Department of Business, Economic
 [18] Development, and Tourism director. Most of my
 [19] professional career I have spent as economic
 [20] professor doing research. I have written over 100
 [21] books and articles.
 [22] One finding I have is that the key
 [23] to the economic success of the United States has
 [24] been technology and technology innovation.
 [25] Technology plays most crucial role.

Page 59

[1] Not too many people realize that this advancement
 [2] of technology originates from U.S. military and
 [3] other Federal Government activities. Not all
 [4] certainly. But a great deal of them come from
 [5] U.S. military and defense as well as other Federal
 [6] program activities.
 [7] What you have at PMRF is a good
 [8] example of this. We are very fortunate that
 [9] Senator Inouye has been instrumental in bringing
 [10] defense technologies to our state and expanding
 [11] Hawaii's contribution to national security.
 [12] One measure of PMRF is that it
 [13] provides high quality and challenging jobs for
 [14] many of our residents and youngsters.
 [15] In fact the PMRF is a major
 [16] contributor to our local economy. Aside from the
 [17] state and county, it is the second single largest
 [18] employer on Kauai, with more than 800 workers and
 [19] generating more than \$112 million in direct
 [20] expenditures in 1997 alone.
 [21] This spending, in turn, has
 [22] additional impacts on other sectors of local
 [23] economy. Therefore, total impact is much, much
 [24] greater.
 [25] Let me cite a few reasons why the

Page 60

[1] proposed upgrades will help sustain and expand
 [2] these economic benefits.
 [3] First, the new project will bring
 [4] in more than \$10 million in funds for construction
 [5] improvements. This is good news for local
 [6] builders and construction workers.
 [7] Also, there will be added demand
 [8] for engineers, technicians, and other
 [9] professionals with income of several million
 [10] dollars.
 [11] There will also be positive impact
 [12] on tourism in Kauai. It is estimated that
 [13] additional number of official visitors to Kauai
 [14] during the planning and testing phases will
 [15] generate an additional \$6 million in visitor
 [16] industry revenues.
 [17] If we count direct and indirect
 [18] impact of this new program, there will be 300
 [19] new - additional jobs in Kauai.
 [20] All of us read about defense
 [21] downsizing. It's the national trend. It's
 [22] happening in our backyard. It's happening at
 [23] Pearl Harbor. Many of them are losing jobs.
 [24] Layoffs are also anticipated for
 [25] PMRF. Many contractors and existing employees

Page 61

[1] might lose their jobs. But if the proposed
 [2] improvements go forward, we would be able to save
 [3] layoffs as Navy sponsors will be able to rehire
 [4] these workers.
 [5] I support strongly the proposed
 [6] expansion. And I have longer testimony, written
 [7] testimony. I will leave it with you.
 [8] I thank you very much for the
 [9] opportunity to testify on behalf of this
 [10] initiative. Thank you.
 [11] (Chanting in Hawaiian language.)
 [12] (Extended remarks in the Hawaiian
 [13] language.)
 [14] WELOKIHIAKEOELOA NIHEU:
 [15] Indigenous people of the Pacific have been
 [16] oppressed by militarism. Militarism of the
 [17] oppressing government, militarism of the American
 [18] government, and militarism of the British
 [19] Commonwealth.
 [20] Those people have been oppressed by
 [21] military projects. For example, Kahiki, as we all
 [22] call it, Tahiti. They tried their bombing there
 [23] for years and years. And the end result has been
 [24] the genocide of the Tahitian people.
 [25] (Brief statement in the Hawaiian

Page 62

[1] language.)
 [2] Indigenous people of the land of
 [3] the hanauma white cloud, commonly known as New
 [4] Zealand. The military has gone there and
 [5] confiscated millions of acres of land belonging to
 [6] the first people of no kealoa for military
 [7] projects.
 [8] I do not have to explain the
 [9] militarism of the United States government towards
 [10] Hawaii Loa (inaudible) -
 [11] THE MODERATOR: Mr. Niheu, some
 [12] people are indicating they are having difficult
 [13] hearing you. If you would please use the
 [14] microphone.
 [15] WELOKIHIAKEOELOA NIHEU: And the
 [16] (Brief statement in the Hawaiian
 [17] language.)
 [18] The Chilean government has
 [19] continued to oppress the indigenous people
 [20] Arapanui.
 [21] I am here not to praise Pacific
 [22] Missile Range Facility. On the contrary, I am
 [23] here to bury them.
 [24] I am here trying to express the
 [25] wishes and feelings of seven generations down the

Page 63

[1] road. For if the military plans to occupy my home
 [2] village, there will be problems, as experienced by
 [3] indigenous people throughout the world.
 [4] THE MODERATOR: One minute left,
 [5] Mr. Niheu.
 [6] WELOKIHIAKEOELOA NIHEU: I am here
 [7] to share with you my experience of analyzing the
 [8] United States of America and all of its lies and
 [9] commitments towards our peoples.
 [10] For example, the United States of
 [11] America has signed an agreement called the
 [12] Declaration of Human Rights, of which these laws
 [13] have been in existence since the late 1940s.
 [14] But if you exam the record of the
 [15] United States government and its obligations
 [16] towards our peoples of the world, it's been an
 [17] utter failure. It's been one of dispossession.
 [18] It's been one of oppression.
 [19] I wish I had more time to talk mau
 [20] ana from Niihau in regard to what I know.
 [21] And I would more than gladly take the opportunity
 [22] to go to Puuwaawaa to share with you face to face
 [23] my mahalo. And with that in mind, I would like to
 [24] say that I had an opportunity to teach at pu'u wai
 [25] but unfortunately my request was turned down.

Page 64

[1] THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr.
 [2] Niheu. Your time is up.
 [3] WELOKIHIAKEOELOA NIHEU: In
 [4] closing, I would like to say -
 [5] THE MODERATOR: We'll have to call
 [6] a recess if you cannot finish your comments.
 [7] WELOKIHIAKEOELOA NIHEU:
 [8] (Extended remarks in the Hawaiian
 [9] language.)
 [10] (Chanting in Hawaiian language.)
 [11] THE MODERATOR: I will call a
 [12] recess for five minutes. Thank you very much.
 [13] (Chanting in Hawaiian language.)
 [14] (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
 [15] THE MODERATOR: We're ready to get
 [16] started again. We apologize for the technical
 [17] difficulties. This room has beautiful
 [18] architecture and it's a nice room to have a
 [19] meeting in, but the acoustics are difficult, as
 [20] all large rooms are.
 [21] As a result I would like to remind
 [22] people again and request - if I could get the
 [23] crowd please to lower their voices, we need to get
 [24] started again.
 [25] I have a list of over ninety

Page 65

[1] speakers. At the rate of approximately fifteen an
 [2] hour, let's say, that means we will probably be
 [3] here this evening. That's fine. But we want to
 [4] do this as efficiently as we can.
 [5] I will also mention that sometime
 [6] between 12:30 and 1:00 we will be taking a
 [7] thirty-minute lunch break. That will be the only
 [8] extended break we will take the entire day.
 [9] The rest of the time we will
 [10] occasionally take a five- or ten-minute break
 [11] maybe every two hours to allow the Court Reporter
 [12] to take a break since, as you might imagine, this
 [13] is a pretty grueling activity for him.
 [14] I would also kindly request that
 [15] again, because of the acoustics and because of the
 [16] need to use a public address system in order for
 [17] everyone to be heard, that you speak into the
 [18] microphone and that you please leave it in the
 [19] position it is in.
 [20] When you turn it around, as you
 [21] probably noticed, we get feedback problems. I
 [22] know you would like to address the audience here.
 [23] I will just remind you that the purpose of this
 [24] public hearing is to provide comments to the
 [25] preparers of the document. They are the panel.

Page 66

[1] That is the reason they are seated in front of
 [2] you. And we would appreciate it if you would
 [3] address them.
 [4] The next speakers up are Ken
 [5] Stokes, Gene Bullock, Douglas Kanahale, Luana
 [6] Kaohelaulii and Paul Kaohelaulii. Ken Stokes?
 [7] (Discussion off the record.)
 [8] THE MODERATOR: I have somebody
 [9] speaking to me from the audience. Of course you
 [10] can't hear him. In the interests of curiosity, if
 [11] nothing else, since many of the people know what
 [12] number they are, I will also periodically announce
 [13] the number of the speaker. Ken Stokes is
 [14] number 9.
 [15] KEN STOKES: Mahalo for this
 [16] opportunity. I come before you as a citizen. I
 [17] do have a background. My training is in
 [18] economics. My professional career was as a
 [19] strategic planning consultant. I have been
 [20] blessed in my short life to have participated in
 [21] the production of many such documents. I feel
 [22] that I have some special expertise in evaluating
 [23] these documents. And my understanding is that
 [24] today we are here for precisely that purpose, to
 [25] evaluate these documents. So I want to direct my

Page 67

[1] comments to the EIS document itself.
 [2] But first, of course, there are
 [3] many reasons that each of us feels for supporting
 [4] or opposing this particular project, this
 [5] particular use of our island. And I just want to
 [6] make it clear that personally I am opposed. I
 [7] oppose it at the national level. I oppose the
 [8] congressional decision to set this kind of
 [9] expenditure as a priority. I disagree that it is
 [10] a priority.
 [11] On the state level, I disagree that
 [12] this is a good direction for our state to go,
 [13] either in terms of economic development or in
 [14] terms of land use.
 [15] Locally, I disagree that this is
 [16] viable economic development that supports and
 [17] sustains our community for the long-term.
 [18] At the same time I think it is
 [19] perfectly appropriate to extend a mahalo to PMRF,
 [20] to all of the military personnel involved, to all
 [21] of the contractors for their wonderful presence on
 [22] our island, for spending money on our island, for
 [23] creating jobs on our island and especially for
 [24] being very careful what they do on our beaches, in
 [25] our forests, and in our ocean.

Page 68

[1] And I should also say that I'm
 [2] blessed to have my older son who's benefited
 [3] greatly from today's Navy. He came through second
 [4] in his class at the Navy Flight School and sits
 [5] today at a desk job in Washington D.C.
 [6] His wife, who is a horn player in
 [7] the military band in D.C., just delivered my first
 [8] grandchild. And so our ohana benefits directly
 [9] from the military today.
 [10] Let me turn my attention for the
 [11] purpose of the few minutes I have left to the
 [12] document itself. For those of you who have been
 [13] participating in our community networking by
 [14] e-mail, the last couple of weeks you will know we
 [15] have been focusing on the summary of the
 [16] Environmental Impact Statement on page 5 of the
 [17] executive summary.
 [18] Just by way of introduction, let me
 [19] suggest to you as the contractor on point for this
 [20] document in this summary, we are told that the
 [21] adverse impacts are represented by black boxes.
 [22] And when you look at this summary, the first thing
 [23] you notice is that there are very few black boxes.
 [24] That tells me right away that this is a
 [25] misrepresentation of the facts.

Page 69

[1] If this were an adequate
 [2] representation of the EIS, there would -
 [3] THE MODERATOR: I won't take this
 [4] away from your time, I promise Mr. Stokes.
 [5] I made a request earlier that I
 [6] need to enforce. That is, that you withhold any
 [7] expressions either against or in favor of the
 [8] speaker. There's no way that the Court Reporter
 [9] can get his words. So while you're agreeing with
 [10] him and you're clapping, you are probably making
 [11] sure we are not capturing them on the record.
 [12] Please hold all of your comments until the speaker
 [13] is finished. Thank you.
 [14] KEN STOKES: Let me just say -
 [15] again, in a general way, if you asked our
 [16] community is this an adequate EIS, the very first
 [17] thing that we would tell you is we insist there
 [18] are many more black boxes. Here's why.
 [19] Because you as a consultant team
 [20] have done your job in presenting the evidence of
 [21] potential impacts. And time again if you dig into
 [22] this document, it will bother the whales, it will
 [23] bother the seals, there are some risks of
 [24] spillage, there are toxic materials, and there
 [25] EMR, electromagnetic radiation, about whose

Page 70

[1] effects we know very little.
 [2] And yet time and time again, after
 [3] having dutifully acknowledging all those things,
 [4] there is one concluding paragraph that says
 [5] overall no impact with a white box.
 [6] That is a misrepresentation of the
 [7] facts that you present in this document. And I
 [8] urge the Governor and the Secretary of the Navy
 [9] that unless they see a document in final form that
 [10] has many more black boxes, this document must be
 [11] rejected.
 [12] Two final comments. Two final
 [13] comments. When I attended the scoping session
 [14] here several months ago, I asked only one
 [15] question. And it was about EMR, electromagnetic
 [16] radiation. I was assured that this document would
 [17] address the question of the environment that we
 [18] are about to create off the shores of Kauai.
 [19] And that is multiple sources,
 [20] multiple levels, multiple kinds of radiation
 [21] bathing our sailors, bathing our residents. And
 [22] where is the research on the cumulative effects of
 [23] that? It is not in this document.
 [24] Until we know the cumulative
 [25] effects, I would argue that we are playing with

Page 71

[1] fire.
 [2] Finally - and this is just my
 [3] third point - there is a section in this
 [4] document, section 4.5, that purports to address
 [5] the question of environmental justice.
 [6] Again, as a professional in this
 [7] field who has worked on these kinds of analyses -
 [8] THE MODERATOR: Sorry your five
 [9] minutes is up. You need to finish -
 [10] KEN STOKES: One sentence. Whoever
 [11] wrote this section on environmental justice does
 [12] not understand what environmental justice is all
 [13] about.
 [14] THE MODERATOR: Thank you. I don't
 [15] know how many of you have arrived in the past two
 [16] hours since I made my introductory remarks,
 [17] especially for some of you speakers that have not
 [18] I just want to remind you that I have a simple
 [19] method of indicating times.
 [20] In case you don't know, when I put
 [21] up an index finger like this, it indicates you
 [22] have one minute left of your five minutes. When I
 [23] put up my hand like this, it indicates that your
 [24] five minutes is up. Just a reminder. The next
 [25] speaker is Gene Bullock.

Page 72

[1] GENE BULLOCK: Good morning,
 [2] Captain, everybody. My name is Gene Bullock, and
 [3] I am presently serving as the State Vice President
 [4] and also a National Director for the Navy League
 [5] of the United States.
 [6] The Navy League is a civilian
 [7] organization formed in 1902 to awaken our citizens
 [8] to the fact that the United States is a maritime
 [9] nation.
 [10] We, therefore, must and should
 [11] maintain a strong Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard,
 [12] and Merchant Marine. Our efforts are directed to
 [13] these sea services and to aid, improve, help,
 [14] develop their efficiency and general welfare.
 [15] Our membership today in the
 [16] Hawaiian islands is over 7,000 and growing. At
 [17] the national level our membership has crossed over
 [18] 70,000 members, and we have councils throughout
 [19] the world.
 [20] We strongly support and recommend
 [21] the EIS regarding the Enhancement of Capabilities
 [22] for PMRF to study, test, and develop a defense
 [23] system against TBM weapons.
 [24] We feel any of the minor and/or
 [25] minimal adverse effects revealed within the EIS

Page 73

[1] must be weighed against the dire need to develop a
 [2] top level TBM defense for our nation. We must
 [3] protect the lives of the women and children of our
 [4] Armed Forces who daily are placed in harm's way
 [5] and, also, the lives of civilians that may be
 [6] subject to any attacks.
 [7] Yes, this threat is real, as more
 [8] and more of these weapons are available in the
 [9] world market to anyone who has the cash.
 [10] We should not, we cannot continue
 [11] to does our armed forces to face these weapons
 [12] without a decisive defense system.
 [13] The Congress of the United States
 [14] recognizes this as a national threat, and they
 [15] have approved funds to find the solution.
 [16] Yes, this is the right thing to do
 [17] and the only thing to do as long as this threat
 [18] remains in many areas of the world. Let's not
 [19] play games or make the mistake and gamble with
 [20] these individuals.
 [21] Yes, they do have these weapons.
 [22] Yes, they have used these weapons. And, yes, we
 [23] have been hurt before in the loss of lives in our
 [24] military.
 [25] Therefore, let's have the EIS for

Page 74

[1] the Enhancement of Capabilities for PMRF approved
 [2] now. They have the knowledge, the people, the
 [3] range, and the ability to accomplish this vital
 [4] task. Yes, please give PMRF the green light to
 [5] get started. Thank you.
 [6] THE MODERATOR: Douglas Kanahele.
 [7] DOUGLAS KANAHELE: Aloha everyone.
 [8] I'm -
 [9] THE MODERATOR: Could you pull the
 [10] microphone up? You're pretty tall. Just lift it
 [11] up. It bends.
 [12] DOUGLAS KANAHELE: I'm Douglas
 [13] Kanahele. I am a Niihau resident. I am here to
 [14] support the military. I have a understanding
 [15] about the project to help with the economic.
 [16] So I'm here say mahalo to the
 [17] military. And we also want to support them for
 [18] their great project. And my family back home
 [19] there, they are the same that I brought up here on
 [20] Kauai, to come to be a speaker for my whole family
 [21] back home on the island.
 [22] And I have some of my family here
 [23] with me today to speak about their thoughts and
 [24] their ideas like I do have now. I don't have any
 [25] papers with me so this is what I got in my heart

Page 75

[1] to say to the people of Kauai and to the whole
 [2] Hawaiian islands.
 [3] I would want to say again thank you
 [4] to your people for this meeting today. And God
 [5] bless. Mahalo.
 [6] LUANO KAOHELAULII: Aloha.
 [7] (Extended remarks in the Hawaiian
 [8] language.)
 [9] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker is
 [10] Paul Kachelauii.
 [11] PAUL KAOHELAULII: Aloha.
 [12] (Extended remarks in the Hawaiian
 [13] language.)
 [14] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker is
 [15] -
 [16] ILEI BENJAMINA: Aloha. We need a
 [17] translator for the two previous speakers in
 [18] English. I wonder if I should.
 [19] THE MODERATOR: Would you give your
 [20] name so we have it on the record?
 [21] ILEI BENJAMINA: Ilei Benjamina,
 [22] translator in our family. You know, if I was
 [23] rude, I should just leave it as that, and you
 [24] folks can just interpret it on your own. As you
 [25] see, when you start with the first speaker, Luana

Page 76

[1] Kachelauii, she hales from Niihau. She's a
 [2] mother. She's a family member. And she has a
 [3] Niihau ohana. And she lives there.
 [4] Her thoughts on PMRF, as she said
 [5] earlier, she supports the military and Navy - and
 [6] she said it in English too - presence on Niihau.
 [7] And as for economic reasons, she's
 [8] leaving everything in God's hands.
 [9] (Inaudible.)
 [10] And, therefore, today we ask your help in support
 [11] of the military perhaps.
 [12] (Inaudible.)
 [13] Perhaps you will note one of the
 [14] most friendliest and most accommodating
 [15] friendships that we in Hawaii have yet to beat.
 [16] Lauano Kachelauii also expresses that it is her
 [17] family and generations from today that have yet to
 [18] see the benefits that Ke Akua has now put in front
 [19] of us.
 [20] We are seizing that opportunity to
 [21] make Niihau military work and perhaps clean up the
 [22] military's name and their presence in Hawaii.
 [23] She expresses mahalo nui to all who
 [24] support us. We are but a small little nation. We
 [25] ask for your kokua and your help for economic

Page 77

[1] reasons for this generation and those unseen.
 [2] Translation for Mr. Paul
 [3] Kachelauii, her husband, father and grandfather.
 [4] Thank you, PMRF, for your support
 [5] in coming to Niihau island to offer us this
 [6] assistance, to help us with our economic dilemma
 [7] that we have not yet come out of. Thank you for
 [8] the understanding, for being with us. We are
 [9] small. And yet we are from Niihau. We believe
 [10] that we have the first and the last say for our
 [11] island.
 [12] Many of you will come and sing your
 [13] song.
 [14] (Inaudible.)
 [15] However, today we ask your support
 [16] for the military and the Niihau island.
 [17] We ask for your prayers because for
 [18] all time Niihau has been God's island. We pray
 [19] for rain. It is not man-made. Ke Akua grants us
 [20] the rain.
 [21] We seek our seashells that are
 [22] precious the world over. That is not man-made.
 [23] Ke Akua brings it to our shores as our economic
 [24] well being.
 [25] That resources is now slow. And

Page 78

[1] that resource is now very rare. So Ke Akua
 [2] provides for our island, for our tradition, for
 [3] our time, for the future.
 [4] So if Ke Akua wills it to be that
 [5] the military is now our helper, let Ke Akua's will
 [6] be done. We trust in him when all human efforts
 [7] have ceased to exist.
 [8] (Inaudible.)
 [9] Mahalo nui. I am Ilei Benjamina
 [10] translating for our ohana. Mahalo.
 [11] THE MODERATOR: Thank you. The
 [12] next three speakers before we take a lunch break
 [13] will be Healani Kelly, Enoka Kachelauii, and
 [14] Leiala Kachelauii.
 [15] HEALANI KELLY: Aloha. My name is
 [16] Healani Kelly, and I'm from the island of Niihau.
 [17] On behalf of myself and our ohana on Niihau we
 [18] support whole-heartedly for this project. We are
 [19] honored for being here today to share our thoughts
 [20] with you all.
 [21] For in whatever things are true,
 [22] whatever things are of serious concern, whatever
 [23] things there are that were spoken of, whatever
 [24] worth there is, whatever praise worthy there is,
 [25] and in considering all these things, the things

Page 79

[1] that we can learn as well as what we have expected
 [2] are what we have prayed for. For we have trusted
 [3] in God that he will help us make our choices, for
 [4] there is a saying, who is our light and our
 [5] salvation, of whom shall we fear. For He will
 [6] grant us the opportunity to receive them, then it
 [7] shall be.
 [8] It will help our economic and
 [9] benefit future of our children. I speak for my
 [10] family in a community of Niihau. And I thank you.
 [11] (Extended remarks in the Hawaiian
 [12] language.)
 [13] ENOKA KAOHELAULII: My name is
 [14] Enoka Kaohelauii. I was born and raised on
 [15] Niihau. And I support the Navy to do their job on
 [16] the island.
 [17] I thank you, the Navy, for getting
 [18] there and getting jobs for us.
 [19] For us and all the children, I
 [20] thank you all for you guys, to come and say, you
 [21] guys, mahalo from us. Thank you very much.
 [22] Mahalo.
 [23] LEIALA KAOHELAULII:
 [24] (Brief statement in the Hawaiian
 [25] language.)

Page 80

[1] Good to see you again.
 [2] I'm one of six from Niihau to
 [3] represent our island and our community.
 [4] (Extended remarks in the Hawaiian
 [5] language.)
 [6] Mahalo nui. Meaning we say yes in
 [7] Jesus powerful name to your proposal.
 [8] (Extended remarks in the Hawaiian
 [9] language.)
 [10] I would also like to say that for
 [11] those of you that say that you speak for Niihau,
 [12] Niihau can speak for itself. We can speak for our
 [13] own. We don't need you people out here to tell us
 [14] what is right for us. We know what is right for
 [15] us.
 [16] Through God's guidance we know what
 [17] is right, and we accept this. We are behind the
 [18] Navy one hundred percent.
 [19] And I would also like to thank the
 [20] Robinson family for their many years of dedication
 [21] to the Niihau ohana. They have treated us with
 [22] nothing but respect.
 [23] I thank them, and Niihau ohana
 [24] thank them for their many years of dedication to
 [25] our ohana and our island.

Page 81

[1] (Extended remarks in the Hawaiian
 [2] language.)
 [3] (Whereupon a hymn was sung in the
 [4] Hawaiian language.)
 [5] LEIALA KAOHELAULII: I would like
 [6] to present Captain Bowlin with this map signed by
 [7] each person on Niihau.
 [8] THE MODERATOR: Sorry, your time is
 [9] up. Could you hand that to him? I'm sorry.
 [10] (Pause.)
 [11] THE MODERATOR: Thank you for that
 [12] very moving comment. I know I was deeply moved by
 [13] it. This is the time when we said we would take
 [14] our half-hour break. Before anyone leaves,
 [15] however, I would like to read out the names of the
 [16] next six or seven people.
 [17] We will reconvene at 1:05. And I
 [18] want to make sure you are here ready to go.
 [19] Michael Corregador, Davianna McGregor, Laurie
 [20] Yoshida, John Isobe, Bill Peay, Alton Miyamoto,
 [21] and Malaki Kanahale, Jr.
 [22] Do you have any comments you wanted
 [23] to make before we close this part?
 [24] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: No.
 [25] THE MODERATOR: We'll see you in

Page 82

[1] thirty minutes. Thank you very much.
 [2] (Whereupon, a luncheon recess was
 [3] taken.)
 [4] THE MODERATOR: We are going to go
 [5] back on the record here. The people had requested
 [6] to know where we were in the series of numbers. I
 [7] said the next speaker will be Michael Corregador.
 [8] He is number 18.
 [9] And, again, in order we are going
 [10] to have Michael Corregador, Davianna McGregor,
 [11] Laurie Yoshida, John Isobe, Bill Peay and Alton
 [12] Miyamoto. Michael Corregador, you're up.
 [13] MICHAEL CORREGADOR: Good afternoon,
 [14] and aloha. My name is Michael Corregador. And I
 [15] am here today to read a statement on behalf of the
 [16] Local 1260. I am also the unit chairman of unit 4
 [17] and an executive board member for the County of
 [18] Kauai.
 [19] To whom it may concern, the
 [20] international - (Inaudible) - strongly supports
 [21] the proposed Enhancements to the Pacific Missile
 [22] Range Facility as described in the Draft
 [23] Environmental Impact Statement published on April
 [24] 3, 1998.
 [25] Our view of the proposal to enhance

Page 83

[1] the Pacific Missile Range Facility indicates that
 [2] any impacts to the environment will be minimal.
 [3] Yet the benefits of the Enhancements will be
 [4] substantial.
 [5] As the United States military
 [6] continues to downsize and the Pentagon proposes to
 [7] close 50 military bases in the next few years, the
 [8] island of Kauai and the State of Hawaii are very
 [9] fortunate to have the Pacific Missile Range
 [10] Facility location of a high priority of national
 [11] defense project there.
 [12] The support that PMRF has been
 [13] asked to provide to the Navy Theater Missile
 [14] Defense program is very similar to the type of
 [15] work that the base has been carrying out for 35
 [16] years; launching and tracking missiles safely in a
 [17] controlled environment.
 [18] The proposal includes enhancing
 [19] PMRF equipment and adding some additional launch
 [20] capabilities. And the project will require only
 [21] small increases in the customary activities at
 [22] PMRF.
 [23] Yet it will help ensure the future
 [24] viability of the base and the continued employment
 [25] of approximately 500 workers that the IEW

Page 84

[1] represents there.
 [2] Many of these jobs are technical
 [3] and require high skill levels, and are, therefore,
 [4] well paying. Few employers on Kauai can offer the
 [5] high tech job opportunities that PMRF can. It
 [6] enables more Kauai young people to stay on Kauai
 [7] and work in a challenging environment or to go off
 [8] island to college or join the military and return
 [9] to their home with an opportunity to put what they
 [10] have learned to good use.
 [11] Overall PMRF employs more than 840
 [12] people on the island and has an annual payroll of
 [13] \$45 million. It is one of the largest employers
 [14] on the island and the largest provider of high
 [15] tech jobs on Kauai.
 [16] PMRF also helps to maintain a
 [17] strong middle class on Kauai, which is important
 [18] to people who want to earn a good living, buy
 [19] homes, raise their families, and send their
 [20] children to school. And we strongly support that.
 [21] PMRF also contributes to the
 [22] community by supporting local schools with the
 [23] Adopt-A-School program, the Toys-For-Tots program,
 [24] helping to put on the Waimea town celebration, and
 [25] other volunteer efforts.

[1] PMRF is the largest ocean range -
 [2] (Inaudible.) - development, evaluation, and
 [3] training environments for military and advanced
 [4] technologies systems that operate on the sea,
 [5] under the sea, in the air - (Inaudible.) - and
 [6] without harming the environment.
 [7] PMRF is one of the greatest assets
 [8] to the economy of Kauai, to the community, and it
 [9] is an important asset in maintaining a strong
 [10] national defense for our country.
 [11] Thank you for this opportunity for
 [12] me to comment.
 [13] THE MODERATOR: Next speaker is
 [14] Davianna McGregor.
 [15] DAVIANNA MCGREGOR: Aloha. I'm Dr.
 [16] Davianna McGregor, associate professor at the
 [17] University of Hawaii, Manoa campus - (Inaudible.)
 [18] I'm also a member of the protective
 [19] ohana and bring a lot of mana and experience from
 [20] our effort to stop the bombing of Kahoolawe and
 [21] now to clean up the mess that the Navy has left
 [22] behind.
 [23] I have read the EIS and have
 [24] several points I would like to have included and
 [25] addressed.

[1] First of all, there's a whole
 [2] scenario for the Navy gunfire soaring (phonetic)
 [3] system in which they target a, quote, safe island.
 [4] This safe island is in the shape of Kahoolawe.
 [5] It's a virtual reality island that
 [6] they have that should be reconfigured to represent
 [7] something fake. The island of Kahoolawe
 [8] (Inaudible) is recognized by the native Hawaiian
 [9] people as a sacred island.
 [10] It is a desecration to Mapuna and
 [11] Akua who struggled so hard to stop the bombing of
 [12] the island in real life, only to have it continue
 [13] to be used as a bombing and ordnance target in
 [14] virtual reality.
 [15] The second issue is the Kamokala
 [16] Magazine. (Inaudible.) These magazines should be
 [17] phased out, not expanded. The cliff should be
 [18] respected as sacred burial grounds.
 [19] The third area relates to Niihau.
 [20] Some of the outstanding issues (Inaudible) water
 [21] consumption. How much water will the PMRF project
 [22] consume? Will this affect the availability of
 [23] water on the island for residents?
 [24] Will PMRF develop water for the
 [25] project? Will PMRF develop the water catchment

[1] systems? Will water be barged in?
 [2] It is noted on page 4156 that the
 [3] landing strip can serve as a water catchment -
 [4] (Inaudible). Will the water be safe for human
 [5] consumption or intended for fire prevention or
 [6] both?
 [7] Fire plan. It says a fire plan
 [8] needs to be developed. What will be the elements
 [9] of the fire plan? It's not stated. Will the
 [10] people of Niihau be employed to implement the fire
 [11] plan? Will there be a potential area of training
 [12] for the Niihau residents so they can be employed
 [13] during the launch preparation and implementation
 [14] period?
 [15] Sea turtles and the presence of
 [16] Monk Seals. The EIS states that land impacts,
 [17] bringing in supplies for the construction would
 [18] destroy turtle nests and could disrupt the Monk
 [19] Seals (Inaudible) should be banned from the
 [20] beaches during the nesting and hatching season.
 [21] (Inaudible) this season is May through September.
 [22] (Inaudible) when the nesting and hatching months
 [23] for Niihau is and prohibit activities that would
 [24] disrupt the nesting and hatching patterns of these
 [25] endangered species on Niihau during this important

[1] season.
 [2] Generators (Inaudible) should not
 [3] be located along the beach. The loud noise would
 [4] adversely impact the turtles' and Monk Seals'
 [5] activities, especially the turtle nesting.
 [6] Sewage. The issue of sewage is not
 [7] addressed. What kind of toilets will be used?
 [8] And what will happen to them upon the completion
 [9] of the project? (Inaudible)
 [10] Protocol. The protocol is
 [11] excellent but might consider the following. The
 [12] protocol states that nothing shall be removed from
 [13] the island. The protocol shall also make it clear
 [14] that personnel should not fish or gather marine
 [15] (Inaudible) for consumption while on the island.
 [16] The protocol acknowledges Niihau
 [17] ranch government point of contact which, I guess,
 [18] is Mr. Takami (phonetic) here. This empowers the
 [19] land owner. But the residents, ho'o aina of the
 [20] island, should be empowered as a whole or as a
 [21] committee.
 [22] On Kahoolawe we have the Kahoolawe
 [23] Reserve Commission. We have three members of the
 [24] ohana on the commission. So we are empowered
 [25] through that vehicle to shut down operations if

[1] necessary.
 [2] The residents should be allowed to
 [3] provide - residents should do a baseline study of
 [4] the natural culture resources of the area to be
 [5] affected, conduct ongoing monitoring and testing.
 [6] And residents should be able to shut down the
 [7] operations if necessary.
 [8] And the people are supporting this
 [9] because of what they believe to be true. Should
 [10] it turn out it's not as good as it's being said it
 [11] is, the residents, the whole island, not just the
 [12] land owner, should be empowered to shut down the
 [13] operations should that turn out to be the problem.
 [14] Also it says about training,
 [15] training should be a requirement. Training
 [16] program should already start. We are having
 [17] training for Molokai Hawaiians.
 [18] Next week I won't be in Honolulu
 [19] giving this testimony because I will on Molokai.
 [20] And ohana is part of this process. (Inaudible)
 [21] This training should already happen.
 [22] My final word on behalf of maka
 [23] ala. We think that it might be good. But really
 [24] have to be maka ala and be empowered so that
 [25] should something happen, that is - that will be

[1] -
 [2] THE MODERATOR: Your time is up.
 [3] Davianna?
 [4] DAVIANNA MCGREGOR: Niihau is what
 [5] we want - it's unfortunately -
 [6] THE MODERATOR: Excuse me. I see
 [7] that the witness -
 [8] DAVIANNA MCGREGOR: Mahalo.
 [9] THE MODERATOR: It appeared to me
 [10] that you had longer comments in written form.
 [11] Will you be turning those in?
 [12] DAVIANNA MCGREGOR: In the box
 [13] outside.
 [14] THE MODERATOR: Thank you very
 [15] much. The next speaker is Laurie Yoshida.
 [16] LAURIE YOSHIDA: My name is Laurie
 [17] Yoshida, and I represent the Kauai Chamber of
 [18] Commerce. The Kauai Chamber of Commerce is in
 [19] strong support of the proposed Enhancements at
 [20] PMRF and in support of the Theater Missile Defense
 [21] Program.
 [22] In a recent survey of our
 [23] membership, 156 surveys were returned out of 645
 [24] that were sent, which is about 25 percent, which
 [25] is a very good return. Our membership is in

[1] overwhelming support of PMRF and the proposed
 [2] enhancement.
 [3] Over the past 35 years, PMRF and
 [4] its over 800 local civilian employees have been an
 [5] integral part of our community. The proposed
 [6] enhancements will allow the continued viability of
 [7] PMRF as a national range for the next 15 to 20
 [8] years.
 [9] The economic impact is enormous but
 [10] simple. The proposed Enhancements will give local
 [11] Kauai contractors an opportunity to bid for over
 [12] \$33 million in projects.
 [13] It will give our local businesses
 [14] the opportunity to continue to supply the base
 [15] with operational goods and services for the next
 [16] 15 to 20 years. And the additional revenue to
 [17] businesses on the islands from the various
 [18] customers and contractors who visit the base is
 [19] also substantial.
 [20] There's also the possibility of
 [21] additional employment opportunities for the
 [22] residents of Kauai, as well as the continued
 [23] employment of the current 800 local civilians.
 [24] Over 91 percent of the businesses
 [25] who responded to the survey felt that PMRF holds a

[1] key to future high tech initiatives on Kauai. The
 [2] proposed Enhancements could serve as a catalyst
 [3] for other high tech initiatives on our island.
 [4] Over 94 percent of the businesses
 [5] felt that PMRF needs to enhance its competitive
 [6] position as a valued national asset, as well as
 [7] Kauai's largest high tech employer.
 [8] Given that Congress has mandated
 [9] that Theater Missile Defense testing be conducted
 [10] to develop a technically, capable, cost-effective
 [11] counter to cruise missiles and that this program
 [12] would entail a \$33 million upgrade at PMRF, over
 [13] 91 percent of the businesses surveyed supported
 [14] the proposal to enhance the existing capabilities
 [15] the PMRF.
 [16] Based on our membership's response
 [17] and the over 35-year track record of stewardship
 [18] of the environment by PMRF, the Kauai Chamber of
 [19] Commerce urges the Department of Defense to move
 [20] forward with the proposed enhancements at PMRF in
 [21] support of the Theater Missile Defense Program
 [22] mandated by Congress.
 [23] We would also like to thank
 [24] Congress for designating the Pacific Missile Range
 [25] Facility at Barking Sands as the lead range for

[1] this testing. We agree that PMRF offers unique
 [2] geographical advantages to enable this long-term
 [3] program to be accomplished safely and effectively.
 [4] Thank you.
 [5] THE MODERATOR: John Isobe.
 [6] JOHN ISOBE: Good afternoon. My
 [7] name is John Isobe. I'm the president of the
 [8] Kauai Economic Development Board. And our
 [9] membership represents over 45 of the largest
 [10] businesses here on Kauai. I've already submitted
 [11] my written testimony and would just like to
 [12] summarize it.
 [13] The Pacific Missile Range
 [14] Facility's contribution to Kauai transcends all
 [15] segments of our community, from agricultural
 [16] operations to the visitor industry, as well as
 [17] small business.
 [18] Kauai's economic condition is
 [19] critical. The anticipated recovery from Hurricane
 [20] Iniki is prolonged. And due to (inaudible) -
 [21] downsizing of the sugar operations, business
 [22] failures are increasing at record rates.
 [23] Throughout this downturn the area
 [24] that continues to shine is PMRF. The astronomy
 [25] community on the Big Island and the supercomputer

[1] on Maui are visibly important to each island's
 [2] diversification. The testing and evaluation area
 [3] represents a multitude of spinoff opportunities
 [4] for the creation of a sustainable economy here on
 [5] Kauai.
 [6] Already having presence on Kauai
 [7] are some of the larger companies in high
 [8] technology; ITT, Federal - (inaudible), Data
 [9] Support Systems, and MIT Lincoln Labs.
 [10] These companies are hiring our
 [11] local people. And my friends, as I was a resident
 [12] - I am a resident here, and I have been born and
 [13] raised here.
 [14] They are helping to train them
 [15] using the facilities at the Kauai Community
 [16] College and creating meaningful, well-paying jobs
 [17] for all of us. The enhancement of PMRF testing
 [18] and evaluation capabilities will bring about
 [19] diversified economic benefits that are built on
 [20] basic precepts of economic sustainability and job
 [21] growth.
 [22] PMRF has been a good neighbor and
 [23] an exemplary corporate citizen, from their
 [24] Toys-To-Tots campaign to their cooperative
 [25] education programs with Kauai Community College.

[1] They help to foster a good neighbor policy, as
 [2] well as train our people.
 [3] In closing, I would just like to
 [4] pass on to you over 550 signatures that we have
 [5] collected today in support of the proposed
 [6] enhancements at PMRF. They represent businesses,
 [7] residents, and also some members of the DAB Kauai
 [8] chapter and the Kauai 42nd Veterans Club.
 [9] Thank you for the opportunity to
 [10] testify this afternoon.
 [11] BILL PEAY: Good afternoon,
 [12] captain, Vida, Ave. Feel free to cut me off if I
 [13] get wound up.
 [14] THE MODERATOR: Please state your
 [15] name.
 [16] BILL PEAY: I'm sorry. Bill Peay.
 [17] I'm the executive director of the West Kauai
 [18] Community Development Corporation.
 [19] Excuse me if I turn my back to you,
 [20] but I will talk back and forth with the audience.
 [21] First of all, it's really exciting
 [22] to be here to talk with you today. I want to
 [23] share something that is a bit different that maybe
 [24] not all of you know about.
 [25] With the West Kauai Community

[1] Development Corporation, a new organization, we
 [2] rely on PMRF in tremendous ways that kind of are
 [3] amazing.
 [4] We have several different
 [5] committees that are working on a variety of
 [6] projects, all of which involve members of PMRF.
 [7] And I know they can't really come forward and talk
 [8] about it. But I will talk about it on their
 [9] behalf.
 [10] For example, you heard about the
 [11] visitor techno center that just a couple of weeks
 [12] ago we had a blessing for. That center is coming
 [13] here as a result of the diligent efforts of people
 [14] like Gary Baldwin, John (inaudible), who was just
 [15] here, Manny Marsten, to get that project under
 [16] way.
 [17] And its primary focus will be to
 [18] house high tech companies that will be able to
 [19] build our economy on the west side. Those high
 [20] tech companies will be working in support of PMRF.
 [21] On the other half of it is a
 [22] visitor center. And in that visitor center we
 [23] will be able to tell the story of West Kauai and
 [24] Niihau. The cultural tourism committee headed by
 [25] Chris - (inaudible) - who are working on putting

Page 97

[1] together the story of West Kauai so that the
 [2] exhibits will portray the culture of this part of
 [3] the island.
 [4] That visitor center wouldn't be
 [5] here if - the visitor techno center wouldn't be
 [6] here - that center wouldn't be here if PMRF
 [7] wasn't here as a support. So our tourism benefits
 [8] from PMRF.
 [9] KGMF - (inaudible) - we had big
 [10] public meeting - (inaudible). It's a big issue.
 [11] That hospital has to become solvent. One way of
 [12] doing that is getting into telemedicine, being
 [13] able to reach out and do some projects to help our
 [14] residents on the island.
 [15] Again, PMRF is stepping up to the
 [16] table. Rich Irwin from PMRF (inaudible) are doing
 [17] the telecommunication linkages so we can reach out
 [18] through Tripler, the hospital on Oahu, and be in
 [19] touch with experts around the world. So if you go
 [20] into KGMF with a cardiac problem, they can consult
 [21] with somebody at a major institution and get a
 [22] second or third opinion to help save your life.
 [23] None of that would be possible if we didn't have
 [24] support from PMRF.
 [25] We have the Infrastructure

Page 98

[1] Committee looking at how we will be able to
 [2] sustain and expand the sugar industry and Amraf
 [3] and Diversified Agriculture. PMRF is working with
 [4] us on trying to support water and how we could
 [5] pump out the salt wear water and waste water.
 [6] It's a huge project. We need the State. We need
 [7] the County. And PMRF is in there right now and
 [8] has been for quite a long time, supporting and
 [9] helping make our infrastructure viable so that we
 [10] have a quality of life on Kauai that we enjoy.
 [11] It just goes on and on. The list
 [12] goes on and on. But I am speaking today on behalf
 [13] of the West Kauai Community Development
 [14] Corporation. And their board of directors
 [15] authorized me to speak in support of the efforts
 [16] that PMRF are engaged in and the expansion.
 [17] We looked over the EIS and the
 [18] findings of the most significant impact. And it
 [19] seems and appears viable. It's fantastic that we
 [20] have people here challenging that and making sure
 [21] that all the T's are crossed and the I's dotted.
 [22] The fact that we have this opportunity to do that,
 [23] that's democracy.
 [24] The last thing I'd like to say in
 [25] terms of the environmental impact is, yes, there

Page 99

[1] is impact in and practically anything that anybody
 [2] does. But the worst impact would be if we go to
 [3] war. And we're sitting right now with our troops
 [4] poised and ready, if necessary, to engage in a
 [5] conflict that will cause more of an environmental
 [6] impact than you can imagine.
 [7] The only reason we have been able
 [8] to not engage in war is simply because we are
 [9] prepared and we have been able to keep an
 [10] engagement from happening. You have seen it all
 [11] played out on the world stage.
 [12] We have serious weapons systems
 [13] that are under development by countries that are
 [14] likely to use them against us. And we need to
 [15] protect against that.
 [16] So PMRF is excellent for our
 [17] economy. PMRF is an excellent neighbor. PMRF is
 [18] doing fantastic things for us. And the residents
 [19] and citizens of PMRF are engaging in community
 [20] activities. We applaud them for that, and we
 [21] welcome them to our community, and look forward to
 [22] the expansion to help keep our economy alive and
 [23] to keep us growing. Thank you very much.
 [24] THE MODERATOR: We're going to hear
 [25] from the 24th speaker. And will the next speakers

Page 100

[1] up please come take their seats at the reserved
 [2] seating. It will be Malaki Kanahele, Jr., Richard
 [3] Daley, Jim Dawson - and some of these I have
 [4] difficulty reading. Lana Papke, Allan Nesbitt.
 [5] And that will be enough for now. Thank you.
 [6] ALTON MIYAMOTO: Good afternoon.
 [7] My name is Alton Miyamoto. I am a resident of
 [8] Waimea. And I am also the manager of Strategic
 [9] Planning at Kauai Electric.
 [10] I have already submitted written
 [11] testimony. And most of the other speakers have
 [12] covered most of my points. So I would just like
 [13] to briefly summarize a few of those.
 [14] PMRF has always supported the
 [15] residents and businesses of Kauai through life
 [16] saving rescues, fire fighting support, collecting
 [17] toys for the children, and most notably for the
 [18] support provided, especially to the west side of
 [19] Kauai, following Hurricane Iniki.
 [20] That service it provides to Kauai
 [21] is not only invaluable, it really should be a
 [22] model for all communities.
 [23] PMRF is also a key player for
 [24] Kauai's long-term future. Kauai is approximately
 [25] the size of Oahu's land size but has only about 6

Page 101

[1] percent of the resident population.
 [2] Kauai needs to focus on providing
 [3] initiative and jobs that will keep this lifestyle.
 [4] The high technology industry meets that criteria.
 [5] And PMRF is the only significant high tech
 [6] employer on the island.
 [7] By expanding on this role, PMRF
 [8] will provide high skill jobs so our children can
 [9] remain on Kauai.
 [10] If there's one message I would like
 [11] to leave with you all here it is that PMRF has an
 [12] annual payroll of approximately \$46 million, as
 [13] other speakers have noted. And the majority are
 [14] civilian residents of Kauai.
 [15] While it is obvious that this has a
 [16] significant economic impact, what is less obvious
 [17] is that PMRF has other significant economic
 [18] impacts that directly impact all of us here. PMRF
 [19] is one of KE's largest customers and, therefore,
 [20] represents a significant portion of our sales.
 [21] If the long-term viability of PMRF
 [22] is compromised, the net impact would be an
 [23] increase in rates at a time when all islands can't
 [24] support it. This scenario is even aggravated more
 [25] when you think and consider that a lot of the

Page 102

[1] people that would lose their jobs would have to
 [2] leave the island to seek other jobs. Again, this
 [3] is kind of a declining snowball effect.
 [4] Therefore, it is really important
 [5] that we not only keep but enhance the viability of
 [6] PMRF to ensure the remaining part of our future on
 [7] this island. Thank you very much.
 [8] THE MODERATOR: Malaki Kanahele,
 [9] Jr.
 [10] MALAKI KANAHELE, JR: My name is
 [11] Malaki Kanahele, Jr. from Niihau.
 [12] I come here for the same supporting
 [13] to the PMRF which my family already gave all their
 [14] statements - (inaudible) - which already shared
 [15] with all you folks.
 [16] I have nothing more else to say but
 [17] to support the PMRF. Thank you very much.
 [18] Mahalo.
 [19] THE MODERATOR: I don't see anyone
 [20] seated in our reserved seating. I will read the
 [21] list of names again. Richard Daley, Jim Dawson
 [22] Lana Papke, Alan Nesbit, Ed MacDowell, and Tom
 [23] Hall are the next speakers.
 [24] THE MODERATOR: Mr. Daley?
 [25] RICHARD DALEY: My name is Richard

Page 103

(1) Daley. I live in Waimea. And I've lived here
 (2) since 1981. And I am going to read a prepared
 (3) statement by Clarence Greff who couldn't be here
 (4) today.
 (5) And I will be - there's nothing in
 (6) this statement that is inconsistent with the way I
 (7) feel. But I'm basically making his statement
 (8) today.
 (9) My name is Clarence Greff. And I
 (10) am usually adverse to the use of titles when
 (11) presenting public testimony.
 (12) The free and too frequent use of
 (13) titles tends, from the public point of view, to
 (14) impute knowledge about a subject which the title
 (15) bearer may or may not have.
 (16) However, I feel that in this
 (17) instance, I must present my credentials. I am a
 (18) captain in the United States Navy, retired.
 (19) During my 26 years of Naval service, among other
 (20) duties, I commanded three ships and worked on
 (21) various staffs, including that of the Chief of
 (22) Naval Operations and the Joint Chiefs.
 (23) My last tour of duty before
 (24) retiring was professor of Naval Strategy and
 (25) Tactics at the naval War College in Newport, Rhode

Page 104

(1) Island. I do have firsthand knowledge concerning
 (2) the vital importance of PMRF.
 (3) I have not been asked by the Navy
 (4) Department or any member thereof to testify.
 (5) However, as a private citizen I feel compelled to
 (6) speak out on such an important issue.
 (7) The first view I ever had of Kauai
 (8) was on a radar scope aboard a then modern guided
 (9) missile destroyer armed with surface-to-air
 (10) missiles. The destroyer which I commanded was
 (11) heading for PMRF to do some vital testing before
 (12) proceeding to the Western Pacific.
 (13) On the several occasions that we
 (14) used PMRF, the level of the level of
 (15) professionalism and expertise was unexcelled.
 (16) From all indications these qualities have
 (17) persisted over the years.
 (18) We should not underestimate the
 (19) importance to our national defense of such
 (20) facilities as PMRF. Without them our ability to
 (21) develop and maintain our extremely complex systems
 (22) would be seriously degraded. PMRF has been
 (23) serving our national defense needs and providing
 (24) badly needed employment for numerous Kauai people
 (25) for more than 35 years.

Page 105

(1) Most people that are against the
 (2) proposed PMRF expansion are honest, concerned
 (3) people who need the assurance that there are no
 (4) significant bad effects on this beautiful island.
 (5) According to published reports, any negative
 (6) effects on the environment should be minimal, if
 (7) at all. Please consider the facts, realizing that
 (8) national defense is a burden which needs to be
 (9) borne by all of us.
 (10) Thank you for the opportunity to
 (11) testify. Clarence H. Greff, Captain U.S. Navy,
 (12) retired. Thank you.
 (13) SPEAKER-Z: I'll address the front.
 (14) My name is Jim Dawson. I have been an employee of
 (15) PMRF for 33 years, both as a contractor and
 (16) government employer.
 (17) And I would like to point out some
 (18) things. When I first came to work at PMRF it was
 (19) known as a backyard range, and it has grown into a
 (20) national asset. And by our national asset, this
 (21) supports national defense and the Office of the
 (22) Secretary of Defense.
 (23) And even (inaudible) are needed to
 (24) secure the commitment to fund OSD and our people
 (25) on our proposed list from the executive office,

Page 106

(1) program executive office of TBMD.
 (2) I would also like to point out that
 (3) I applaud the EIS process. I grew up in Colorado.
 (4) I have been out here for 35-plus years. And then
 (5) back in the 1950s, before anything was in effect
 (6) such as an environmental process, we lost a lot of
 (7) sheep. We lost a lot of cattle because they had
 (8) chemical programs going on. And let me guarantee
 (9) you that this is not in this EIS.
 (10) I always said to myself if I had a
 (11) responsibility to ensure that nothing like this
 (12) happens, I want to guarantee that I will be a
 (13) steward of the safety and the environmental
 (14) process out there.
 (15) I would also like to challenge Dr.
 (16) Jim Anthony. What I want to say here, he has a
 (17) good point. If there's anything illegal in there
 (18) that we have not looked at in this process, if
 (19) there's anything left out purposefully - I say
 (20) if, if, if - we should be taken to task.
 (21) I have read this, reread this. I
 (22) personally don't see anything. But I just want to
 (23) give you my utmost - the people behind me know
 (24) what I do at the base. But it will be a safe and
 (25) an environmentally compliant EIS. Thank you.

Page 107

(1) THE MODERATOR: Lana Papke. I
 (2) believe it's P-A-P-K-E.
 (3) LANA PAPKE: Aloha everybody. I
 (4) don't like to stand with my back to you folks
 (5) either. So please forgive me, sir. My name is
 (6) Lana Papke, for the record. I oppose this
 (7) project. It not only is going to compromise this
 (8) generation, but every generation of the past, and
 (9) every one to come.
 (10) If PMRF is go good for the economy,
 (11) why is West Kauai's economy doing so poorly?
 (12) To start off, I want to leave one
 (13) thing in the beginning of my testimony for
 (14) everybody to remember, especially for the
 (15) Hawaiians. Remember how Hawaii was lost. A
 (16) businessman used the U.S. military. Now Hawaiians
 (17) are homeless in their own home. When PMRF talks
 (18) about jobs, this is coming out of businessmen's
 (19) mouth to make us appeal to their plan.
 (20) When the PMRF workers stood up, I
 (21) didn't see any Hawaiians standing with them. I
 (22) didn't see any of those jobs going to Hawaiians.
 (23) But when the jobs are gone, we're
 (24) still going to need to fish, and we're still going
 (25) to need to farm, and we're still going to need to

Page 108

(1) take care of land that our Ke Akua gave us. And
 (2) the military destroys and builds things that
 (3) destroy what our Ke Akua gave us to protect and
 (4) provide for the kanaka maoli.
 (5) In Tahiti the military had their
 (6) way. The Tahitians say now you catch a lobster,
 (7) it has two heads. You eat the lobster, your
 (8) eyeballs fall out, your hair falls out, your body
 (9) hair falls out.
 (10) But jobs, that's where our benefits
 (11) are. And for those Hawaiians that are going to be
 (12) over there, low wage jobs and dangerous jobs.
 (13) Aole to these jobs. They are not
 (14) good enough to compromise our environment. And to
 (15) compromise our aina and for death and destruction
 (16) and war games.
 (17) How beneficial are these jobs going
 (18) to be for Hawaiian community and to our cousins on
 (19) Niihau and to us on this island?
 (20) Hawaiians have a job. Ke Akua gave
 (21) it to them. Malama aina. Fish, farm, take care
 (22) of their ohana. They don't need to clean the
 (23) houses or the toilets of the military. Their
 (24) money is only going to build the stores and
 (25) houses.

[1] But this is not a hearing about the
 [2] economy or jobs or politicians and businessmen.
 [3] This is about a Draft EIS that does not include
 [4] human impact, like Jim Matthew suggested earlier.
 [5] What happens in an attack? Do we
 [6] wait here and die? Do we go to the caves and wait
 [7] for the radiation to kill us? What is the safety
 [8] plan for the people of these islands? Do you guys
 [9] have a plan for if an attack happens and the
 [10] missiles doesn't intercept? Do we just die?

[11] THE MODERATOR: Please finish your
 [12] comments.

[13] LANA PAPKE: All right. I'll
 [14] finish. Hold on. I got a little bit more to go.
 [15] Okay. So this plan is not in the
 [16] EIS. And the military - this military
 [17] enhancement is creating a greater threat. It's
 [18] making our islands more of a strategic area for
 [19] attacks.
 [20] Ke Akua does not allow violence.
 [21] Missiles create the threat of violence. Now we
 [22] are going to increase the threat by becoming a
 [23] more strategically important target.
 [24] EIS does not address this threat to
 [25] human and environmental impact. I would

[1] appreciate it if you guys would take your EIS back
 [2] and consider some kind of plan so - in case there
 [3] is an attack and the missiles are not intercepted.
 [4] We are trained in a way to protect ourselves and
 [5] our families.
 [6] And if not, I would appreciate a
 [7] contested case hearing on this basis. And please
 [8] give the Niihauns the truth on what's going on.
 [9] Don't tell them it's just good for their economy.
 [10] Tell them what the real deal is. Mahalo.

[11] THE MODERATOR: The next speak will
 [12] be Allan Nesbitt, number 29. The speakers after
 [13] that will be Ed MacDowell, Tom Hall, Jeff
 [14] Chandler, Linda Chandler, and Nani Marston.
 [15] Allan Nesbitt? Again, it would be
 [16] very helpful if when I call your name to come up
 [17] here, you would come and take the reserved seats
 [18] here.

[19] I don't see Allan Nesbitt coming
 [20] forward. You are not Allan Nesbitt, are you? I
 [21] didn't believe so. So we'll go ahead. Ed
 [22] MacDowell?
 [23] You're not Ed. Okay. Tom Hall?
 [24] Jeff Chandler? Okay.

[25] JEFF CHANDLER: Hello. My name is

[1] Jeff Chandler. I was born and raised on the North
 [2] Shore of Kauai, Hanalei, specifically Haena. I'm
 [3] a native Hawaiian.
 [4] The track record with the military
 [5] in Hawaii is one that has bought the native
 [6] Hawaiians down to their knees. As I put this
 [7] today, the sovereign people of Niihau.
 [8] Surely you are people of your
 [9] word - which you are not, because you were not
 [10] true to our queen. Truly if you are going to take
 [11] care of the native Hawaiian people, then you must
 [12] - you must start the reparation process for the
 [13] native Hawaiians so they can carry on where they
 [14] left off over a hundred years ago.
 [15] Truly if you work for Native
 [16] Hawaiians of Niihau your actions - your actions
 [17] would have been taken about 35 years ago to
 [18] (inaudible). Now that you want your islands, you
 [19] have come up with an idea of give them jobs. You
 [20] are not the first ones that have come into Hawaii,
 [21] and nor will you be the last to try to swindle
 [22] your way in as America has done to the Pacific
 [23] islanders. One that comes to mind is the island
 [24] of Ibarra (phonetic), which I testified years ago
 [25] about,

[1] Where the people live in boxes, in box houses.
 [2] They eat sand, and they drink beer.
 [3] Today we cannot eat the fish off
 [4] the aina. They will never be able to eat it.
 [5] This is what missiles has done to these people.
 [6] And if you think these missiles are going to
 [7] protect you, I'm sorry. They're one of the
 [8] countries that supply other nations in the world
 [9] with these missiles.

[10] Awake. The people of Aioha have
 [11] become the people of destruction. That is your
 [12] moral, isn't it? As Kanaka Maoli, I am ashamed.
 [13] Because these people that have left have not
 [14] gotten the full mana'o of the history of what
 [15] happened to their ancestors. And it's still
 [16] happening today to us.
 [17] The effects is going to go a
 [18] hundred years more, two hundred years. I am
 [19] ashamed. Now it is your duty, America, as you do
 [20] for the Native Indians, to take care of them, take
 [21] care of the native people. To protect, you know,
 [22] their island, the Napua, the research that has
 [23] been done.
 [24] There's depletion of their natural
 [25] resources; mainly fishing. Why? We have the

[1] military here. We have the State. We have the
 [2] County. And it's your obligation and your job to
 [3] protect the natural resources. By that you
 [4] haven't done your job.
 [5] And I don't know how technology is
 [6] going to make it better. You know, you brought
 [7] the Polaris missiles. Now you gonna move the base
 [8] over to the island of Niihau. Like Kahoolawe, I
 [9] wonder how much more generations from now on will
 [10] have to fight.

[11] I am here to participate in the
 [12] restoration of the Hawaiian nation. And it is
 [13] your duty (inaudible) - by the president of the
 [14] United States of America to start reparations. I
 [15] just saw a snicker over there. You know, brother,
 [16] your day will come too when you going to realize
 [17] that missiles do not bring aloha.

[18] THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr.
 [19] Chandler.

[20] LINDA CHANDLER: I know this isn't
 [21] my best side. And I apologize. If I turn my
 [22] back, I won't see the man when he waves his hand.
 [23] My name is Linda Chandler. Aloha. I am a member
 [24] of - (inaudible) as a member of the human race, I
 [25] guess to establish some kind of - (inaudible).

[1] I lived in Morocco when they were
 [2] fighting for independence. (inaudible). I lived
 [3] Iran in the last days of the Shah, which was an
 [4] exciting period to live there.
 [5] My parents both worked on
 [6] (inaudible), as did my brother. And my older
 [7] daughter was a sergeant in the Air Force, spent 12
 [8] years there. My youngest daughter was a sergeant
 [9] in the army (inaudible). So I am hardly
 [10] antimilitary. But I am real anti-expansion.
 [11] I don't see how it will accomplish
 [12] anything but woe for the island. My experience
 [13] has taught me that traditionally the military does
 [14] not always tell the truth. And there is, of
 [15] course, presently the documented history to
 [16] indicate that that is, in fact, a major
 [17] understatement.
 [18] Our County Council, Mayor, and
 [19] newspapers have already endorsed this plan, though
 [20] the County Council admitted they had not read the
 [21] Draft EIS. I find that scary.
 [22] I live in Waimea, too far way to
 [23] have daily contact with PMRF but, in fact, only 19
 [24] miles or so away as the crow flies or the missile
 [25] falls. That's a lot closer than most Kauaians

Page 115

[1] live.
 [2] I truly feel for the people of
 [3] Niihau. But I am sure there are other ways their
 [4] many talents can be used without this program. I
 [5] am positive that if they put as much energy into
 [6] positive thought that they would come up with some
 [7] bright ideas. I'll just do this one completely
 [8] out of the water.
 [9] I do not trust that all the
 [10] mitigating circumstances have been thought of or
 [11] even recognized, let alone dealt with in this
 [12] Draft EIS. Saying something is no significant
 [13] impact doesn't make it so.
 [14] I know that my being against the
 [15] expansion of PMRF as a way of spending my tax
 [16] money makes no difference here because, regardless
 [17] of statements to the contrary, I am sure,
 [18] unfortunately, that this is a done deal.
 [19] I'm here just to make a public
 [20] record of my stand. If this goes through, I will
 [21] one day have the opportunity of saying I told you
 [22] so. And I'd really rather not. If jobs are the
 [23] new God spend, as huge amounts of money -
 [24] (inaudible) - jobs instead. Mahalo.
 [25] THE MODERATOR: We are now on

Page 116

[1] speaker number 34; nani Marston. She will be
 [2] followed by Pamela Sihola, Betty Chandler, Michael
 [3] Loo, Dick Turlington, and David Bennett. Nani
 [4] Marston?
 [5] NANI MARSTON: Mahalo. Nani
 [6] Marston Kilauea resident, long time Kauai.
 [7] I would like to submit my testimony
 [8] in writing. I have it prepared. But I'm going to
 [9] go completely off it.
 [10] When the Niihau people got up to
 [11] speak and then they - (inaudible) - from the
 [12] deepest place, and I could understand much of what
 [13] they said and the way they said it and the love
 [14] that was behind it. It's a difficult time for me.
 [15] I would like to turn it in writing and just
 [16] speak from my heart.
 [17] Dr. Anthony is right. Jeff
 [18] Chandler is right.
 [19] (Clapping)
 [20] Let me finish. Mahalo. But let me
 [21] finish.
 [22] They are right. This is not all
 [23] about money. It can't be all about money. It
 [24] can't be all about economy.
 [25] It's about so much more. This is

Page 117

[1] about protecting the very thing that we are here
 [2] doing, protecting our freedom of speech to agree
 [3] to disagree, to love, to laugh, to cry, to come to
 [4] a table. Nowhere else can you do this in such a
 [5] way. I am not ashamed to be spoken in the same
 [6] breath as America.
 [7] I have lost some dear friends in
 [8] some very ugly places. And as a native Hawaiian
 [9] who understands and has spoken out against some of
 [10] the many mistakes that the military has made -
 [11] Kahoolawe. I sat with George Helm (phonetic) and
 [12] Niko Martin (phonetic), and I considered it my
 [13] privilege to be next to such visionaries.
 [14] We all want peace. We all want
 [15] this life. But if this family, this ohana - 72 I
 [16] understand - come and say we understand, we want
 [17] to wipe the slate clean, we want the Navy to have
 [18] a presence because it will allow us to continue
 [19] our life as we know it with no Nintendo, with
 [20] choosing our life, our children playing outside
 [21] with the rocks and simple things. Who are we to
 [22] speak for them?
 [23] On the area of environment we must
 [24] realize that there are exciting transfer
 [25] potentials that will exist in the test and

Page 118

[1] evaluation community. And they will inevitably
 [2] bring these transfers to us, and they will affect
 [3] everything from medical transfers, allowing auntie
 [4] or uncle not to have to jump on an airplane but to
 [5] stay in the safety of their own land and get a
 [6] reading from a far away place.
 [7] Environmental - ERAST,
 [8] Environmental Research Aircraft Sensor Technology
 [9] came here with the Pathfinder through PMRF.
 [10] It's also able through Precision
 [11] Spectral Photography to collect data for all kinds
 [12] of applications, for mapping, for identifying
 [13] undesirable vegetation, perhaps even some viruses.
 [14] Remember there are very evil
 [15] threats. This is not a perfect world. But they
 [16] are not all human. We know that in our deepest
 [17] way through Iniki.
 [18] I would just like to thank you.
 [19] And I'd like to turn the rest of this in. Mahalo.
 [20] THE MODERATOR: Pamela Sihola.
 [21] PAMELA SIHOLA: Good afternoon. To
 [22] the courageous people of Hawaii, my name is Pamela
 [23] sihola. And I am a privileged individual to spend
 [24] a few months every year on this beautiful sacred
 [25] island.

Page 119

[1] What you are proposing, planning,
 [2] to do here is absolute sheer madness. In light of
 [3] the fall of Communism and the Soviet Union close
 [4] to ten years ago, there are no military threats to
 [5] warrant expansion of operations such as what is
 [6] proposed here on Kauai.
 [7] This island is the most beautiful,
 [8] precious place on earth. People come here from
 [9] distances of tens and thousands of miles away to
 [10] rejuvenate their spirits, their body, and soul, to
 [11] capture a glimpse of a primordial beauty already
 [12] destroyed elsewhere in the world.
 [13] This island is a sacred jewel
 [14] constantly fighting destruction from all sides;
 [15] human greed, natural forces, and now this mad
 [16] folly to expand the operations at the Pacific
 [17] Missile Range.
 [18] This island should be dedicated to
 [19] peace. This base should be recommissioned and
 [20] rededicated as an International Peace Center for
 [21] the Pacific. There must be some creative minds in
 [22] the local and state governments to find ways of
 [23] employment, sustainable, honorable employment,
 [24] based on land use by local people in a way to
 [25] create a completely self-sustaining independent

Page 120

[1] system of living.
 [2] I think the business community is
 [3] ill-advised if they support this expansion.
 [4] Visiting tourists will not tolerate seeing
 [5] military helicopters passing by the south shore
 [6] day after day. The sound is already utterly
 [7] intolerable.
 [8] It is also my understanding that in
 [9] spite of the denials, there are radioactive
 [10] materials and radioactive waste stored currently
 [11] on the island.
 [12] This so-called disclosure has been
 [13] omitted in the Draft EIS. And I hope that this
 [14] fact will be revealed as part of Bill Anthony's
 [15] legal action.
 [16] My question is what happened to the
 [17] radioactive waste during the attack from Hurricane
 [18] Iniki. Were radioactive materials present in the
 [19] buildings destroyed by Iniki - (inaudible) - as
 [20] the hazard report indicated?
 [21] Did you provide a post-Iniki
 [22] environmental assessment to the impacted
 [23] community? Nuclear warheads contain plutonium
 [24] with a 23,000 year half life. And tritium, a
 [25] radioactive isotope of hydrogen oxidizes quickly

Page 121

[1] in the atmosphere and becomes created water which,
 [2] like regular water, is taken up by the vegetation,
 [3] plants, and food stuffs.
 [4] My last question is to the business
 [5] community. Are you going to allow this threat of
 [6] toxic and radioactive contamination from the base
 [7] in an accident and natural disaster such as
 [8] hurricanes destroy the island, the environment,
 [9] the health and safety of people?
 [10] There must be a peaceful means for
 [11] survival and sustainable living. People have the
 [12] right and must fight for their communities safety
 [13] for clean environment, clean water, and the
 [14] basics.
 [15] This current proposal, the
 [16] expansion of the TBMD, will mean Kauai will become
 [17] the number one target for an offensive attack.
 [18] Hawaii is officially designated to be sacrificed
 [19] in an offensive attack.
 [20] I urge you to work for peace.
 [21] Leave the old Cold War mindset. Don't allow the
 [22] military industrial complex to expand on this
 [23] island. The long-term results will be only a
 [24] horrific environmental toxic radioactive
 [25] contamination legacy on this side, and ultimately

Page 122

[1] the island will become a target for an attack.
 [2] Please, we all need to work for
 [3] peace in the Pacific, in the world, in the next
 [4] millenium, the EIS has not considered this as a
 [5] viable alternative. Thank you.
 [6] THE MODERATOR: Betty Chandler.
 [7] BETTY CHANDLER: At this point I
 [8] will abide by the rules. My name is Betty
 [9] Chandler. And I live in Kalaeo.
 [10] I am a believer in free speech too.
 [11] But I also believe with free speech comes
 [12] responsibility. Today I have heard fear being
 [13] given out. I have heard misinformation being
 [14] given out. And I think it behooves all of us to
 [15] really know the truth. Truth today seems to not
 [16] be the real thing to do all over these United
 [17] States.
 [18] It is my understanding that there
 [19] will not be an attack at PMRF or on Kauai because
 [20] this is a testing ground. It is also my
 [21] understanding that we need to have tests of all
 [22] weapons. There has been war from the beginning of
 [23] time. And I imagine there will be at the end of
 [24] time.
 [25] But if there is a war, I want the

Page 123

[1] United States to have the best missile defense in
 [2] the whole wide world.
 [3] Most of us are totally unaware of
 [4] any testing that does go on at PMRF or has gone
 [5] on. I commend all of the people in the military
 [6] for these United States. Because without them and
 [7] those in the past, we would not have our freedom
 [8] today.
 [9] At Pearl Harbor, thank God for the
 [10] presence of the military. Because the island
 [11] probably would have been taken over by some
 [12] country other than the United States.
 [13] I now - I had not intended to
 [14] speak these particular words because today I came
 [15] to represent the Republican Women's Club of Kauai.
 [16] We had a meeting.
 [17] Not a representative of the Navy,
 [18] but a fellow resident of Kauai who has studied and
 [19] studied and studied, read all the EIS and so
 [20] forth, on the completion of his presentation to
 [21] us, we passed a resolution which states - and
 [22] this has been mailed to you, Captain - Commanding
 [23] Officer, Captain Bowlin, Pacific Missile Range
 [24] Facility, PO box 128, Kekaha, Hawaii 96752.
 [25] Dear Captain Bowlin, the Republican

Page 124

[1] Women's Club of Kauai fully supports the Range
 [2] Enhancement of the Pacific Missile Range Facility
 [3] at Barking Sands to accommodate the Ballistic
 [4] Missile Defense testing as described in the Draft
 [5] Environmental Impact Statement dated April 3,
 [6] 1998.
 [7] This support was affirmed by a
 [8] unanimous vote at the April 1998 meeting held on
 [9] April 21, 1998. Sincerely Alani Pine (phonetic),
 [10] president. Thank you very much.
 [11] THE MODERATOR: Michael Loo.
 [12] MICHAEL LOO: Good afternoon,
 [13] Captain Bowlin, members of the panel. I am
 [14] Michael Loo, president of the Kauai North Shore
 [15] Business Council. Our community is distant by
 [16] road but physically very proximate to operations
 [17] at the Pacific Missile Range Facility. During our
 [18] most recent board of directors meeting, we voted
 [19] unanimously to support the U.S. Navy's efforts to
 [20] improve and enhance the operational and testing
 [21] capabilities of PMRF.
 [22] We feel that any scale would mean
 [23] heavily to support the Navy's Enhancement plans as
 [24] they outweigh any negative impacts which the plan
 [25] would bring to Kauai and Niihau by a large margin.

Page 125

[1] There is a need to support
 [2] maintaining our national defense systems at the
 [3] highest levels possible. There is a need to
 [4] support the more than 800 jobs currently in place
 [5] at the base. There is a need to support the
 [6] programs that will bring more permanent
 [7] well-paying jobs to the base, providing our
 [8] children with the employment opportunities not
 [9] available anywhere else on this island.
 [10] There is a need to support plans
 [11] that will solidly anchor PMRF's position as the
 [12] foremost ocean testing range in the world because
 [13] our island and the state of Hawaii have been and
 [14] will continue to be dependent on military spending
 [15] to supplement our economies.
 [16] There is a need to support the
 [17] programs and facilities that have already spawned
 [18] peripheral high tech and community benefits to
 [19] Kauai and which will allow further development of
 [20] these opportunities. There is a need to support
 [21] the good neighbor that the Navy has been.
 [22] In our view there appears to be
 [23] very few significant negative environmental
 [24] impacts that could not be mitigated. We feel that
 [25] the Navy has been a good steward of the land and

Page 126

[1] the sea and that the Navy and its contractors have
 [2] more than adequately demonstrated that they care
 [3] and are concerned about our aina and the people of
 [4] this community.
 [5] They have made the base available
 [6] not only to their local community but even those
 [7] like us who live and work on the north shore.
 [8] They have fostered programs that encourage bonding
 [9] of the military with the community. The bottom
 [10] line; they have been good neighbors and we should
 [11] treat them as such.
 [12] Thank you for the opportunity to
 [13] present our observations and comments. We hope
 [14] that we have added sufficiently to the scale - to
 [15] the side of the scale favoring the project so that
 [16] the decision will be positive and the project can
 [17] proceed post haste. Thank you.
 [18] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker
 [19] will be Dick Turlington, number 38. Speakers
 [20] after him will be Dave Bennett, Tom Hughes,
 [21] Gabriela Taylor, Wendy Benton.
 [22] Turlington? Is he here? Looks
 [23] like Dick is not here. Go ahead Dave Bennett.
 [24] DAVE BENNETT: Good afternoon. My
 [25] name is David Bennett. I am the Project Manager

Page 127

[1] for ITT Federal Services Corporation. We are the
 [2] operations and maintenance contractor for the
 [3] range at PMRF.
 [4] I know I speak for all of the 230
 [5] employees of ITT there when I say we strongly
 [6] support PMRF's Enhancements to its Capabilities.
 [7] After sitting here all day, I think
 [8] we all need to understand what this EIS is all
 [9] about. It's about the need for a defensive
 [10] missile system, a system that will protect our
 [11] forward-deployed ships, our sailors, our ground
 [12] forces. And that has to be balanced with
 [13] protecting our environment and our wildlife.
 [14] The purpose of the Enhancements are
 [15] to prepare PMRF to accommodate testing of the
 [16] Navy's Theater Ballistic Missile defense program
 [17] as well as other programs.
 [18] These missiles are purely defensive
 [19] in nature, and the entire testing program
 [20] represents only a small increase in PMRF's
 [21] existing testing and training activities. During
 [22] Desert Storm the U.S. discovered we had no
 [23] credible defense for the SCUD missile. And you
 [24] only had to tune into your TV to see the death and
 [25] destruction wrought by those missiles on our

Page 128

[1] forces and our allies.
 [2] Unfortunately, we still don't have
 [3] an operational defensive missile for the SCUD.
 [4] Yet as we speak today over 60,000 American people
 [5] are poised in the Middle East ready to pounce on
 [6] Saddam Huessin if they are called on to do so.
 [7] We should never again send our
 [8] young men and women anywhere without a defense for
 [9] incoming ballistic missiles.
 [10] Obviously, what we are saying here
 [11] is there's a need to test these defensive missile
 [12] systems and get them out to the fleet. PMRF was
 [13] selected for the TBMD program because the range
 [14] has the capability and is in the right location to
 [15] perform these tests faster and more efficiently
 [16] than can be done at any other range.
 [17] After development, these defensive
 [18] missiles translated to, one, substantial savings
 [19] to the taxpayer and, two, delivery to the fleet of
 [20] these missiles in the shortest possible time
 [21] frame.
 [22] The economy has been talked about.
 [23] The impact of PMRF on the economy has been
 [24] discussed. I won't add to it. I would just like
 [25] to say that it's significantly. Acquiring the

Page 129

[1] TBMD programs may increase employment at PMRF by
 [2] as much as several hundred employees.
 [3] That's good for all of us. Our
 [4] friends and neighbors can remain on island. So
 [5] can our children. They won't have to leave and
 [6] raise their families elsewhere.
 [7] On the other hand, if it doesn't
 [8] come here, it's quite possible that the range
 [9] would downsize, that jobs would be lost, and that
 [10] the future for PMRF could be dead.
 [11] Throughout its 75 years of history
 [12] PMRF has proved that it operates safely and
 [13] protects the ecosystem in which it operates we
 [14] know - and we can and we do hope without
 [15] impairing our military mission.
 [16] In my nine years of association
 [17] with the people of the west end of this beautiful
 [18] island I have learned that they are very strong
 [19] stewards of our environment.
 [20] And anyone who has visited PMRF can
 [21] attest to the extraordinary efforts that are taken
 [22] by all of us out there to save our environment and
 [23] protect endangered species. And we recent the
 [24] implication by misstatements, innuendo that it's
 [25] any other way.

Page 130

[1] Lastly, and most importantly, we
 [2] support these enhancements because they pose no
 [3] significant threat to the environment or our
 [4] wildlife. We know that if anyone can point out
 [5] any areas where this may - where there may be a
 [6] threat, the Navy will do the right thing. Thank
 [7] you.

[8] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker is
 [9] Tom Hughes. That's you? It's your turn. By the
 [10] way, I will say on behalf of Tom Hughes he does
 [11] not want any of his five minutes used up by
 [12] laughter. He informed me this will be
 [13] entertaining. So go ahead and go, Tom Hughes.
 [14] And if you hold your laughter to the end, he will
 [15] appreciate it.

[16] TOM HUGHES: Thank you very much.
 [17] THE MODERATOR: Make sure we can
 [18] hear you on the microphone.

[19] TOM HUGHES: I want to say that I
 [20] appreciate you being here to listen to us today.
 [21] But actually I've been a resident of Kauai for
 [22] over ten years now. It's no surprise to me to
 [23] find the people coming out again to try to put
 [24] PMRF off the island and out of business.
 [25] They've been out every couple of

Page 131

[1] years in the last five, ten years I've been here.
 [2] So it's nothing new. But in the last run around,
 [3] about two and a half years ago, an easement - I
 [4] had a chance to talk to some of them.
 [5] And I asked them what do they do if
 [6] they shut PMRF down? They said, well, they will
 [7] convert to peaceful activities, like making Koa
 [8] furniture and souvenirs - (inaudible) - they
 [9] would probably out law chairs.
 [10] But he said I have a few prototypes
 [11] here - (inaudible) - when they take over PMRF.
 [12] One of them is this. And I said that looks like a
 [13] fly swatter for killing giant horse flies. He
 [14] said, no, it's not. It's for "fwatting slys."
 [15] So when someone, for instance,
 [16] catapults something the size of a football that
 [17] might contain - (inaudible) - poison gas, he
 [18] says you'll have to be ready. If you see it, you
 [19] "fwat" it right back at them.
 [20] I said, well, what about the big
 [21] missiles like the SCUD missile? He said don't use
 [22] that word again. If I hear that word again more
 [23] than three times in five minutes, I get diarrhea.
 [24] So I said, okay, I won't. I'm sorry. But what
 [25] about the big SCUDs that fly? What happens to

Page 132

[1] them?
 [2] He said we have a prototype for
 [3] that one too. And I'll have to get that one.
 [4] (Pause.)

[5] He said it looks like - it's in
 [6] the umbrella family. But it has an automatic
 [7] release mechanism like that.
 [8] And what it will do, he says it
 [9] will throw up a terrifically strong elastic net
 [10] which will capture the SCUD and throw it back at
 [11] them.

[12] I said this guy, he has the first
 [13] stage of the Anti-PMRF disease. He denies that
 [14] there is such a thing as a defensive missile. And
 [15] then, of course, he goes on to deny a lot of
 [16] things.

[17] But that disease is very
 [18] progressive. They go on to deny history. They
 [19] deny the fact that there are evil people in world.
 [20] They deny the fact that every generation produces
 [21] another Saddam Huessin, Hitler, or Timothy McVay.
 [22] And then they finally go on to deny
 [23] facts about truth. And they say certain truths
 [24] are lies. Then they say lies are truth and
 [25] preserving the peace is making war.

[1] Well, they are hoping this time
 [2] around - because you have the Titanic news around
 [3] and it's in the air, you know. They are hoping to
 [4] sink PMRF with its fantastic mix of - unique mix
 [5] of people and facilities for research and
 [6] development in areas of - especially in TBM we
 [7] are talking about tonight.

[8] This will be the first step I think
 [9] that will lead inevitably to a disaster of
 [10] catastrophic proportions. In fact, it's hard to
 [11] imagine - if you look at the world today, you
 [12] realize this - (inaudible) - exceed the
 [13] disasters in all our history, like the Civil War,
 [14] World Wars I and II and also Vietnam.

[15] It's very sad for me that on our
 [16] beautiful island of Kauai it would start a chain
 [17] of reactions which could permit a mad man like
 [18] Saddam Huessin to freely - freely, that's what
 [19] the problem is, freely - that he would be free to
 [20] float down weapons of mass destruction, including
 [21] nuclear, biological and also chemical.

[22] So I say the reason why they are
 [23] denying the Armed Forces the necessary vital
 [24] defensive weapon which they need to defend against
 [25] these weapons, as Captain Bennett said - I think

[1] the message today that flies out loud and clear is
 [2] simply this. We will not permit anyone to sink
 [3] the good ship PMRF. Thank you very much for not
 [4] laughing.

[5] THE MODERATOR: Gabriela Taylor.

[6] GABRIELA TAYLOR: Aloha. I'm going
 [7] to turn my back on the audience. I would like to
 [8] say that - let me just adjust the microphone.

[9] THE MODERATOR: Did you state your
 [10] name?

[11] GABRIELA TAYLOR: My name is
 [12] Gabriela Taylor. And I would like to speak on
 [13] behalf of the animals.
 [14] I feel they are not represented.
 [15] The endangered species and many of the sea birds
 [16] are not represented here today. So I'm going to
 [17] be presumptuous and try to do that. I'm using a
 [18] lot of the evidence that was in this document. It
 [19] took a long time to read it all.
 [20] I'm here today to oppose the
 [21] expansion of the PMRF missile testing program,
 [22] Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced
 [23] Capability, which would impact Kauai, Niihau, Tern
 [24] Island, Johnston Atoll, and open areas northwest
 [25] of Kauai within and outside U.S. territorial

[1] waters.
 [2] I am responding to the sections I
 [3] have read in the Draft EIS. There is no question
 [4] in anyone's mind about the status of Tern Island
 [5] as a designated U.S. wildlife refuge. The
 [6] National Wildlife Refuge System Act defines its
 [7] mission "to administer a national network of lands
 [8] and waters for the conservation, management, and,
 [9] where appropriate, restoration of the fish
 [10] wildlife and plant resources and their habitats
 [11] within the United States for the benefit of
 [12] present and future generations."
 [13] What a beautiful statement. The
 [14] act requires public involvement in decisions to
 [15] allow new uses of national wildlife refuges.
 [16] Therefore, it is clearly illegal
 [17] for Tern Island, a national wildlife refuge for
 [18] almost 90 years, to be used for building and
 [19] operating a missile launch pad. This is why.
 [20] There are two endangered species
 [21] nesting and inhabiting the island at various
 [22] times. The Green Sea Turtle and the Hawaiian Monk
 [23] Seals. Numerous species of threatened sea birds
 [24] use the island as nesting grounds.
 [25] Major research on these animals is

[1] done on Tern Island under the guidance of the U.S.
 [2] Fish and Wildlife Service. Studies of these
 [3] animals would be restricted up to 56 days per
 [4] year. Here are some factors which would impact
 [5] the animals negatively. Again, getting these
 [6] facts out of the Draft EIS.

[7] Proposed target missiles at Tern
 [8] Island use solid propellants that according to the
 [9] EIS, potential soil contamination could occur from
 [10] rocket emissions from hazardous residues in
 [11] concentrations which would dictate a hazard to
 [12] human health. I assume that would also include
 [13] animals and birds that would be nesting on Tern
 [14] island.

[15] Portable generators would also make
 [16] noise and create pollution. The USFWS uses solar
 [17] power, which is noiseless, which is silent because
 [18] they are so aware of the fact of how noise does
 [19] impact the nesting animals there.

[20] Construction of new facilities up
 [21] to 6 months and renovation of existing structures
 [22] would create noise, toxic waste, additional
 [23] material transport. They talk about a 3,000
 [24] horsepower engine for the tug that would have to
 [25] be there. Imagine how noisy that would be. And

[1] it would take up more space on a small island.
 [2] Also construction workers
 [3] inhabiting as well as working and moving around
 [4] the island would interfere fear with nesting and
 [5] with vocalization of animals and birds. Light
 [6] from the increased proposed operations and
 [7] increased personnel on the island is dangerous to
 [8] the animals. The volunteers and researchers with
 [9] the USFWS do not turn on lights at night unless
 [10] they are shielded or red in color.

[11] I could go on and on mentioning
 [12] toxic consequences of radar, sonic boom, ground
 [13] hazard areas and other environmental assaults on
 [14] this important wildlife research lab.
 [15] Also, these considerations apply to
 [16] Johnston Atoll, which is also a designated
 [17] national wildlife refuge, and unfortunately has
 [18] been misused by the military since the 1940s. It
 [19] was used to test nuclear weapons in the 1950s and
 [20] '60s and served as a dumping ground for obsolete
 [21] chemical weapons. That's what the military has
 [22] already done to that island as a refuge, which is
 [23] totally outrageous.

[24] So clearly there are too many
 [25] reasons that the Navy will legally not be

[1] permitted to expand their operations to Tern
 [2] Island and Johnston Atoll. Because they would not
 [3] be in compliance with the Endangered Species Act
 [4] or the U.S. Wildlife Refuge Act.

[5] THE MODERATOR: Thank you very
 [6] much.

[7] GABRIELA TAYLOR: You're welcome.

[8] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker up
 [9] will be number 42, Wendy Benton. She will be
 [10] followed by Arius Hopman, Alan Lloyd, Gregg
 [11] Gardiner, Alberto Partida, and Wendell Nunes.
 [12] If you would come up and use this
 [13] reserved area, I would appreciate it.

[14] WENDY BENTON: My name is Wendy
 [15] Benton. I am from Kekaha.
 [16] Aloha. I am opposed to the
 [17] expansion or enhancement of the PMRF Theater
 [18] Ballistic Missile Defense testing program which
 [19] would impact Kauai and Niihau and possibly the
 [20] northwestern Hawaiian Islands' natural wildlife
 [21] and beaches, including Tern Island and Johnston
 [22] Atoll.
 [23] Yes, PMRF has been a good neighbor
 [24] for over 30 years and has provided jobs, and they
 [25] are not the ones being threatened here.

Page 139

[1] This issue and illusion that a vast
 [2] amount of jobs will be created by this expansion
 [3] of our residents is not true, and it is clouding
 [4] the real issues. Please open up to the bigger
 [5] issues. Our military and our people are not being
 [6] referred to with words like endangered or extinct
 [7] like are Monk Seals and are Green Sea Turtles and
 [8] other animal populations are.
 [9] Our society continues to go the way
 [10] of the mainland, Wal-Marts, Kmarts, materialisms,
 [11] a lot of trash – Kekaha landfill is filling up
 [12] out of control. I don't see my friends here
 [13] happier because of these influences. I don't see
 [14] our children any better, happier, healthier, or
 [15] safer.
 [16] I've had children for over 18
 [17] years. And, in fact, I see the reverse happening.
 [18] Parents more stressed, less family time, children
 [19] ruder, and more angry. We don't need to go the
 [20] way of the mainland. There are other ways.
 [21] The Cold War is over. It is time
 [22] now for major changes. A time to base decisions
 [23] on love, instead of fear; on our children's
 [24] future, instead of the car that we drive.
 [25] Our country's economy for too long

Page 140

[1] has been addicted to the military. Let's work
 [2] toward healing this addiction.
 [3] I feel Kauai is the most precious
 [4] place on earth. It is fragile, and it needs
 [5] protection. Who is the enemy? Who are they? Who
 [6] is out there? Who's out to get us? We are all
 [7] the enemy when we do things that harm our own
 [8] planet, our own health, our own children's future.
 [9] Why not develop health,
 [10] recreational, cultural, educational facilities
 [11] here instead of promoting the war machine. We
 [12] could attract people from all over this world to
 [13] visit us for our wildlife refuges, cultural and
 [14] educational healing centers. We could nurture our
 [15] agriculture.
 [16] Niihau could become a great center.
 [17] I also believe Niihau is in God's hands and that
 [18] there are many, many, many other ways than this to
 [19] get a well dug. Mahalo.
 [20] ARIUS HOPMAN: My name is Arius
 [21] Hopman. I am a geologist - (inaudible) - and
 [22] business owner in Hanapepe. I object to most of
 [23] the testimonies in favor of the PMRF expansion on
 [24] the grounds that they are not addressing the Draft
 [25] Environmental Impact Statement.

Page 141

[1] We are dealing here today with an
 [2] environmental situation. We are not dealing here
 [3] with jobs or money. And if you look at the way
 [4] money is spent around the world, most money spent
 [5] means consumption, means environmental
 [6] destruction. So there's been a lot of favorable
 [7] comments made for expansion of PMRF which deals
 [8] basically with money. I rule those out as null
 [9] and void.
 [10] The government prepared specialists
 [11] who spent nearly a year preparing the DEIS. It is
 [12] insulting to expect lay people to respond
 [13] intelligently to the DEIS five weeks from receipt
 [14] of this three-inch thick document. Such short
 [15] notice makes me conclude that the Navy is not
 [16] really interested in public input. This is
 [17] nothing short of a violation of the democratic
 [18] process. I hereby request in democratic fashion
 [19] equal time to respond. That means about ten
 [20] months.
 [21] We, the people, are not
 [22] specialists. If anything, we need more time. The
 [23] DEIS is fundamentally flawed. It has glaring
 [24] holes in it. In particular, the DEIS talks about
 [25] several endangered marine species. They are not

Page 142

[1] talking about the land species on Niihau and the
 [2] Tern Islands.
 [3] The land species are extremely
 [4] important in Niihau, which is an old island. It
 [5] is older than Kauai. And as a geologist, I
 [6] estimate it's between 7 and 10 million years old.
 [7] Does anybody here know how old it is? Okay.
 [8] There are species that were evolved
 [9] on Niihau before Kauai or any of the other
 [10] populated islands were even coming out of the
 [11] ocean. So there are a lot of species there that
 [12] were able to adapt to Niihau before the others
 [13] even came into existence. We need to identify
 [14] those species before they are destroyed.
 [15] So it's a logical deduction that
 [16] the species that evolved on these islands exist
 [17] nowhere else. At this stage it is urgent that
 [18] these land species be identified and civilian
 [19] specialists be brought into Niihau.
 [20] The moment Robinson invited the
 [21] military to Niihau, he opened of doors to the
 [22] public. The military is a public service.
 [23] Robinson's hands-off policy cannot apply. The
 [24] public must be able to inform itself about the
 [25] conditions on Niihau.

Page 143

[1] This is a glaring lack of
 [2] disclosure in the DEIS in terms of the land
 [3] species that are endangered on Niihau as well as
 [4] on the other islands.
 [5] At the PMRF-sponsored scoping
 [6] meeting in June of last year at the Waimea
 [7] Community Center, there was an information
 [8] specialist and military spokesman from Washington
 [9] D.C. present to answer public questions.
 [10] I asked him if land-based expansion
 [11] was essential and whether launchings could not be
 [12] done from the sea. His response was clear and
 [13] could not be misinterpreted. He said, sure,
 [14] target missiles can be launched from barges. We
 [15] have been doing that. Land-based missile
 [16] launchings are not essential.
 [17] Ocean launches are less convenient,
 [18] more costly, and more weather dependent. We are
 [19] required by our law to review all existing
 [20] alternatives before making a decision.
 [21] That protocol is what has triggered
 [22] the administration of land-based launchings on
 [23] Niihau and the uninhabited islands as well, even
 [24] though they are not essential to our success.
 [25] Jim Irwin, information specialist

Page 144

[1] from PMRF who was here today, just advised me that
 [2] the main interest in Niihau is for future military
 [3] expansion, not for the present expansion. Niihau
 [4] is not necessary for target missile launchings. And
 [5] - okay.
 [6] Considering the fact that barge
 [7] launchings are a viable option, I feel it
 [8] unconscionable for the Navy to pursue the
 [9] possibility of invading another new island for
 [10] their expansionism. It has never been clear to me
 [11] why the largely unused lands of PMRF are not
 [12] considered as first choice.
 [13] I read a long testimony in the June
 [14] 1997 PMRF meeting. The response I got was
 [15] traditional, institutional, boiler plate jargon.
 [16] Basically, an I-don't-care-about-what-you-say
 [17] attitude, defensive, and flippant attitude. Not
 [18] the respectful response of a public servant. But
 [19] a condescending response of an autocrat.
 [20] There's a lack of disclosure that
 [21] is required by law. Many of the main points of my
 [22] letter were disregarded completely. And responses
 [23] were limited to pat answers such as the proposed
 [24] action complies with guidance from Congress,
 [25] without significant impact.

Page 145

[1] THE MODERATOR: Your time is up.
 [2] Thank you very much.
 [3] ARIUS HOPMAN: I will submit the
 [4] rest by mail.
 [5] THE MODERATOR: Please do.
 [6] ALAN LLOYD: Good afternoon. I
 [7] have given a copy of my testimony to the
 [8] receptionist.
 [9] I am Alan Lloyd. And I am a
 [10] National Director of the Navy League of the United
 [11] States, And I am testifying on behalf of 5,500
 [12] members of the Honolulu Council of the Navy
 [13] League.
 [14] The Honolulu Council strongly
 [15] supports the proposal by the United States Navy to
 [16] upgrade the existing installations and
 [17] capabilities at PMRF in order to qualify this
 [18] facility as the lead range for our nations Theater
 [19] Missile Defense testing program.
 [20] During the 1991 Gulf War the only
 [21] weapons systems that we could not adequately
 [22] counter were the relatively primitive Iraqi SCUD
 [23] ballistic missiles. If we are going to ask our
 [24] young men and women to go into harm's way in
 [25] future military conflicts, we must ensure that

Page 146

[1] they have the necessary equipment to protect
 [2] themselves as well as the civilian populations and
 [3] troops of our allies, especially if such defensive
 [4] systems could be produced and made available at
 [5] reasonable cost.
 [6] The United States Congress has
 [7] recognized that the broad open ocean areas north
 [8] and west of Kauai's Na Pali coast coupled with
 [9] multiple sites for radar tracking stations at high
 [10] elevations are ideal for testing the Theater
 [11] Missile defense systems which must be perfected
 [12] over the next several years.
 [13] There is no other range that has
 [14] the unique technical, operational, and
 [15] geographical advantages of the PMRF on Kauai. Not
 [16] only do the assets of the PMRF offer a unique
 [17] advantage to our nation and its armed forces, but
 [18] in addition they offer a very special advantage to
 [19] our state's economy and to the daily living
 [20] environment of the people who live on Kauai and
 [21] also on Niihau.
 [22] These advantages include the
 [23] following. In addition to the Navy personnel
 [24] assigned to the Barking Sands facility, PMRF
 [25] provides 800 civilian jobs for Kauai residents.

Page 147

[1] If the PMRF is upgraded to support the Theater
 [2] Missile Defense program and also to improve its
 [3] ability to serve our nation's ongoing daily needs
 [4] for training and testing of its ships and
 [5] equipment, PMRF will remain part of Kauai's
 [6] economy for a long time and these 800 jobs will
 [7] remain secure.
 [8] It is a well-established fact that
 [9] some of our nation's best preserved coastlines are
 [10] on U.S. military reservations. These military
 [11] facilities protect the shorelines from commercial
 [12] development. And the necessary base security
 [13] requirements protect historic sites from poaching
 [14] and vandalism as well as the piles of trash and
 [15] garbage that often accumulate in the areas that
 [16] are accessible to the general public.
 [17] The island of Niihau has been
 [18] preserved in a very special way by the Robinson
 [19] family. It is the only island where Hawaiian is
 [20] still the spoken language and the only island
 [21] where the traditional Hawaiian values are still
 [22] practiced by the entire population.
 [23] It is very important that this most
 [24] Hawaiian of our state's communities remain viable
 [25] and intact for the foreseeable future. For this

Page 148

[1] to continue, the Niihau Ranch must have a steady
 [2] income that is dependable and minimizes the need
 [3] for a subsidy from sugar operations on Kauai.
 [4] In this context it is important to
 [5] know that sugar production has ceased on Oahu and
 [6] on the Big Island. In the 1960s there were 6
 [7] sugar mills and 3 pineapple canneries on Kauai.
 [8] Today only 3 sugar mills remain in operation, and
 [9] the canneries are gone.
 [10] Because the traditional land
 [11] management policies of the Navy's Barking Sands
 [12] facility and the Niihau Ranch are so similar, the
 [13] two organizations have been able to work together
 [14] in great harmony.
 [15] For ten years PMRF has maintained
 [16] an unmanned remote controlled radar tracking
 [17] station on Niihau. As part of this proposal to
 [18] upgrade PMRF's ability to test these new missile
 [19] defense systems for our nation, the Navy is
 [20] proposing to lease additional sites from the ranch
 [21] on Niihau.
 [22] Because of the traditions and the
 [23] culture of the community on Niihau, it will not be
 [24] necessary to station any Navy or civilian person
 [25] now on Niihau to supervise these new facilities.

Page 149

[1] As a result the Niihau Ranch will gain additional
 [2] income, and the traditional Hawaiian life style of
 [3] the island will not be adversely affected.
 [4] PMRF represents a very special
 [5] economic asset. The only island of our state that
 [6] has been badly damaged by four hurricanes in the
 [7] last half of this century. PMRF is not only a
 [8] hurricane-proof business for Kauai, it is an
 [9] important emergency facility and organization that
 [10] is always available to assist the people of Kauai
 [11] and Niihau during natural disasters.
 [12] The State of Hawaii is presently
 [13] suffering a significant economic downturn. For
 [14] this reason it is very important to encourage
 [15] existing businesses to expand and invest in new
 [16] facilities so that their operations will remain
 [17] economically viable and that the state's tax base
 [18] will be protected.
 [19] Several years ago a suggestion was
 [20] made by two United States Senators that PMRF
 [21] should be shut down as part of the Defense
 [22] Department's need to close military bases
 [23] throughout the nation. The Honolulu Council
 [24] immediately wrote to those senators to make sure
 [25] that they were fully informed as to the unique

Page 150

[1] assets that the PMRF offers for our Navy.
 [2] Fortunately, the U.S. Congress is
 [3] now fully aware of the importance of the Pacific
 [4] Missile Range Facility and the special role that
 [5] it stands ready to play in testing the new defense
 [6] equipment that will protect the lives of our
 [7] military personnel in future engagements.
 [8] Because our military must
 [9] constantly train and test their equipment and
 [10] ensure that we will prevail in any future conflict
 [11] with minimum loss of ships and aircraft, and more
 [12] importantly, minimum casualties, active military
 [13] assets and bases must be located where they can
 [14] accurately calibrate their equipment and
 [15] continuously train their people.
 [16] Accordingly, the presence and the
 [17] capabilities of the Pacific Missile Range Facility
 [18] are an important consideration with regard to home
 [19] porting ships and maintaining significant
 [20] maintenance facilities at the Pearl Harbor Naval
 [21] Shipyard on the island of Oahu.
 [22] In closing, the Honolulu Council of
 [23] the Navy League strongly supports this proposal to
 [24] upgrade the existing installation and capabilities
 [25] of the PMRF on the islands of Kauai and Niihau.

Page 151

[1] We completely concur with the Draft Environmental
 [2] study conclusion that there will be no significant
 [3] adverse environmental impacts on Kauai or Niihau
 [4] resulting from this proposed expansion of the
 [5] PMRF. Thank you very much for this opportunity.
 [6] GREGG GARDINER: Thank you for the
 [7] opportunity to comment today on the Draft
 [8] Environmental Impact Statement. My name is Gregg
 [9] Gardiner. And I speak today on behalf of myself
 [10] and the Kauai Chapter of the Marine Corps League,
 [11] some fifty-five members strong.
 [12] For most of us the Ballistic
 [13] Missile Defense era began a little over 7 years
 [14] ago on January 18, 1991 when a Patriot missile
 [15] intercepted an incoming Iraqi SCUD missile over
 [16] Saudi Arabia. Not only was that interception at
 [17] night with a dazzling display of technical
 [18] virtuosity, but it was recorded on video and
 [19] replayed numerous times before hundreds of
 [20] millions of viewers worldwide.
 [21] We, the public, recognized for the
 [22] first time that there could be limited defenses
 [23] against ballistic missiles.
 [24] Missile attacks are not new to the
 [25] eighties and nineties. During World War II the

Page 152

[1] Germans launched rockets to England. And since
 [2] then people all the over the world have been
 [3] living in fear of missile attacks from the sky.
 [4] While the Gulf War was in many
 [5] respects a great triumph, there are certainly many
 [6] lessons that need to be learned from that war.
 [7] One of these lessons is that future conflicts will
 [8] very likely include attacks on American forces by
 [9] ballistic missiles.
 [10] Sadly it was also the Gulf War when
 [11] a primitive Iraqi SCUD missile carrying a
 [12] conventional warhead slammed into a barrack
 [13] housing American troops in Saudi Arabia. 28
 [14] Americans were killed, and another 96 were
 [15] injured. It was the single largest loss of life
 [16] in that war.
 [17] The Washington Post recounted the
 [18] horror of how these brave young Americans well
 [19] behind the front lines were cold bloodedly
 [20] attacked and murdered without warning. As the
 [21] Post described it, it was simply a freak of war.
 [22] No ground was gained. None was defeated. No
 [23] tactical purpose was served.
 [24] People were assassinated in their
 [25] beds as they dozed or lounged or downed around

Page 153

[1] with their buddies. They were in a converted
 [2] warehouse in the suburbs of Saudi Arabia 200 miles
 [3] behind the front lines in a neighborhood that
 [4] included a supermarket, a hotel, and other
 [5] buildings. The war was winding down. Two days
 [6] after the attack the war was over.
 [7] This is not the first time that
 [8] Iraq fired a missile in anger. Just a few years
 [9] earlier in the Iran-Iraq War where Bagdad SCUDs
 [10] caused over 1100 deaths and 4,000 wounded in
 [11] Teheran. This clearly will not be the last time
 [12] that missiles are fired in anger.
 [13] Since 1980 ballistic missiles have
 [14] been used in 6 regional conflicts. Strategic
 [15] ballistic missiles exist in abundance around the
 [16] world today. Ballistic missiles are fast becoming
 [17] the weapons of first choice for those who seek to
 [18] harm American interests abroad.
 [19] We know and our intelligence
 [20] community confirms that 25 nations have ballistic
 [21] missiles of different degrees of technology. The
 [22] capability is there. Keep in mind that the one
 [23] that murdered 28 Americans was a very primitive
 [24] SCUD missile. These 25 nations today all have
 [25] missiles that are much more sophisticated.

Page 154

[1] Let me state a few more important
 [2] facts. Five nations have declared that they have
 [3] nuclear weapons. And at least 20 other nations
 [4] either unofficially have weapons of mass
 [5] destruction and the means of delivering them or
 [6] are attempting to gain those weapons and delivery
 [7] systems today.
 [8] North Korea has a ballistic missile
 [9] which can reach Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam today.
 [10] We have already witnessed the willingness of
 [11] countries to use their theater class ballistic
 [12] missiles for military purposes. There will be a
 [13] next time and you must be ready. It is imperative
 [14] that we have good testing and good training for
 [15] those systems. PMRF provides that training. And
 [16] that the technical ability to be able to do that.
 [17] Thank you.

WENDELL NUNES: My name is Wendell Nunes -

THE MODERATOR: Before you go, Alberto Partida was next, number 46. Is he here? Alberto.

ALBERTO PARTIDA: Hello. My name is Alberto Partida. I have lived and worked in Kauai for over 20 years as a self-employed high

Page 155

[1] tech advisor and repairman. Another 35 years were
 [2] spent living and working in California and many
 [3] other countries in our world. This testimony is
 [4] not influenced by fear of losing my job and home
 [5] or increased utility bills or master/servant
 [6] loyalty.
 [7] In my search to find my native
 [8] roots, I discovered we are all related, a world
 [9] family. All working members of our planet earth,
 [10] which are also family members of the universe,
 [11] this testimony is my legal defense for our world
 [12] family and planet earth in honor of Earth Day.
 [13] The issue here is not just a local
 [14] issue. It is a world environmental concern,
 [15] perhaps a World Court concern issue. I love my
 [16] country of America and all countries, people,
 [17] animals, plants, and all life forms on our planet.
 [18] My four years training experience
 [19] in classified nuclear warfare design branch of the
 [20] U.S. Navy gives me special insight and special
 [21] interest in new warfare developments, especially
 [22] the unnoticed and unseen covert special forces,
 [23] warfare tactics, such as germ, chemical, mind
 [24] control, and culturecide, or other military
 [25] enhancements.

Page 156

[1] For twenty years I have watched
 [2] PMRF grow unnoticed and unchecked from a small
 [3] low-impact weather monitoring station to the
 [4] world's largest and most sophisticated nuclear
 [5] Naval training base, to STARS missile testing, and
 [6] now to proposed \$4 billion U.S. Missile testing
 [7] industry, a very large amount of tax money spent
 [8] for a very obsolete warfare system. STARS of Star
 [9] Wars is a deceptive front to milk the taxpayers.
 [10] It's convincing to the majority of people not
 [11] interested in knowing the real truth.
 [12] Like who is the real enemy here?
 [13] A Missile attack can be traced to sender and
 [14] subject to retaliation.
 [15] For generations America has tested
 [16] its less traceable covert warfare methods on
 [17] American Indians and native people worldwide,
 [18] including the Hawaiian people, exterminating
 [19] millions like insect pests to better steal their
 [20] lands.
 [21] In the last Gulf War, America
 [22] tested chemical warfare on its own young military
 [23] men. Read Psychic Warrior by David Moorehouse for
 [24] verification of that. A generation or more ago
 [25] our U.S. government issued blankets as peace

Page 157

[1] offerings to American Indian mother's and babies.
 [2] Blankets have smallpox virus which we knew would
 [3] exterminate Indian populations.
 [4] Hawaiians experienced the same germ
 [5] warfare tactics. It was no accident, like history
 [6] teachers tell us. From American government
 [7] perspective, this planned worldwide extermination,
 [8] genocide of pesty native people appears to me to
 [9] have had no significant impact. They were able to
 [10] mitigate the problem, relocates them on useless
 [11] land until oil or other minerals were discovered.
 [12] Mind control, culturecide warfare
 [13] is the most perfected and foolproof of all modern
 [14] warfare methods. It focusses on destroying a
 [15] people's belief system and way of life.
 [16] Christian missionaries still
 [17] practice this deception practice to brainwash
 [18] people in the Christian/American way to worship
 [19] the afterlife more than life. It is insane and
 [20] very destructive and dysfunctional. Just look
 [21] around for proof at our world crisis.
 [22] Presently we have a large group of
 [23] Christian missionaries touring the Pacific
 [24] islands. This is very interesting because this
 [25] buildup of missionary and military focus on Hawaii

Page 158

[1] and the Pacific islands seems like a defense
 [2] against Hawaii independence from America and its
 [3] destructive value system, more so than some small
 [4] third world enemy.
 [5] It is deceptive tactics at its
 [6] best. The military industry takes orders from its
 [7] government industry which takes orders from its
 [8] people. The U.S. consumer, who consumes up to ten
 [9] times more energy than other modern people in the
 [10] world, most of which is spent on luxury and social
 [11] status - thank you.
 [12] THE MODERATOR: That's the five
 [13] minutes. You weren't looking when I gave you the
 [14] one minute. Your five minutes are up. Thank you
 [15] very much -
 [16] ALBERTO PARTIDA: What I'm saying
 [17] is we have to take responsibility for creating
 [18] monsters that we accuse of our problems. Thank
 [19] you.
 [20] THE MODERATOR: Thank you.
 [21] WENDELL NUNES: Good afternoon. My
 [22] name is Wendell Nunes. Before I start, I would -
 [23] I'm looking at this gentleman back here with the
 [24] big stick. That's a joke, folks. And I am kind
 [25] of wondering what is happening here. It fits in

Page 159

[1] with the topic that I wanted to present to you
 [2] today.
 [3] I was born and raised here in
 [4] Kauai, and I'm 57-years-old. My family originates
 [5] from Hanalei and Kekaha. My wife's family lives
 [6] here in Kaunakakai. We are a small business owner
 [7] here in Waimea. And we presently employ 14 people
 [8] here in Waimea.
 [9] I'm not here today to expound upon
 [10] the economic benefits if this program should go
 [11] forward, but to look back on my experiences of
 [12] what I have experienced throughout my lifetime.
 [13] I was at Johnson Island for 11
 [14] years. I was there when we did testing on ICBM
 [15] Saturn and Atlas missiles in the sixties. I still
 [16] stand here before you. And I'm not glowing in the
 [17] dark.
 [18] I was there in 1971 when they
 [19] brought in trailer loads of chemical agents from
 [20] Okinawa. There was not one accident. I was there
 [21] in 1993 when they started to process ammunitions
 [22] and to tell today there has not been one accident.
 [23] By the way, when they did fire the
 [24] Saturns and Atlas missiles after - I believe Sand
 [25] Island thing is only a short swim away - there

Page 160

[1] were no birds laying on the runway from the firing
 [2] of those missiles. Also the Monk Seals remained
 [3] there.
 [4] I also was involved with the
 [5] rehabilitation and resettlement program of the
 [6] Marshal Islands and - (inaudible) - and I have
 [7] been to Costa Rey, I have been to Panapai
 [8] (phonetic), and I also was there when the Bikini
 [9] people who live presently on Kili Island was
 [10] brought back - (inaudible) - were brought back
 [11] to see the island and to decide what they wanted
 [12] to do.
 [13] Further, I was also assigned to
 [14] work in the European area. And I worked on the
 [15] NATO bases in Turkey, on the southern side of
 [16] Turkey, and also on the eastern side of Turkey
 [17] near Iran and the Russian border.
 [18] If you talk about security, we were
 [19] searched four times before we got onto the plane
 [20] at the airport. And this was not the military
 [21] airport. Remember I was not there as a military
 [22] person. I was there as a civilian contractor.
 [23] I left Turkey and I also went to
 [24] Israel, and I was searched there by six military
 [25] people for two hours. They were baffled because

Page 161

[1] they couldn't understand what a tone dialer was
 [2] which I had purchased at Radio Shack.
 [3] It's one of those things because at
 [4] that time the technology was not advanced, you put
 [5] it on the telephone set and you punch in the
 [6] numbers, and the tone dial would get you
 [7] international response.
 [8] My point is if we - we live in a
 [9] very small world with a lot of sick people. If we
 [10] don't take precautions to be strong and to be
 [11] alert of what is happening in our country, then we
 [12] won't be strong.
 [13] The Hawaiians have a word called
 [14] ikaika. Ikaika means to be strong. I want my
 [15] country, I want my children and my grandchildren
 [16] to live in a safe environment.
 [17] Many years ago we used to board the
 [18] plane here on Kauai without having to go through
 [19] security searches. Now you do.
 [20] At different times of the year when
 [21] there were alerts you had to get in and out real
 [22] fast. Security was enhanced when there were
 [23] problems, especially recently like in the
 [24] Olympics. We have to realize that we live in a
 [25] small world and that our country has to be

Page 162

[1] prepared.
 [2] I want our country to carry a big
 [3] stick to protect me and my children and my
 [4] grandchildren. I just spent a lot of time doing
 [5] living trusts. And I have in my trust I wanted to
 [6] pass it down, whatever I have, to my children's
 [7] children. I want our country to be prepared. So
 [8] have a big stick, like this gentleman here in case
 [9] there are crazy people, pupule people, that live
 [10] here that want to take advantage of us, that we
 [11] are prepared. Thank you.
 [12] THE MODERATOR: The next five
 [13] speakers before we take a break will be number 48
 [14] - the next five and then we'll take a break are
 [15] Turk Tokita, Ron Takamura, Jim Lawshe, Jennifer
 [16] Prince, and William Georgi.
 [17] Turk Tokita? He does not appear to
 [18] be here. Ron Takamura? Jim Lawshe?
 [19] JIM LAWSHE: Thank you. My name is
 [20] Jim Roger. And I have been employed at PMRF for
 [21] 25 years. I fully support the PMRF and the Draft
 [22] EIS. I have been privileged over these years to
 [23] have made many friends at PMRF who I respect and
 [24] enjoy. I take great pride in being part of the
 [25] PMRF team.

Page 163

[1] For those of you who can see this,
 [2] you can see that I crossed off practically
 [3] everything that I had to say because it has been
 [4] said once or twice before by all of you.
 [5] I would like to make one comment in
 [6] conclusion. That PMRF needs the expanded
 [7] capability described in the EIS to support
 [8] Ballistic Missile Defense programs. Our country
 [9] and the Navy must be able to defend itself from
 [10] ballistic missile attacks.
 [11] Without this defense, the
 [12] international hoodlums cannot be contained. The
 [13] provo of the EIS will allow PMRF to be a major
 [14] player in future tests, evaluation, and training
 [15] operations.
 [16] This morning I was accused of
 [17] supporting war. For the record I do not support
 [18] war. I support peace. But I believe that peace
 [19] must be earned. It just doesn't happen.
 [20] I am reminded of a football cliché
 [21] that simply states a good defense is the best
 [22] offense. Thank you.
 [23] THE MODERATOR: Jennifer prince is
 [24] next.
 [25] JENNIFER PRINCE: Thanks for the

Page 164

[1] opportunity to speak today. My name is Jennifer
 [2] Prince. I am a mother, a taxpayer, a small
 [3] business owner, and my husband works at PMRF as a
 [4] fire man.
 [5] I and my husband and my daughters
 [6] and sons are against this military expansion on
 [7] our Garden Island and Niihau.
 [8] For example, if you lived in a nice
 [9] neighborhood and it was a safe, beautiful,
 [10] peaceful neighborhood, then suddenly one day one
 [11] of your next door neighbors decides to put a
 [12] missile launcher in their backyard - well, hey,
 [13] it's his yard, isn't it? And maybe he's employing
 [14] a few people to clean it.
 [15] But would you feel safe and secure?
 [16] All of a sudden this neighbor has changed the
 [17] neighborhood, to me, for the worst. There are
 [18] also community rights, children's rights, and
 [19] various concerns.
 [20] I feel that the military I paid for
 [21] with my taxes and I hire is creating an unsafe
 [22] environment for my family and the island of Kauai
 [23] and the waters around Kauai.
 [24] Can you tell me for absolutely
 [25] certain if this military expansion turns the

Page 165

[1] Garden Isle and Niihau into a target? My husband
 [2] works at PMRF. I know for a fact that military
 [3] launches take place without the general populace
 [4] of Kauai knowing about it. What else don't we
 [5] know? I'm worried for my husband's safety every
 [6] time he goes to work.
 [7] What to speak of how this expansion
 [8] will affect all of the wildlife and ocean
 [9] creatures, including fish that the local people
 [10] fish in the area. Can you absolutely guarantee
 [11] that the safety and health of not only the people
 [12] of Kauai and its surrounding waters are protected?
 [13] I have to say that based on the
 [14] past record, I do not trust the Navy or the
 [15] military. The military has said one thing and
 [16] done other, especially regarding native islanders.
 [17] And, in particular, just look at
 [18] Tahiti and the outer islands. I feel that even
 [19] though I am here testifying, you do not want to
 [20] hear anything against your plans. I feel that you
 [21] have already made Kauai a new target. And you
 [22] could care less that this expansion affects me and
 [23] Kauai and the waters around Kauai environmentally.
 [24] I feel that I'm part of the
 [25] environment, and I was not included in that study.

Page 166

[1] I feel that the government of Kauai has also
 [2] already made its plans without numerous forums on
 [3] every side of the island to hear all the people.
 [4] Please show me exactly how my jobs
 [5] this is creating. What about the environmental
 [6] impact on the native Hawaiian lands and how many
 [7] other economically viable plans for the creation
 [8] of jobs on Kauai - (inaudible) - how can you
 [9] guarantee there are no negative impacts on the
 [10] fishing, whales, animal life, bird life? You
 [11] cannot.
 [12] You are using my tax dollars to
 [13] expand weapons of mass destruction that I find
 [14] morally and environmentally unacceptable. Thank
 [15] you on behalf of the children of Kauai and myself
 [16] and my family. Aloha.
 [17] WILLIAM GEORGI: My name is William
 [18] Georgi. I wish to address three issues. First is
 [19] the theater ballistic missile defense program.
 [20] Second is the Pacific Missile Range Facility as a
 [21] neighbor. And, third, the suitability of PMRF for
 [22] TBMD testing.
 [23] As the 21st century dawns, we face
 [24] the challenges of the aptly named New World
 [25] Disorder. Some heavily armed rogue nations have

Page 167

[1] acquired ballistic missiles and weapons of mass
 [2] destruction, poison gas, biological, or atomic
 [3] weapons.
 [4] In some cases the threat is to use
 [5] these terrible weapons against innocent bystanders
 [6] to prevent U.S. or UN intervention in a war of
 [7] aggression. Another threat is direct use against
 [8] United States forces.
 [9] TBMD is designed to shield both
 [10] U.S. military and innocent civilians and it lets
 [11] our military defend themselves. We send our young
 [12] men and women into a hostile world to protect our
 [13] interests. We owe them the right of self-defense.
 [14] It's like peace officers wearing bullet proof
 [15] kevlar vests. For many of us the threat isn't to
 [16] some faceless soldier, but to our children and
 [17] grandchildren who are now and who soon will be
 [18] serving our country.
 [19] I submit that PMRF has been a good
 [20] neighbor. I am not going to talk about the
 [21] economics now. But I would like to talk about
 [22] during emergencies. And I'm not going to talk
 [23] about during Iniki. I would like to look at what
 [24] PMRF has done for us since Iniki.
 [25] PMRF has supplied helicopters for

Page 168

[1] fire fighting, for searches and for rescues. PMRF
 [2] range boat and helicopter crew rescued damaged
 [3] boats, freed a whale entangled in net buoys, and
 [4] evacuated sick or injured seamen to medical
 [5] facilities.
 [6] recently a PMRF team air lifted out
 [7] a Niihau resident who was gored by a wild pig.
 [8] The Navy isn't the coast guard. That is not their
 [9] job really. But they do it any way.
 [10] Navy boats, ships, and aircraft
 [11] stay well away from marine mammals. If whales
 [12] show up in an exercise area, the exercise is moved
 [13] or postponed until the whales leave, sometimes
 [14] even for a couple of days.
 [15] Ne ne released in Kalalau valley
 [16] have moved up on Makaha Ridge near the PMRF
 [17] installation. From what I've read in the
 [18] newspapers, both the whales and geese are safer at
 [19] PMRF than in the sanctuaries.
 [20] PMRF hazardous materials program is
 [21] strict. Hazardous materials, even cleaning
 [22] products that are in our homes, are strictly
 [23] controlled. Hazardous waste is disposed of
 [24] properly. Improper disposal means disciplinary
 [25] action.

Page 169

[1] And PMRF has gone all out to reduce
 [2] hazardous waste. The Navy-wide goal is to reduce
 [3] hazardous waste by fifty percent by the end of
 [4] next year. PMRF has already reduced it by seventy
 [5] percent. They are way ahead of where they need to
 [6] be at the end of next year. I would like to
 [7] remind some people as part of the expansion, PMRF
 [8] seems to remove hazardous waste from an illegal
 [9] dump site, one that it didn't even create.
 [10] PMRF is suitable for testing of
 [11] TBMD, the largest instrumented open ocean range in
 [12] the world. It has minimal ocean and air traffic.
 [13] Adding in Kauai's low electronic noise, PMRF is
 [14] unparalleled.
 [15] I would like to address briefly the
 [16] question of wildlife refuge at the missile launch
 [17] site. Some people had some concerns. I would
 [18] like to remind them that there's a major wildlife
 [19] refuge right by the Kennedy Space Center. It has
 [20] been there for a little over forty years. It was
 [21] ample opportunity for research into the effects of
 [22] noise on migratory birds and nesting. So far I
 [23] didn't see an adverse study. If there's one, make
 [24] sure it's included in the report. But I just
 [25] haven't seen it. And I've I can only look so far

Page 170

[1] on the Internet.
 [2] In conclusion, I believe that we
 [3] owe TBMD to our service men and service women.
 [4] PMRF has been a responsible, helpful neighbor.
 [5] PMRF is the logical place to conduct TBMD testing.
 [6] Considering these facts I believe the PMRF range
 [7] enhancements should be approved. Thank you.
 [8] THE MODERATOR: We're going to take
 [9] a ten-minute recess right now. Just so you know
 [10] who is up next. Benjamin Kali, Sr., Colin Kipper,
 [11] Barbara Franklin, Ron MacDonald, Liz Randol, and
 [12] Thomas Nizo. We will be back in ten minutes.
 [13] Thank you very much.
 [14] (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
 [15] THE MODERATOR: We are ready to
 [16] begin the proceedings again. Again, for anyone
 [17] who may have missed my initial remarks -
 [18] actually, could I have the audience's attention
 [19] please and bring the sound level down so we can
 [20] get ready to listen to the next speakers.
 [21] For those of you who may not have
 [22] been here before when I made the procedural
 [23] remarks, you have five minutes to speak. In order
 [24] to make that easy for you to figure out when that
 [25] time is up, after four minutes I put up an index

Page 171

[1] finger like this to indicate that you have one
 [2] minute left. That is why it's occasionally a good
 [3] idea to look up.
 [4] When five minutes are up, I will
 [5] put up a closed hand like this, indicating it is
 [6] time to finish your comments.
 [7] The next speakers are, starting
 [8] with number 55, Benjamin Kali, Sr., followed by
 [9] Barbara Franklin, Ron MacDonald, Liz Randol, and
 [10] Thomas Nizo.
 [11] Again, if you will begin your
 [12] comments by stating your name, I'd appreciate it.
 [13] Mr. Benjamin Kali, Sr., number 55 Benjamin Kali,
 [14] Sr.
 [15] He does not appear to be here.
 [16] Barbara Franklin.
 [17] (Discussion off the record.)
 [18] BARBARA BULATAO-FRANKLIN: Good
 [19] afternoon. My name is Barbara Bulatao-Franklin.
 [20] I am a resident of Kekaha, Kauai, and I am here
 [21] representing the administration of Kauai Community
 [22] College as its director of continuing education
 [23] and training and the faculty members and students
 [24] of our trade and electronic technology divisions
 [25] and our apprenticeship training programs.

Page 172

[1] We asked Dr. Francis Takahashi,
 [2] assistant professor in electronic technology, to
 [3] prepare our testimony. He is one of several
 [4] members from KCC on the faculty who has worked
 [5] directly with staff members at the Pacific Missile
 [6] Range Facility.
 [7] Our testimony is in the form of an
 [8] open letter addressed to Ms. Vida Mossman, public
 [9] affairs officer at PMRF.
 [10] Quote. Dear Ms. Mossman, we live
 [11] in a time of ever accelerating technological
 [12] change and increasing global competitiveness. If
 [13] we ignore these events and choose to amble along
 [14] at a leisurely pace into the new millenium, we
 [15] will be overwhelmed by technologically more
 [16] aggressive and competitive peoples and societies.
 [17] Our economic and social well being
 [18] and our island home depends on our ability to
 [19] compete at the global level. Only in doing so can
 [20] we maintain the economic vitality which will allow
 [21] us to control the future of the society that we
 [22] live in.
 [23] Education and technology are the
 [24] keys to this competitiveness, and PMRF has long
 [25] been a willing partner in supporting the growth of

Page 173

[1] technology education at Kauai Community College.
 [2] The development of the college in
 [3] the following areas were either driven by or made
 [4] feasible because of the high technology presence
 [5] of PMRF on Kauai. Let me list a few.
 [6] Electronics technology and the
 [7] Technology Center. These centers of learnings
 [8] were developed to support high technology
 [9] industries such as PMRF.
 [10] Solar car technology. PMRF has
 [11] been the training and testing base for our KCC
 [12] solar car which finished 9th, 15th and 8th in
 [13] races on the mainland and Japan.
 [14] Electric vehicle technology. The
 [15] college and PMRF, along with Kauai Electric and
 [16] the County, are participants in the Kauai Electric
 [17] Vehicle Consortium.
 [18] Environmental research in aircraft
 [19] sensor technology, ERAST, this high tech project
 [20] is here because of the initiative and support of
 [21] PMRF.
 [22] In this time of budget restrictions
 [23] by the State, this project has injected much
 [24] needed funding into the college and the scientists
 [25] and engineers who travel here to aid Kauai's

Page 174

[1] lagging economy.
 [2] Pathfinder. The solar airplane
 [3] moved its testing here because PMRF could provide
 [4] the high tech support. Our students gain valuable
 [5] work experience on the project supporting flight
 [6] operations. Data analysis.
 [7] Our students also have the
 [8] opportunity to support the scientific data
 [9] gathering and analysis. Digitized images of the
 [10] environment gathered by the Pathfinder and other
 [11] flight operations will make it possible for us to
 [12] monitor agriculture and protect the native ecology
 [13] of this state.
 [14] The Technology Center's
 [15] participation in ERAST is helping us enhance our
 [16] data acquisition, analysis, and storage
 [17] capability, as well as our networking capability.
 [18] This keeps us abreast of the latest
 [19] technology and raises the aspirations of our KCC
 [20] students who participate in this project.
 [21] The project's monitoring of the
 [22] environment is also increasing student awareness
 [23] of the environmental problems in our fragile
 [24] island environment.
 [25] Continuing education and training

[1] in high technology, the college has developed
 [2] noncredit training courses in digital electronics
 [3] and fiberoptics for PMRF and has participated in
 [4] PMRF-funded networking courses. This mutually
 [5] beneficial exchange enhances the level of
 [6] technology education.
 [7] High tech jobs. PMRF offers a
 [8] choice of technology-oriented jobs for our
 [9] students whose interests lie in this area. We
 [10] must face the global challenges and step boldly
 [11] into the technology and information age of the
 [12] 21st century. We support the PMRF Enhancement.
 [13] Thank you very much.
 [14] THE MODERATOR: Thank you. One of
 [15] the first names I called, I believe you just got
 [16] back. So we will go ahead and call Benjamin Kali,
 [17] Sr. I was told I missed him. Is he here? Well, I
 [18] got a note I had missed him. Benjamin Kali, Sr.
 [19] It's your turn. Thank you.
 [20] BENJAMIN KALI, SR: I was going to
 [21] read to you - (inaudible) - of the United
 [22] States Navy, but it takes too much time.
 [23] This reading was taken from -
 [24] anyway, sorry - (inaudible) - many talk about
 [25] the amount of aircraft carriers that you have

[1] within the world. I am not sure of the exact
 [2] amount. But to me it's about 17.
 [3] Like - (inaudible) - you have
 [4] four and a half acres of seven U.S. territories.
 [5] In my estimation of 17 aircraft carriers, your
 [6] average air carriers are 86 and a half acres. And
 [7] I would rather altogether in the Pacific ocean,
 [8] Uncle Sam could land one of these biggest bombers
 [9] that he have.
 [10] Over here - (inaudible) - the
 [11] biggest aircraft carrier in the Pacific ocean.
 [12] And it's that island back here - (inaudible) -
 [13] us Hawaiian people is still - it's not easy for
 [14] kanaka maoli. Me, I represent the Kingdom of
 [15] Hawaii, and this is my card. My serial number is
 [16] 00071.
 [17] I'm not here to talk about
 [18] sovereignty. Because I - (inaudible) - took
 [19] over the responsibilities to be a kanaka maoli -
 [20] (inaudible) - dad died in that year of 1964. And
 [21] I had special responsibility that I was taught
 [22] from young to protect the aina.
 [23] From 1964 until today, 1989, I been
 [24] abused by people, I been put in a washing machine,
 [25] I been rudely attacked by police officers just

[1] because I was performing my sovereignty rights as
 [2] a kanaka maoli.
 [3] Why those rights taken away from
 [4] me? I was a school bus driver at Saint Theresa's
 [5] School. But just because I was performing my
 [6] sovereignty rights, they took my license away.
 [7] And today I feel I am a person without a country.
 [8] In 1968 my unit the 2929 infantry
 [9] brigade went over to the Vietnam War. I had to
 [10] give up my life, my family - (inaudible) -
 [11] because my children are small. I had to say I -
 [12] I'll just have to say I'm going to serve the
 [13] United States Army.
 [14] I was trained to defend myself in
 [15] Vietnam. But to get attacked by these two police
 [16] officers, they knock me out and I couldn't even
 [17] fight with them to keep myself free. I just want
 [18] to read about -
 [19] THE MODERATOR: We can't hear you
 [20] unless you use the microphone. Actually your time
 [21] is up, sir.
 [22] BENJAMIN KALI, SR: One of the most
 [23] powerful powers on earth has met the most -
 [24] THE MODERATOR: Mr. Kali, I'm
 [25] sorry, your five minutes are up.

[1] BENJAMIN KALI, SR: - on Kauai -
 [2] let me finish.
 [3] THE MODERATOR: Your five minutes
 [4] are up.
 [5] BENJAMIN KALI, SR: In the
 [6] interval -
 [7] THE MODERATOR: We need the next
 [8] person. We will recess these proceedings.
 [9] BENJAMIN KALI, SR: - Kauai.
 [10] THE MODERATOR: We are going to go
 [11] ahead and take a ten-minute recess. We will come
 [12] back at 4:00. Thank you.
 [13] (Whereupon, Benjamin Kali, Sr. continued
 [14] speaking.)
 [15] (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
 [16] THE MODERATOR: Okay. We are ready
 [17] to go back on the record again. I will start off
 [18] by reading the list of the next five or six
 [19] people. Be ready to come up to the reserved area
 [20] up here.
 [21] Ron MacDonald, Liz Randol, Thomas
 [22] Nizo, Sue Kanoho, Emmaline White, and Mileka
 [23] Kanahoe. Ron MacDonald, you are first.
 [24] RON MACDONALD: Hello. My name is
 [25] Ron MacDonald. I wasn't sure exactly what I was

[1] going to say. I have a lot of things to say about
 [2] this whole issue here. But to have it prefaced by
 [3] the police dragging off a Native Hawaiian perhaps
 [4] shall bring an inspiration to my talk here this
 [5] afternoon.
 [6] First of all, I think this whole
 [7] meeting is a sham. Because there's been a million
 [8] dollars that's been given to Mr. Mullins already
 [9] to start his business - which is another word
 [10] that hasn't been brought up today, Textron in
 [11] Lihue.
 [12] Now, this company that he has going
 [13] on in Lihue is not going to go on if this doesn't
 [14] go through. Why is this money invested by the
 [15] Kauai Economic Opportunity Council to a business
 [16] that is inherent that this proposal goes through.
 [17] It's already money invested in the outcome of this
 [18] meeting.
 [19] I asked Mr. Mullins about this
 [20] directly. He told me that it was a no brainer,
 [21] meaning that there would be no reason not to
 [22] approve of this issue. No reason not to approve
 [23] of it. You told us our information that we are
 [24] bringing for you today here, our feelings, you are
 [25] listening to. It's a lie. You've already made

[1] your - can you look at me now and tell me that
 [2] there's a possibility that this isn't going to go
 [3] through?
 [4] (Pause.)
 [5] I didn't get any head shakes.
 [6] Anyway. Okay.
 [7] I was impressed by the people from
 [8] Niihau coming here and testifying for the natives.
 [9] What great aloha those people have and the
 [10] remainder of the Hawaiians still have here.
 [11] It's a shame that you didn't show
 [12] the same aloha to the people of Hanford around the
 [13] nuclear base where the plutonium was made for
 [14] Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
 [15] When the Freedom of Information Act
 [16] was released it was - people were informed of the
 [17] release of radioactive material into the
 [18] environment, into the water, into the area, and
 [19] into the ground, which is public information now.
 [20] Is my microphone being turned down?
 [21] That was kind of odd.
 [22] Anyway, I talked with Mr. Mullins
 [23] about it. I talked with this fellow about it.
 [24] And I talked with Captain Bowlin about it, and he
 [25] wouldn't answer my questions either.

Page 181

[1] I talked with Mr. Mullins about
 [2] this question, about the Freedom of Information
 [3] Act. And the Navy is purposefully deceiving the
 [4] public about what they are releasing into the
 [5] environment, denying it every chance they had.
 [6] And when the information came out, the tests in
 [7] the area showed increased pregnancy defects,
 [8] increased amounts of cancer in individuals.
 [9] We are talking about trust here.
 [10] We got to trust these guys they are not going to
 [11] do it. They lied to us for 20 years that they
 [12] were doing it in Washington. And none of them
 [13] could give us an answer as to why this was done.
 [14] Do you know who did? Vida said we
 [15] need to keep our country strong. We need to do
 [16] these things so we have a strong defense. And I
 [17] thought, all right, Vida's got the guts to give me
 [18] an answer.
 [19] What she told me was the Navy's
 [20] willing to deceive the public and the people if
 [21] they feel it's in the national interest, just as
 [22] they did in Washington. That's the only reason
 [23] they could have done that. They could justify the
 [24] reason to lie to the public and expose them to
 [25] these carcinogenic agents? I don't know.

Page 182

[1] Money isn't the only relevance here
 [2] at all. Money is of very little relevance. This
 [3] is what you bought many people with here. Oh,
 [4] we're going to bring so much to the island. It
 [5] will be so good for everybody. That's not the
 [6] issue there.
 [7] The issue is the islands. What
 [8] they've done already in the Hawaiian Islands,
 [9] Kahoolawe, not to mention overthrowing the Queen.
 [10] It's just ridiculous to trust these guys with such
 [11] a fragile piece of property there. There's none
 [12] left in the world. This is class A, there's no
 [13] purer water in the world.
 [14] And we are going to let them dredge
 [15] over there and build missile sites. This is
 [16] ludicrous. This is beyond comprehension.
 [17] And just by - even if we could
 [18] possibly stop this, which I'm sure we can't now -
 [19] but even if we could, left on the course that we
 [20] are going right now, we've got some of the most
 [21] potential vehicle for the destruction of all that
 [22] is most precious to us here.
 [23] One minute left here, okay.
 [24] That reminds. We have been keeping
 [25] track of the time. And it has been extended for

Page 183

[1] the people who are pro on this issue, such as the
 [2] Niihauns over here, how they extended it. The two
 [3] Hawaiians who were speaking their mind, we had the
 [4] police drag one of them away.
 [5] What does this represent to us?
 [6] Are they going to give the Hawaiians an even break
 [7] here? Oh, and being a good neighbor. I don't
 [8] know. I guess - I don't know. I hope the people
 [9] of Niihau are all right and Ke Akua will protect
 [10] them from these people. They didn't at Hanford
 [11] and at many other places in the world. To just
 [12] believe these people is the rest of the genocide
 [13] that they have begun over a hundred years ago.
 [14] Okay.
 [15] THE MODERATOR: Liz Randol?
 [16] Rebecca - no, she's not here either. Thomas
 [17] Nizo?
 [18] THOMAS NIZO: My name is Thomas
 [19] Milimili Naka La Weloilehua. My name means the
 [20] cherished descendent from the island of Loi Lehua.
 [21] First I would like to apologize - (inaudible) -
 [22] it's an emotional subject.
 [23] And I take it to heart because
 [24] myself I am a kanaka maoli, a kanaka maoli aina.
 [25] I practice on this land. But look. I am a

Page 184

[1] management analyst at this place. For five years
 [2] I work here. The base has an open door policy.
 [3] You guys want to find out what's happening over
 [4] there, you come see me. You know what I mean?
 [5] I'm in there working there.
 [6] Get educated, you guys. We don't
 [7] have any toxic things over there. Somebody said
 [8] we had toxic or radiation things. I was laughing
 [9] in the back there. You guys don't know. You guys
 [10] want to know you come out to the base and see us.
 [11] The base is out there to protect
 [12] the very things you guys are doing; voicing you
 [13] guys opinions.
 [14] You know, day to day we work out
 [15] there. Those sailors do hard work to test the
 [16] equipment that we have to offer the sailors out on
 [17] the ships protecting our freedom.
 [18] This is not an issue of
 [19] sovereignty, you know. That's why I took it to
 [20] heart when somebody says that the kanaka maoli
 [21] only can get beat down. No way. This kanaka
 [22] maoli is middle management and only going straight
 [23] to the top.
 [24] So I invite all you guys - the
 [25] base has an open door policy - to come and see

Page 185

[1] us, to get educated.
 [2] I was going to read this long
 [3] speech. But after, you know, what happened, it's
 [4] more than just words. It's in my heart. And the
 [5] base supports a lot of programs out here.
 [6] I'm in been charge of the tents,
 [7] to go to Saint Theresa's Carnival. That's our
 [8] property, that's our presence, helping the
 [9] community - (inaudible) - we support the Waimea
 [10] town celebration.
 [11] We supported of World Impact Tour,
 [12] whoever is a Christian and went to that. You
 [13] know, we are a good neighbor. And that's what
 [14] we're here to do, that's why we're here to stay,
 [15] that's what we are all about, protecting your
 [16] guys' freedom. Thank you.
 [17] THE MODERATOR: Sue Kanoho?
 [18] Emmaline White. You will need to pull the
 [19] microphone towards you.
 [20] EMMALINE WHITE: My name is
 [21] Emmaline White. I looked over your EIS report and
 [22] found that the geological, atmospheric, and
 [23] oceanographic areas were covered in that report.
 [24] To me the Pacific Missile Range
 [25] Facility has been a boost to our island economy.

Page 186

[1] We speak of the environment, which is a part of
 [2] our life. You look at the whales. We look at the
 [3] turtle. And we look at the birds too.
 [4] But we fail to see that some
 [5] animals are some other people's livelihood and
 [6] culture. Today the most endangered species on
 [7] earth is the human being. They are the endangered
 [8] species who need to be clothed, fed, and cared
 [9] for.
 [10] When we talk about the environment
 [11] we say, oh, economy doesn't fit in. It does.
 [12] Because this provides food for the human race.
 [13] Are we going to deprive people of
 [14] work and food for their families? The base and
 [15] its facilities provide a livelihood for some of
 [16] our families here in Kauai, and it does provide a
 [17] boost to the economy. Let us not forget it is the
 [18] human being that is the most endangered species
 [19] today.
 [20] The nation's defense is important.
 [21] As we all know defense is dependent on bases such
 [22] as the one here in Mana, the Pacific Missile Base.
 [23] Our country needs to be prepared for any aggressor
 [24] nations. And they need to be so they can
 [25] encounter other countries who are aggressive.

Page 187

[1] The use of Niihau island as a
 [2] possible extension site to the missile program is
 [3] an excellent idea. Of course, we need to realize
 [4] the cultural and traditional aspects, such as the
 [5] burial areas. It could widen the horizon even for
 [6] future defense as well as our island economy.
 [7] We need to look at the positive
 [8] impact of these extensions and what it would
 [9] provide for our people here in the islands, both
 [10] economically and defensively. Thank you.
 [11] THE MODERATOR: We're now on
 [12] speaker number 64. The next people I have on my
 [13] list to come up to speak are Mileka Kanahele,
 [14] Nancy Kanahele, Annie Kanahele, Dan Shook, and
 [15] Sandra Field-Grace. Mileka Kanahele?
 [16] MILEKA KANAHELE: Aloha.
 [17] (Brief statement in the Hawaiian
 [18] language.)
 [19] I am concerned for my family. All
 [20] those you saw in front here earlier are my nieces
 [21] and nephews. You can see they speak with their
 [22] heart. And I go out with them. They only see the
 [23] good. They don't see the wrong in anything.
 [24] I am from Niihau. I belong and I'm
 [25] living in Honolulu. I came this morning for

Page 188

[1] different reason. But when I heard this, I make
 [2] the journey because this is the first meeting I
 [3] ever set in. Very interesting.
 [4] I heard the good, the bad, the like
 [5] and, the dislike, everything. But my only concern
 [6] is safety.
 [7] We only see now. We not seeing
 [8] ahead of us. My family, are they going to be
 [9] safe? They are the only pure living in Hawaii.
 [10] If they're wiped out, there's no pure. I'll be
 [11] the only one. I live in Honolulu.
 [12] Safety is more important. And that
 [13] promise to us, when all this happens, is going to
 [14] take place. Now I need some information on the
 [15] safety.
 [16] After hearing all of the earlier
 [17] speeches - thank you very much. I am sure
 [18] everything you said - of course some of you all
 [19] upset. Sure we all upset. But don't let upset
 [20] control you. Because we here for one purpose,
 [21] what can be done. And I want to know their
 [22] safety.
 [23] And if anybody can tell me their
 [24] safety, thank God. You see they were singing,
 [25] praying with all their heart. I see all that

Page 189

[1] because I stay on Honolulu. I faced everything.
 [2] They don't face all this kind of life. I do.
 [3] And I'm glad I am the one gets
 [4] yelled at. Those who want go straight, go
 [5] straight. Those who want get busy, get busy
 [6] because they have no choice. They either go right
 [7] hand, left hand, good or bad.
 [8] But my concern is their safety.
 [9] And they thinking there with the missile, TBM, are
 [10] interested in - (inaudible) - but just you and
 [11] I. All morning I heard the letters said - I
 [12] thought it was different group doing all the -
 [13] (inaudible) - but you are taxpayer. You are part
 [14] of that.
 [15] What they are doing - telling them
 [16] they happy to give, Niihau has been always like
 [17] that. And I lived there when I was 24-years-old.
 [18] It never changed. But this gonna bring change.
 [19] And I guarantee this going to be change. But
 [20] please, for their safety. That's all I want to
 [21] say. Mahalo and aloha.
 [22] THE MODERATOR: Nancy Kanahele?
 [23] She's gone, okay. How about Annie Kanahele?
 [24] Okay. Dan Shook?
 [25] DAN SHOOK: For the record, my name

Page 190

[1] is Dan Shook. Lots to be said today. I'll have
 [2] to say I don't agree with some of it. I think my
 [3] biggest problem with this whole thing is not so
 [4] much the people at PMRF. It has more to do with
 [5] the people that control the weapons from the
 [6] higher levels of our government, where those
 [7] weapons end up, and what's done with those
 [8] weapons.
 [9] I have one good question I would
 [10] like answered in the EIS. And that is how will
 [11] the impact to our island, to tourism, to the
 [12] people of our island, how will it be affected by
 [13] an accident like happened off the east coast on
 [14] flight TWA 800 where there's substantial evidence
 [15] that it was shot down by an exercise very similar
 [16] to what happens here at PMRF.
 [17] How will the effect of that type of
 [18] accident - whether you agree or admit is
 [19] irrelevant. How will that affect this island in
 [20] the future? If accidents like that can happen on
 [21] the east coast, it's theoretically possible that
 [22] that could happen here too.
 [23] I would like that question answered
 [24] in the EIS, please.
 [25] Back to, I guess, the philosophical

Page 191

[1] aspect of this thing. I think the people of PMRF
 [2] are wonderful people. I have no problems with the
 [3] people that work there, live there. How it
 [4] affects our island economically, you heard enough
 [5] on that. I personally feel that economics should
 [6] not always dictate decisions.
 [7] I feel that Kauai can survive quite
 [8] well without any military whatsoever. There are
 [9] islands all over the Pacific ocean who have no
 [10] military, and people live a healthy, happy life
 [11] there with no threat of invasion.
 [12] I think we hype up this threat,
 [13] this fear of the bad guy who is going to invade or
 [14] they're going to do whatever. I think the reality
 [15] of this whole thing is we have a war machine in
 [16] our country that is way out of control. Over \$200
 [17] billion a year we spend on defense, which to me is
 [18] just - it's what broke the Russian government.
 [19] Our buildup caused their buildup to
 [20] the point where their whole government fell. And
 [21] now we are going off into new technology which
 [22] ultimately will cause more buildup. Other
 [23] countries will try to keep up with us. And we
 [24] keep escalating these things to the point where
 [25] it's just breaking the world's back.

Page 192

[1] People are starving around the
 [2] world. Yet we're building weapons that are going
 [3] to overprotect everybody. And those weapons when
 [4] they fall into the wrong hands, this is what can
 [5] destroy the whole world. This is what is the
 [6] problem.
 [7] We create things that are
 [8] destructive by nature. And we really should be
 [9] maybe taking a more spiritual look at where we are
 [10] at in this world. And we can do something better
 [11] with the money to change the attitude towards
 [12] America to where we are not the enemy, to where
 [13] we're friendly towards other countries.
 [14] These are the problems that I see.
 [15] It's not in your department to decide. But I
 [16] would like the message sent back to those people.
 [17] Let's look at different avenues here. Let's look
 [18] at the alternatives of a peaceful approach to
 [19] defending our country not but by creating enemies.
 [20] I see the American people becoming
 [21] the enemy because of the way we bully ourselves
 [22] around the world. We are the aggressor. We are
 [23] the ones telling the people in the middle east how
 [24] and what they can do. And we really have no
 [25] business there whatsoever.

Page 193

[1] We are supposedly protecting our
 [2] allies. It's like why don't we take care of our
 [3] problems in our own country? We have a serious
 [4] problem in our own country. Our society is
 [5] crumbling from within. Yet we are building
 [6] weapons to defend this crumbling society. And
 [7] that's really, I think, where we should be
 [8] spending our money, trying to save our country.
 [9] Trying to have some integrity, some trust for our
 [10] military.
 [11] I don't have trust for our
 [12] military. I don't have trust for our government
 [13] because I've seen too many atrocities. We built
 [14] our country on taking the land from the Indians,
 [15] killing the Buffalo, taking away their food. We
 [16] took away Hawaii from the Hawaiians. We wrecked
 [17] Vietnam. You know, these things - this is the
 [18] foundation of our country.
 [19] Yet we seem to think we have
 [20] integrity. And I have to question, you know,
 [21] where are we going? We really don't have
 [22] integrity.
 [23] We have done atrocities, and we
 [24] need to look at what we have done and then go on
 [25] and try not to make those mistakes again.

Page 194

[1] Building more weapons I am afraid is the wrong
 [2] direction. Thank you very much.
 [3] THE MODERATOR: We are currently on
 [4] speaker 71. The next speakers up in order are
 [5] Sonehei Field-Grace, Amy Kahale, Helen Mehl, Hali
 [6] Shintani, and Robert Measel, Jr.
 [7] Again, if you would take advantage
 [8] of the reserved seats up here, that will help me
 [9] know whether you're here and ready to speak.
 [10] Sandra Field-Grace? Okay. Amy
 [11] Kahale? Helen Mehl? Hali Shintani? Robert
 [12] Measel, Jr.?
 [13] The next group up after Robert is
 [14] Kaipō Kanāhele, Jr., Kanāhele, Sr., Sandra
 [15] Makuāole, and Linda Collins.
 [16] ROBERT MEASEL, JR: Thank you.
 [17] Thank you, Captain Bowlin and people of the panel.
 [18] My name is Robert Measel, Jr. I live in Waiāluā.
 [19] I'm a product of - I don't know what generation
 [20] I'm from. I am not a war baby, and I am not an X
 [21] generation because I was born on the last day of
 [22] the war. That is World War II.
 [23] A little bit of my background. I
 [24] come from a long line of military. Both sides of
 [25] my family have been in America since 1720. That's

Page 195

[1] long before the constitution was written that we
 [2] all uphold to hold.
 [3] My grandfather on my mother's side
 [4] was in army calvary who made the transition into
 [5] the Army Air Corps and Air Force. And my father
 [6] came out of college in Kentucky and became a pilot
 [7] in World War II in the Air Force.
 [8] Subsequently at my birth after the
 [9] war, I spent most of my time around the military
 [10] in the Pacific basin.
 [11] My father was a base command -
 [12] noncommissioned officer, commander in charge of
 [13] Hickam Air Force Base, and the flight lines in the
 [14] Pacific such as Wake, Midway, Johnson, Kwajalien,
 [15] and others.
 [16] I was raised on those islands and
 [17] have been on over 800 islands in the Pacific in my
 [18] lifetime, including the Hawaiian Islands, where I
 [19] was mostly raised.
 [20] I served four years in the Air
 [21] Force myself, following the footsteps of my
 [22] family. And fought in the Vietnam war. My father
 [23] fought in three wars. World War II, the Korean
 [24] War, and Vietnam.
 [25] I am generally in support of the

Page 196

[1] military and its efforts to defend this country.
 [2] I am in support of the EIS study to the degree of
 [3] anything it has to do with expansion and
 [4] maintaining of the original mission that was
 [5] designated for PMRF.
 [6] I'll just reiterate that a little
 [7] bit with a little more background. When my father
 [8] retired in '64 from the Air Force, he was
 [9] contracted at Barking Sands.
 [10] He worked for Page Communication
 [11] Company and started the development and
 [12] implementation and installation of the
 [13] telecommunications and tracking system that you
 [14] guys are using today, even though it's a lot more
 [15] sophisticated and you don't have such big
 [16] equipment as they had back then.
 [17] He then went later in the sixties
 [18] to Panapai (phonetic) in the East Carolina chain,
 [19] again with Page Communication Company and further
 [20] set up the compatible system there for the Army.
 [21] I'm very familiar with the
 [22] background of this program, all the way back to
 [23] the fifties when he caught the first capsule that
 [24] was shot into space with a C-97 and an air hook.
 [25] I support anything at PMRF that

Page 197

[1] employs the people. The military has always been
 [2] a good neighbor in Hawaii on all the islands.
 [3] But I have strong reservations with
 [4] all the information that's been given with regards
 [5] to any missile firing or launching into the
 [6] Hawaiian Islands
 [7] That goes from the Frigate Shoals
 [8] to the farthest north to the Black and White
 [9] Islands on the opposite side of the Hawaiian
 [10] chain.
 [11] The ecology in an island is one
 [12] hundred times to 1,000 times more critical than a
 [13] continental shelf environment. If there is an
 [14] accident with the launching of those rockets with
 [15] an explosion on the pad, like happened at
 [16] Vandenberg, the devastation to this island's
 [17] ecology will be much more severe than it was in
 [18] California. Again, I have reservations with the
 [19] rocket launching and the fuel storage.
 [20] I have talked to some of your
 [21] technicians in the back. They've given me the
 [22] answers I need as an oceanographer. But I still
 [23] maintain those reservations.
 [24] I also know the main mission for
 [25] PMRF was the technological side for tracking. And

Page 198

[1] no matter where you fire those missiles from, I
 [2] happen to be well aware that you still need PMRF
 [3] for the tracking in the Pacific. If you have any
 [4] questions, I will be glad to answer them.
 [5] Otherwise I'm through. Thank you.
 [6] THE MODERATOR: Kaipō Kanāhele,
 [7] Jr.? Kaipō Kanāhele, Sr.? Sandra Makuāole?
 [8] SANDRA MAKUĀOLE: Aloha. My name
 [9] is Sandra Makuāole. Like my friend Nani Rogers
 [10] who spoke very early this morning, I knew I was
 [11] going to say something today. Until I got here I
 [12] had no idea what it was.
 [13] My husband and his family are all
 [14] more than half Hawaiian. Our brothers, our
 [15] nieces, our nephews, and cousins work at Pacific
 [16] Missile Range Facility. I work at Pacific Missile
 [17] Range Facility. I have made fifteen years of
 [18] mortgage payments as some of your tax dollars at
 [19] work, and I thank you very much.
 [20] Although it's nice to be able to
 [21] fall out of bed in the morning and go to work, I
 [22] am not speaking here as an employee of PMRF. I am
 [23] speaking as a private citizen and as a resident of
 [24] Kekaha.
 [25] And I speak in support of the

Page 199

[1] Pacific Missile Range Facility testing program.
 [2] If you read my recent Letter to the Editor in our
 [3] local newspaper, you know that I am a pacifist. I
 [4] only fight with words.
 [5] Words will not protect me in the
 [6] world as we know it today. All around us we see
 [7] and we hear of violence. Families fight.
 [8] Neighbors fight. Countries fight. World peace is
 [9] a wonderful concept. But it is just a concept.
 [10] I thank the military, and I thank
 [11] PMRF just for being here to protect people like
 [12] me.
 [13] What the military testing program
 [14] has done for you. How many of you in the audience
 [15] know that our national highway system, the
 [16] interstate highways, were put into place for the
 [17] military to be able to transport troops and
 [18] supplies in time of attack?
 [19] How many of you know that the
 [20] military satellite systems are responsible for the
 [21] quality of your satellite cable television, for
 [22] our weather tracking systems in the warning of
 [23] hurricanes and tornados and tsunamis so we can be
 [24] prepared?
 [25] How many of you know that military

Page 200

[1] aircraft testing has given you a faster trip to
 [2] the mainland and safer aircraft? You like that?
 [3] You can go to Las Vegas, Mr. Trask.
 [4] The cellular phones you are using
 [5] today are direct descendants from the
 [6] walkie-talkies of War II.
 [7] Military testing. I firmly believe
 [8] testing will keep us free. Free and able to speak
 [9] out at public hearings like this.
 [10] We speak of the environmental
 [11] impact of testing at PMRF. I have to tell you
 [12] that I am much more concerned and leery about the
 [13] environmental impact of that ugly thirty-foot high
 [14] landfill I pass on the way to work every morning.
 [15] Finally, if the people of Niihau
 [16] support the Navy's program, who am I to oppose it?
 [17] Thank you.
 [18] THE MODERATOR: That was speaker
 [19] number 78. The next speakers are Linda Collins,
 [20] David Helela, Ian Emberson, Craig Wall, Paul
 [21] Lemke, Rollean, and Judy Dalton.
 [22] Linda Faye Collins? Is she here?
 [23] David Helela? David Helela? Ian Emberson?
 [24] If I call your name and you come up
 [25] here, I'd appreciate it. Paul Lemke?

Page 201

[1] And after that we - after Rollean
 [2] and Judy Dalton will be Ross Kagawa, Calvin
 [3] Shirai, and Caren Diamond.
 [4] PAUL LEMKE: Aloha. Name is Paul
 [5] Lemke. I was born and raised in Honolulu in 1923,
 [6] birth date.
 [7] I wrote two letters - of course, I
 [8] live here now. I moved back in 1952, marrying a
 [9] local girl.
 [10] I wrote two letters. One in 1992
 [11] when the Star Wars was the controversy at that
 [12] time. And another letter I wrote in the scoping
 [13] meeting we had - I submitted to the Pacific
 [14] Missile Range.
 [15] So I'll read both of them. I'll
 [16] leave out some of it. They're short.
 [17] This was originally sent to the
 [18] Garden Island, but then I resubmitted it to the
 [19] Pacific Missile Range.
 [20] To the editor. I did not intend to
 [21] get into the Star Wars controversy. But I must
 [22] satisfy my conscience and give you my views on the
 [23] matter, as I was involved when the missile program
 [24] was in its early years.
 [25] I am part Hawaiian, a World War II

Page 202

[1] veteran. Who participated in the Korean and
 [2] Vietnam Wars by being a crew member on ships that
 [3] supplied the military installations around the
 [4] world.
 [5] Of course, this was written in '92
 [6] when they had the Cold War. One would be naive to
 [7] think that the Russians have destroyed their
 [8] ballistic nuclear arsenal. The threat is still
 [9] there. And you better believe it.
 [10] They have missiles just as
 [11] efficient and accurate as ours. Since my native
 [12] Hawaii will become a major Star Wars launching
 [13] compound - God forbid - the island will be all
 [14] the more vulnerable, a prime objective to be
 [15] destroyed by any potential enemy.
 [16] Back in the 1960s I was crew member
 [17] on a missile tracker, chief electrician on a
 [18] missile tracker, the Longview, a converted World
 [19] War II victory ship. We were one of two ships,
 [20] the other being the Seinfeld. I was stationed in
 [21] Honolulu.
 [22] Our mission was to track missiles
 [23] launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base in
 [24] California 2,000 plus miles away.
 [25] At launching time I traversed the

Page 203

[1] area in the vicinity - (inaudible) - north of
 [2] Kauai, tracking the flight of missiles, and the
 [3] eventual splashdown.
 [4] According to the Vendex Corporation
 [5] (phonetic) technicians aboard ship, our missiles
 [6] were almost always on target. Yes, this was
 [7] thirty years ago. It was scary. We were not the
 [8] only nation tracking missiles.
 [9] The Russians had their fleet of
 [10] missile trackers, as we did, and were using the
 [11] same area for their exercises.
 [12] So one can surmise that these
 [13] islands were and could still be zeroed in. I'm
 [14] not opposed to the U.S. experimenting with Star
 [15] Wars, STARS. But not in my backyard. I disagree.
 [16] This testing will be performed on sovereign
 [17] Hawaiian lands which the U.S. military has not
 [18] paid a dime for its past and present use while my
 [19] Hawaiian brothers suffer homelessness, abuse, and
 [20] denied sovereignty of their lands. Look what has
 [21] happened to 45 square miles of Hawaii's land mass.
 [22] The island of Kahoolawe is an
 [23] example of Hawaiian land Desecrated, polluted, and
 [24] left unfit for human habitation. What a shame.
 [25] I understand it would take 200

Page 204

[1] years to clear this mess up. The U.S. government,
 [2] mostly the military, occupies and controls more
 [3] than 400,000 acres, a combined area of Kauai and
 [4] Niihau, of the Hawaiian islands. Never paid for
 [5] nor any back rent to the Kamamalu. One of the
 [6] great frauds of the century.
 [7] THE MODERATOR: Your time is up,
 [8] Mr. Lemke. Thank you.
 [9] PAUL LEMKE: Not much more. Thank
 [10] you for listening.
 [11] THE MODERATOR: Single name looks
 [12] like Rollean? Judy Dalton?
 [13] JUDY DALTON: I would like to make
 [14] a statement for the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club
 [15] believes there can be no compromise in the form of
 [16] mitigation that would make the Navy's expanded
 [17] operations compatible with the present tranquility
 [18] and security of the northwestern Hawaiian Island
 [19] National Wildlife Refuge.
 [20] Since the refuge is mandated to
 [21] advance the recovery of threatened and endangered
 [22] species, such as the Hawaiian Monk Seal and other
 [23] wildlife, any military activity there would be in
 [24] violation of the mission of the refuge and of the
 [25] Endangered Species Act.

Page 205

[1] In the Navy's recent tests
 [2] involving whales, the testing was entered into
 [3] without knowing what the effect on the whales
 [4] would be. There was a
 [5] let's-wait-and-see-what-will-happen approach.
 [6] The burden of proof should be with
 [7] the Navy that no harm would come to marine life
 [8] involved with its experiments or missile
 [9] launchings. In the case of an endangered species,
 [10] we cannot afford to take a
 [11] wait-and-see-what-happens stance. We have both a
 [12] legal and moral responsibility to protect these
 [13] species and their critical habitat.
 [14] We urge that the wildlife sanctuary
 [15] located on Tem Island not be considered even as a
 [16] remote possibility for the Navy's project. As it
 [17] would have a devastating effect of setting a
 [18] terrible precedent for the future and would be a
 [19] cause of erosion of the public good faith. Thank
 [20] you.

[21] THE MODERATOR: Ross Kagawa. Ross
 [22] Kagawa? Is he out there?

[23] ROSS KAGAWA: Good afternoon. I'd
 [24] like to thank you guys for having the hearing
 [25] here. I would just like to state for the record

Page 206

[1] that my dad, you know, worked on the EIS,
 [2] participating with it, along with other PMRF guys
 [3] and local and civilians, as well as the Navy
 [4] personnel. And you know, I know that the -
 [5] (inaudible) - the Navy are really thorough.
 [6] Currently I work for the County
 [7] government. And, you know, I think I can see a
 [8] big difference where on the Federal level much
 [9] more concern about the public's feelings and
 [10] lifestyle such as these that will be affected.
 [11] And total confidence that the
 [12] Navy, Federal government - (inaudible) - will
 [13] make the right decisions and that it would be safe
 [14] for the public.
 [15] Yet they know that the west side
 [16] sorely needs, you know, to have more jobs here
 [17] available for us. You know, we have kids that go
 [18] to school. And we encourage them to get degrees,
 [19] engineering, accounting, and what not.
 [20] But, you know, the way the economy
 [21] is right now, you know, I'm seeing a lot of our
 [22] successful students in the classroom living on the
 [23] mainland or in Honolulu. And it's real
 [24] disappointing, you know, your top notch people are
 [25] supposed to get your island going, and there's

Page 207

[1] just not opportunity.
 [2] They are coming back with degrees,
 [3] and they're having to apply for clerk-type jobs at
 [4] the County entry level. It's just sad. We are
 [5] encouraging our kids to go to school, and they're
 [6] better off working for a trade, making double the
 [7] money.
 [8] So, you know, I thank you folks for
 [9] wanting to expand here. I lived here all my life.
 [10] I'm an average fishing man. I enjoy the shore
 [11] line. I had no problems all these years going to
 [12] the base. It's just the drive that prevents me
 [13] from not going most of the time.
 [14] It's you guys checking that makes
 [15] the beach safe. There's no kids. The wiley ones
 [16] don't go in there because you always have
 [17] standards when you enter that place.
 [18] And, you know, for me, there's been
 [19] no problem. You guys adequately announce shutdown
 [20] dates and just total class on the part of the Navy
 [21] for all these years. Many have come - because I
 [22] knew how important PMRF was to my dad in raising
 [23] us, you know, paying our way through school and
 [24] what have you. I'm just grateful.
 [25] So I want it to continue. I want

Page 208

[1] it to continue as Senator Inouye sees it. And to
 [2] opposition I say, put up a candidate that would
 [3] beat Senator Inouye if you so concerned that -
 [4] and, you know, you're against the idea. You know,
 [5] the senator has roots here on Kauai. He has local
 [6] roots, feelings that the residents have like me.
 [7] And look at the - (inaudible).
 [8] Senator Inouye against - (inaudible). Kauai is
 [9] strongly behind him because we know he's backing
 [10] us. For us to shut down his plant will hurt
 [11] Senator Inouye's chances of doing any positive
 [12] things in Kauai for the future to come.
 [13] To opposition - hey, everybody has
 [14] an idea. And it's good that you have this forum
 [15] so you guys can make the right decision. But as a
 [16] local, some day maybe I want to work there.
 [17] I want to see us turn this thing
 [18] out. Mahalo. Thank you. And for all the PMRF
 [19] guys, congratulations for the outstanding job you
 [20] continue to do on Kauai.

[21] THE MODERATOR: The next speakers I
 [22] have on my list, starting with number 87 are
 [23] Calvin Shirai, I believe it. Caren Diamond, Chris
 [24] Mildwater, Liko Martin, Monte Hull, and Arthur
 [25] Trask. Calvin Shirai, please. Caren Diamond?

Page 209

[1] KAREN DIAMOND: Aloha. My name is
 [2] Caren Diamond. Today I am quite embarrassed to be
 [3] an American citizen. I feel like the people of
 [4] Niihau are so innocent and so trusting of you.
 [5] And I feel like you are betraying them.
 [6] How can you tell these people there
 [7] will be no impact on their life? You will ravage
 [8] their life. They are not going to have a life.
 [9] They are not doing to have an island. The whole
 [10] ancestral cultural impact of what you are
 [11] proposing will totally wipe them out. And because
 [12] they have no other economic alternative, right now
 [13] they are looking at you for an answer.
 [14] And you are saying the words that
 [15] they want to hear, and they are trusting you. And
 [16] I think that it is garbage. Look at Kahoolawe.
 [17] And you guys have ruined it. Now you've given it
 [18] back to the Hawaiian people. Here you go. Here's
 [19] your island that is now all bombed out and
 [20] completely ruined. And you can have that as a
 [21] sanctuary now.
 [22] Niihau already is a sanctuary. It
 [23] is untouched by man - untouched by white man. It
 [24] is not ruined. And you have the opportunity to
 [25] encourage growth in other ways besides turning it

Page 210

[1] over to the military.
 [2] There is too much that the Niihau
 [3] people could benefit the entire world and the
 [4] Hawaiian Islands without having to ruin them.
 [5] That it is a crime that you are looking at them,
 [6] telling them there will be no significant impact.
 [7] It is the same for the turtles and
 [8] the Monk Seals on Tem Island. No significant
 [9] impact for them either. We just might wipe them
 [10] out. But I guess that's not an impact. All we
 [11] care about is our money and our jobs and our
 [12] precious children. But what about the children
 [13] when the missiles hit? Where are we going to go
 [14] if we, Kauai, become a target?
 [15] Then what do we have to do with our
 [16] children? Our children will be dead. Along with
 [17] the turtles and the native Hawaiians and the Monk
 [18] Seals.
 [19] And I ask you why do all EIS
 [20] documents end in no significant finding? Is this
 [21] something that you are trained to do? No
 [22] significant findings?
 [23] Is there no impact that is not
 [24] mitigatable? I ask you, please, in your heart
 [25] don't respond to these people's honesty and their

Page 211

[1] innocence with lies. Tell them that they're not
 [2] going have an island afterwards, that there will
 [3] be ordnances all over the island. Tell them the
 [4] truth. Tell all of us the truth.
 [5] Please, peace in the Pacific.
 [6] Peace on Kauai. Please, no missiles.
 [7] THE MODERATOR: Chris Mildwater?
 [8] CHRIS MILDWATER: My name is Chris
 [9] Mildwater. I'm speaking in opposition to the PMRF
 [10] expansion, specifically because - specifically
 [11] about the EIS on this project.
 [12] I believe the adverse effects on
 [13] the environment and to the endangered and
 [14] threatened species are understated in this
 [15] document. I also believe the introduction of
 [16] launch sites on Johnston Atoll and Tern Island -
 [17] (inaudible) - this expansion is just not
 [18] acceptable to me.
 [19] And I'd also like to go on record
 [20] as saying I don't think it was right to allow the
 [21] Niihauns to go over their five-minute limit and
 [22] have the man not be able to finish his statement
 [23] and, in fact, be taken away by the KPD officer.
 [24] Thank you.
 [25] THE MODERATOR: Liko Martin? Monte

Page 212

[1] Hull?
 [2] MONTE HULL: My name is Dr. Monte
 [3] Hull. I want to thank you for holding the
 [4] hearing. Thank you for producing such a massive
 [5] EIS.
 [6] I'd also like to say that I have a
 [7] great deal of confidence in your personal
 [8] integrity and your personal decency.
 [9] And the reason I'm making these
 [10] initial remarks is because I'm a trained
 [11] philosopher. So when I look at your EIS, I look
 [12] at it in a philosophic sense. Kind of weird. But
 [13] when I look at your EIS and the hearing so far
 [14] today, it's quite obvious that most of the remarks
 [15] have been irrelevant to the EIS, particularly jobs
 [16] for the island and so forth. That is - except
 [17] for the social economic impact on Niihau, that's
 [18] irrelevant.
 [19] What has happened a lot with your
 [20] very successful PR campaign - I don't know how
 [21] much orchestrated - is that you end up with a
 [22] nonsequitur. You end up with all these - you,
 [23] know PMRF had been a wonderful neighbor because of
 [24] Iniki and all the wonderful things they did after
 [25] that.

Page 213

[1] I don't deny that. I think you
 [2] have wonderful decent people. But if you use that
 [3] kind of argument, then that applies to anybody. I
 [4] can do anything I want and say but I've been
 [5] decent to people and so forth.
 [6] What counts is the impact on the
 [7] Northwest Pacific Islands, the island of Niihau,
 [8] and so forth. By in large that has not been
 [9] addressed to in the meeting.
 [10] With your actual EIS - I'm
 [11] probably almost as tired as you, but not quite.
 [12] With your actual EIS, it's quite an amazing
 [13] document.
 [14] It's very much like when you look
 [15] at a TV screen. From a distance it looks like
 [16] there are images and so forth. But as you walk up
 [17] to the TV screen, it all dissolves into just a
 [18] mass of meaningless dots. The same thing happens
 [19] when you start looking at the EIS.
 [20] It seems to talk about things. But
 [21] when you start looking, you get this mass of
 [22] presumably inviolable data that's supposed to be
 [23] convincing.
 [24] But when you put it back together
 [25] to see what the real impacts are, there's no

Page 214

[1] image. It's usually - in other words, it's no
 [2] adverse impact.
 [3] And when you look at the actual
 [4] arguments, you say, for example, just to take a
 [5] few selections, that there will be no adverse
 [6] impact on the culture of Niihau. But when you
 [7] look at the data, you change culture into things
 [8] like cultural artifacts and cultural sites.
 [9] You say we are not going to build
 [10] here so it won't affect them. Or you say
 [11] socioeconomic, and you tend to reduce the
 [12] socioeconomic to really economic and say, well, it
 [13] will be beneficial.
 [14] And you say social will be handled
 [15] adequately by your Niihau Navy access procedures.
 [16] But it's not at all clear how that will work.
 [17] What it seems to suggest is you don't have a real
 [18] understanding of cultural impact and a real
 [19] understanding of what a culture is and how it's
 [20] impacted by just us being here.
 [21] And I realize that's a very hard
 [22] thing to assess. But you haven't assessed it.
 [23] When you talk about other things like visual
 [24] impact on the island, you will go and say, okay,
 [25] we will consider these things have a visual

Page 215

[1] impact, such as a balloon you can see from any
 [2] part of the island, and so forth. But you don't
 [3] say anything - what about the sound 82 decibels
 [4] in the main town.
 [5] That has cultural impact. That
 [6] changes the character of the place. That means
 [7] that the Navy is very much present there. It
 [8] means the military is very much present.
 [9] If you go down the Na Pali coast
 [10] and you have helicopters or no helicopters, even
 [11] though the sound is below health standard levels,
 [12] it completely changes the character of the place.
 [13] So what you're doing is you are having immense
 [14] cultural impact. I just use this as one example.
 [15] The same thing with your comments
 [16] on the impact - more specifically, environmental
 [17] impact on the declining Monk Seal population and
 [18] the turtle populations and so forth. You give
 [19] data which is very often - sometimes good,
 [20] sometimes incomplete. And then you say no adverse
 [21] impact. Its a nonsequitur, and it's not
 [22] convincing, and it's not what you're supposed to
 [23] do.
 [24] So, particularly with the Niihauns,
 [25] they're trusting you, and you have an incredible

Page 216

[1] responsibility. You and I are of an age where we
 [2] will see what the effects are. And I hope you're
 [3] right. But from what my training says, you don't
 [4] even know what you're doing. I don't mean that
 [5] personally offensively. But it's a serious
 [6] situation. It's happened to other indigenous
 [7] people. And I'm afraid it's going to happen to
 [8] them.
 [9] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker is
 [10] number 92, Arthur Trask. He will be followed by
 [11] Don Traina, Hana Neening, Andy Parks, and Gary
 [12] Hooser.
 [13] Arthur Trask, you're next. Mr.
 [14] Trask? It's your turn, Mr. Trask. Why don't you
 [15] pull the mike down so we can hear you.
 [16] ARTHUR TRASK: Aloha kakou Aloha
 [17] kakou. I want you to know that we're all
 [18] Americans. And America right or wrong has - as
 [19] president Cleveland said, if right, keep it right.
 [20] If it's wrong, make it right. Who's in favor of
 [21] that?
 [22] Sure, the Navy. The Navy with
 [23] Hawaiians is a love affair. It's always been a
 [24] love affair. One day it's this - (inaudible) -
 [25] and what is that? And that is when they're having

Page 217

[1] an interference with some mermaid or other.
 [2] The situation is - let's - the
 [3] Navy is the most romantic organization of any
 [4] nation. The Navy began, as far as we know, in
 [5] western history in the bathtub of the
 [6] Mediterranean. Those little boys were just
 [7] playing with themselves in the bathtub of the
 [8] Mediterranean when we in Hawaii had all this vast
 [9] ocean.
 [10] It's incredible to think so. But
 [11] here we are on canoes, the lightest thing on the
 [12] earth, lighter than the wind, lighter than the
 [13] waves, lighter than anything. It floats. It
 [14] almost flies.
 [15] But that was the life of a seaman.
 [16] The greatest navigators in the world were the
 [17] Hawaiians, the Polynesians. While these boys were
 [18] in the Mediterranean, the bathtub of the
 [19] Mediterranean, fooling around, making great
 [20] romances.
 [21] But we in Hawaii have always had
 [22] all the men of the sea. The reason why they're
 [23] romantic is, first, because they keep themselves
 [24] clean. They bathe every day, like it or not.
 [25] I had occasion to have a brother

Page 218

[1] classmate of mine in Georgetown law school who was
 [2] from Boston. And I said to him - I said - one
 [3] time he came to my apartment.
 [4] And I said, listen, my fellow, you
 [5] smell. He said you're offending me. I said I
 [6] don't want to offend you at all. I'm your
 [7] brother's pal. But, by God, you stink you better
 [8] get into the goddamned shower and clean yourself.
 [9] I said how often do you bathe? He
 [10] says once a week. All the Bostonians bathe only
 [11] once a week. And we in Hawaii bathe two or three
 [12] times a day.
 [13] The thing of life is different
 [14] under your circumstances. You have here presented
 [15] - presented a draft of an environmental
 [16] statement, a draft. It's supposed to be a joint
 [17] enterprise.
 [18] THE MODERATOR: Mr. Trask, you have
 [19] one minute.
 [20] ARTHUR TRASK: To me it, it's an
 [21] extraordinary work of art. The great volume you
 [22] have produce and kindly sent to a retired
 [23] 92-year-old guy. And I don't want to boast about
 [24] it. Certainly you shouldn't boast about your age.
 [25] But, nevertheless, I'm most

Page 219

[1] extraordinarily happy and grateful for the
 [2] privilege of being here, like all of the speakers
 [3] are.
 [4] This is the greatest oratory and
 [5] sincerity of brains and sincerity of heart,
 [6] sincerity of feeling that I have ever honestly
 [7] witnessed. And I'm glad that it's the Navy and
 [8] you're representing the president of the United
 [9] States, who's the greatest guy since Roosevelt and
 [10] Truman -
 [11] THE MODERATOR: Your time is up,
 [12] Mr. Trask.
 [13] ARTHUR TRASK: One your minute?
 [14] THE MODERATOR: Sorry, your five
 [15] minutes are up.
 [16] ARTHUR TRASK: It's over?
 [17] THE MODERATOR: It's over. Thank
 [18] you very much, Mr. Trask.
 [19] ARTHUR TRASK: I want to say this
 [20] for one minute -
 [21] THE MODERATOR: You -
 [22] ARTHUR TRASK: - treaty with the
 [23] Hawaiian Islands -
 [24] THE MODERATOR: Mr. Trask -
 [25] ARTHUR TRASK: - 1848.

Page 220

[1] THE MODERATOR: Mr. Trask, your
 [2] time is up. Sorry. The next speaker is Dawn
 [3] Traina -
 [4] ARTHUR TRASK: - Great Britain and
 [5] the French before them -
 [6] THE MODERATOR: Sorry. We will
 [7] have to recess. Your time is up. Excuse me -
 [8] ARTHUR TRASK: - with the
 [9] government. And so forth. I want to thank you
 [10] while I say this - one last thing -
 [11] ARTHUR TRASK: The land on which
 [12] you occupy - the land which you occupy is
 [13] Hawaiian Homes Commission land. You haven't paid
 [14] one cent of rent. I'm having my family file a
 [15] suit against the Navy for rent. And it will be at
 [16] least a million dollars. And you haven't paid a
 [17] dime. You paid everybody else -
 [18] (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
 [19] THE MODERATOR: Back on the record
 [20] now. The next speakers are Dawn Traina, Hana
 [21] Neering, Andy Parks, Gary Hooser, George Taguma,
 [22] and William Fernandez. Dawn Traina.
 [23] (Discussion off the record.)
 [24] THE MODERATOR: Is Hana Neering
 [25] here?

Page 221

[1] HANA NEERING: My heart was
 [2] breaking this morning when I was preparing to come
 [3] here. Not only did I know that I would be a
 [4] minority because of the venue. But I don't like
 [5] to come to places where people are in conflict.
 [6] And I don't like to come to a place where people
 [7] are going to be disrespectful to each other.
 [8] I have seen those things happening
 [9] here today. And it's hurt my heart a lot. I
 [10] believe the people in the military are by and
 [11] large wonderful people of integrity. I believe
 [12] the people of PMRF often love Kauai and serve
 [13] Kauai and its people.
 [14] But I could not live with my
 [15] conscience and myself unless I came here today to
 [16] oppose this expansion. Because I believe it's
 [17] harmful to the people of the earth, to the earth,
 [18] to our beloved island of Kauai, and to the animals
 [19] that live on the land and in the ocean.
 [20] I grew up in Utah downwind of -
 [21] (inaudible) - in Nevada. For decades the
 [22] military told the people of Utah that there was no
 [23] harm from these winds. There's lots and lots of
 [24] documentation - and I truly believed the people
 [25] that were telling the inhabitants of Utah there

Page 222

[1] was no harm being done believed what they were
 [2] saying.
 [3] The books I read and the studies
 [4] I've reviewed show that a lot of the people really
 [5] were innocent players. And I feel like this is
 [6] something that's happening to the people of
 [7] Niihau.
 [8] I don't believe that a lot of the
 [9] people involved in this project believe there will
 [10] be harm to Niihau or to the oceans or the lands.
 [11] Unfortunately, I still have members of my family
 [12] and friends dying from diseases because of atomic
 [13] testing.
 [14] I knew that when I came here today
 [15] there would be so many strong agendas, and I'm a
 [16] very simple person, and I live a very simple life.
 [17] I would hope and I would pray that we could all
 [18] get behind and down underneath the plans that we
 [19] have and that we feel are so right and delve deep
 [20] into our hearts and see if there is not another
 [21] way to do this.
 [22] I look at the people of the
 [23] military, and I see integrity, and I see strength,
 [24] and I see intelligence, and I believe that we have
 [25] the technology already to destroy all of the

Page 223

[1] inhabitants of the earth many times over.
 [2] So these missiles to me are
 [3] learning how to selectively kill human beings. We
 [4] have the superior technology. We have the ability
 [5] to kill.
 [6] Please let's take this
 [7] intelligence, let's take this technology, let's
 [8] use it and let's use it here on Kauai to find
 [9] peaceful means of bringing the world together. We
 [10] know how to kill. What we don't know how to do is
 [11] to live in harmony. As you said, world peace is
 [12] only a concept.
 [13] Let this be the place. Let this be
 [14] the world leader where we come together and break
 [15] through, where world peace is no longer just a
 [16] concept because the people in Kauai live beyond.
 [17] I'm not a naive person. I don't
 [18] believe that there is no evil in the world. I
 [19] don't believe there are no madmen in the world.
 [20]
 [21] I do not believe that meeting madness with madness
 [22] is the answer. I believe that we have to be more
 [23] intelligent. I believe that we have to be more
 [24] loving. I wish I had the answers. I don't. I
 [25] only know what I feel in my heart, what I believe

Page 224

[1] with all of my mind and my spirit.
 [2] THE MODERATOR: One minute.
 [3] HANA NEERING: I don't really have
 [4] much more to say. I would like to ask everyone
 [5] who cared enough to stay here all of these hours
 [6] and for all of the people that will be listening
 [7] and watching and participating as this process
 [8] continues to really delve deep into your hearts to
 [9] find the truth and then live the truth. Thank
 [10] you.
 [11] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker is
 [12] Randy Parks. Terry Hooser? George Taguma?
 [13] Mr. Taguma will be followed by
 [14] William Hernandez, Atwood Makanani, Edward
 [15] Kawamura. Mr. Taguma?
 [16] GEORGE TAGUMA: I for the record am
 [17] George M. Taguma. I was born and raised on Kauai.
 [18] I spent the first 20 years growing up here on
 [19] Kauai.
 [20] On my 21st birthday when I was
 [21] legally able to go and sign my name, I went to
 [22] Chicago to grow up and see the world. And I
 [23] thought that was the world. But, you know, the
 [24] world is bigger than Chicago.
 [25] But I learned a lot. And I came

Page 225

[1] back to Kauai to work at the NASA tracking station
 [2] up at Kokee for eight years. Then my feet started
 [3] to get a little itchy. So I went where my feet
 [4] was headed for, and I said, wow, Saudi Arabia is
 [5] the place to go.
 [6] I spent six and a half years there
 [7] - right on the doorstep of that bad guy in the
 [8] Middle East. And that guy was really bad, I'm
 [9] telling you. You guys haven't seen a bad guy
 [10] until you've gone to the Middle East.
 [11] And you guys think that we have
 [12] problems here. No. We're happy here. Even if we
 [13] have problems with our neighbors and the
 [14] community. But these are natural, normal things
 [15] that we have to live with.
 [16] The bad guys are out there with
 [17] missiles aimed at us. And if you guys think those
 [18] missiles are just little firecrackers, think
 [19] again. They got some bad things going on with the
 [20] missiles that will make you shudder. Not only
 [21] shudder, but you'll have bad dreams thinking when
 [22] are they going to let loose.
 [23] And when that day comes and we
 [24] don't have a defense because some of you guys shut
 [25] down the program that was going to give us the

Page 226

[1] defense, I'd say, hey, you guys better catch a
 [2] boat or canoe or whatever and go to the Middle
 [3] East and see for yourself what these guys have in
 [4] store for us.
 [5] Because we won't have time to
 [6] think, hey, I don't like that neighbor's dog
 [7] coming into my yard. I don't like this -
 [8] whatever you guys got going in the north shore or
 [9] down at Hanapepe or at Barking Sands.
 [10] But if you guys shoot down that
 [11] program, God help you and us and you and me.
 [12] Because those guys over there don't care whether
 [13] you like fishing malasadas or manapua or anything
 [14] like that. Because they are aimed at destroying
 [15] the Western Civilization. That's you, me, us.
 [16] And we better be ready and have a
 [17] defense against that day. Or else you not going
 [18] to be able to argue anything anymore or you not
 [19] going to take an afternoon nap because you won't
 [20] have time. So think again, you guys. Don't shoot
 [21] down this program. Thank you.
 [22] THE MODERATOR: Willy Fernandez.
 [23] WILLIAM FERNANDEZ: Captain and
 [24] members of the committee. My name is William
 [25] Fernandez. I'm married to a part Hawaiian Evelyn

Page 227

[1] Mokuholai (phonetic). I'm a former senator from
 [2] this island. And the other people don't recall
 [3] back in the sixties when jobs were scarce.
 [4] And we pioneered - the late
 [5] Senator Miyaki (phonetic) and myself went to
 [6] Washington to convince the Senator that we needed
 [7] a military presence in Kauai to help us get over
 [8] the crisis we were facing, no jobs.
 [9] We were happy that we succeeded.
 [10] It was not PMRF at that time. It was a military
 [11] organization at that time coming over. And we
 [12] succeeded to get that. That's in the sixties. A
 [13] lot of people forget that.
 [14] Then we found out through research
 [15] that the personnel that lived close to the base,
 [16] not less than fifteen minutes from the base - go
 [17] back to the Pentagon to convince them to put a
 [18] housing program. It's been built. It's out
 [19] there.
 [20] We did all this because we looked
 [21] at the bases, the island economy. We needed it
 [22] not only for the jobs, but now as a veteran, let
 [23] me speak as a veteran.
 [24] How many of you have been in World
 [25] War II? Very little. If it wasn't for research

Page 228

[1] we had spent, we'd have lost thousands of
 [2] thousands more men in Europe.
 [3] The Germans had developed a machine
 [4] gun that they could continue firing without
 [5] getting hot. If it wasn't for our research, that
 [6] they developed the flame thrower, the flame
 [7] thrower, it would have been total disaster going
 [8] to war. It was basic research.
 [9] I appeared here some years ago
 [10] concerning Star Wars. And, boy, did we go through
 [11] that one. There was so much said that got me
 [12] believing that what they were saying was true.
 [13] But Captain Mullins showed us the
 [14] truth factors. In fact, they took a picture of a
 [15] mockup missile that's cemented and came out in the
 [16] papers that this belonged from Barking Sands.
 [17] Just imagine how far people will go.
 [18] I respect the views of people. I
 [19] respect the views of those who have something to
 [20] say and they wish to say it loud and clear. They
 [21] must be respected. But they also got to respect
 [22] us.
 [23] The veterans, we know what we are
 [24] talking about. We're not safe. You never can
 [25] tell what might happen.

Page 229

[1] Concerning Niihau, the Robinson
 [2] family saved Niihau. The Robinson family worked
 [3] hard to keep Niihau going. I had a lot of
 [4] opportunity to go pilot to Niihau. And one of the
 [5] greatest opportunities was Grandma Kanahale, when
 [6] she came to Kauai to give my wife and I both two
 [7] big leis, shell leis, which we cherished.
 [8] And her words were this. Senator,
 [9] Billy, you malama my people, protect my people.
 [10] The Robinsons have protected my people. If it
 [11] wasn't - this program for Niihau was not good for
 [12] its people, you wouldn't be there.
 [13] So I'd like to conclude one little
 [14] story right now. I'm just keep going with my
 [15] heart. We - (inaudible) - and I was instructed
 [16] to get to Pearl Harbor - (inaudible).
 [17] We were told that we were going
 [18] into enemy waters and that we would have to dash
 [19] to Johnson island. To each his own to Johnson
 [20] Island. So the man on the top of the bridge said
 [21] one word. We got to get there. And you know what
 [22] was going on down in the engine room? This was
 [23] the word going on. Damn goes the torpedos. Full
 [24] speed ahead. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: I think this is

Page 230

[1] Attwood Makanani.
 [2] ATTWOOD MAKANANI: Hello. My name
 [3] is Attwood Makanani. I am here to speak on behalf
 [4] of Native Hawaiians. I am a Native Hawaiian, born
 [5] and raised here on this island of Kauai.
 [6] I have also been involved for over
 [7] 20 something years working with the Navy. And
 [8] there's a lot of people here, Dave, that I know
 [9] has been very instrumental working with the Navy
 [10] and PMRF. Becky has been a very important person.
 [11] I was arrested way back in 1977 in
 [12] opposition of a cultural genocide that was
 [13] occurring of the major impact culturally that was
 [14] being put upon Native Hawaiians.
 [15] And a lot of that twenty something
 [16] years - what was one of our worst enemies was one
 [17] of our worst nightmares have also become one of
 [18] our best assets and neighbors and friends.
 [19] It has been unfortunate that it has
 [20] taken this long, up to twenty years, that
 [21] Kahoolawe, another island - and the closest to
 [22] that island is Niihau - was some place where
 [23] Native Hawaiians would be able to look, where we
 [24] could work together in a partnering in becoming
 [25] the best for both words of technology and the

Page 231

[1] defense, national security of our nation, our
 [2] homeland as Native Hawaiians would be able to
 [3] better our culture and better the defense, not
 [4] just for Hawaii, but for the United States of God
 [5] Bless America.
 [6] We are a stepping stone, a first
 [7] line of defense between what we're calling SCUD
 [8] missiles of the Middle East. And since the
 [9] Spanish-American War a major food basket within
 [10] this continent of water which by canoes (phonetic)
 [11] we have been able to educate peacefully some of
 [12] those alternatives, cultural values that we have
 [13] to offer.
 [14] Kahoolawe is a hazardous site.
 [15] Kahoolawe, the Navy all of a sudden which doesn't
 [16] have enough money has a lot of money to invest in
 [17] missiles. The Navy that doesn't have money and
 [18] programs to hire Native Hawaiian companies who
 [19] have been trying to look for jobs in a time of
 [20] economics, all of a sudden we don't have jobs for
 [21] local people.
 [22] We don't have local businesses.
 [23] They are bettering themselves. Gerald Lynn
 [24] (phonetic), one of the few native local Hawaiian
 [25] companies who worked in the partnering which

Page 232

[1] started a model cleanup is now practically going
 [2] bankrupt.
 [3] And those very same partners of
 [4] ex-military, ex-contractor persons seem to be
 [5] doing exceptionally well. How is it that we as
 [6] Native Hawaiians always end up in a time of
 [7] economics?
 [8] And I would like to commend our
 [9] Senator Daniel Inouye. If it was not for him,
 [10] Kahoolawe would not have come back. But what was
 [11] intended as an economic opportunity to partner and
 [12] to at least prepare and to have some jobs for
 [13] local people, especially when veterans come up to
 [14] me and telling me I am unemployed and how can I
 [15] find work, I'm saying you are entitled to have
 [16] work.
 [17] Why you don't have work, I don't
 [18] know. But if anybody should be working, it should
 [19] be the veterans who should be working, especially
 [20] when you are trying to bring closure. You have
 [21] retired. You have your family. You don't have a
 [22] job. You live here. You are trying to bring
 [23] closure to bombing an island, and you would like
 [24] to at least pick up one bomb. I have no idea why
 [25] you don't have a job. I don't have a job.

Page 233

[1] Part of this cultural alternative
 [2] has been what I as a twenty-year vet of working in
 [3] partnering with the military, with the Navy in
 [4] particular, have come out without winning your PhD
 [5] college degree as a professor, without a job,
 [6] working.
 [7] Sometimes I wonder. We have looked
 [8] at Niihau as the best, the last of the living
 [9] culture. Niihau was a model that we saw Kahoolawe
 [10] as. Niihau is the last - where I wish I could
 [11] go, which I haven't gone, to at least learn my
 [12] native tongue, my olelo.
 [13] Niihau, sometimes I wonder like me,
 [14] what would happen if all of a sudden I was
 [15] unemployed because my employer said I don't have a
 [16] job, I have to move out of my home because I have
 [17] to file Chapter 13. Who when I'm out on the road
 [18] will hire me without one college, without one high
 [19] school degree, talking Hawaiian? Who with so much
 [20] jobs coming with people with high skills and
 [21] technology is going to hire uneducated - we're
 [22] looked at as savages - Native Hawaiian. We had
 [23] hoped to be trained out of Kahoolawe to be able to
 [24] look at erosion and environmental. And that is
 [25] one of the worst hazards that I hope Niihau never

Page 234

[1] becomes
 [2] THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr.
 [3] Makanani.
 [4] ATTWOOD MAKANANI: Thank you.
 [5] THE MODERATOR: The next speakers
 [6] are Andrew Evans, Edward Kawamura, Judy Naumu
 [7] Stuart, Jim Seia Benjamina, William Honjiyo and -
 [8] that will take us through the next five.
 [9] Andrew Evans? Thank you for using
 [10] this reserved seating up here. Is Andrew Evans
 [11] here?
 [12] Edward Kawamura? He's next.
 [13] EDWARD KAWAMURA: Ladies and
 [14] gentlemen, my name is Edward Kawamura. I am a
 [15] twenty-year veteran, spent time in Vietnam. And
 [16] I'm here to speak in support of the Veterans
 [17] organization, which I represent under the Kauai
 [18] Veterans Council.
 [19] The Kauai Veterans Council
 [20] consisting of the following organizations.
 [21] American Legion Post 2, American Legion Post 51,
 [22] American Legion Post 54, Disabled American
 [23] Veterans, Kauai Chapter Number 5, Kauai Merchant
 [24] Marines, Kauai Veterans Club, Kauai Vietnam Era
 [25] Veterans Association, Kauai 100th Infantry

Page 235

[1] Battalion Veterans, Kauai 442nd RCT Veterans Club,
 [2] Korean War Veterans, Military Intelligence Service
 [3] Veterans of Kauai, Military Order of the Purple
 [4] Heart Chapter 489, Veterans of Foreign Wars,
 [5] American Legion Auxiliary unit 2, Sons and
 [6] Daughters of the 100/442nd RCT, respectfully
 [7] submit this letter as a testimony in favor of the
 [8] program for expansion of the PMRF facility and the
 [9] EIS of the project.
 [10] I'd like to go on further because I
 [11] spent many years on the Kauai Veterans Council. I
 [12] view many points, from the veterans, learning from
 [13] the World War II veterans that the infantryman is
 [14] the man that is up front. Korea, the same thing.
 [15] Vietnam, the same thing.
 [16] We the people of Vietnam came back
 [17] to a country that was mixed emotions. I can see
 [18] electronic technology. I can see the future. I
 [19] was here when Star Wars was here. I supported the
 [20] program because high tech is here. And if you
 [21] don't believe me, high tech is gonna be here,
 [22] because the simple reason that satellites are here
 [23] that you are viewing television via satellite.
 [24] I can tell you the impact of a
 [25] missile. We here look at it as an emotional

Page 236

[1] thing. I tell you from the technical aspect the
 [2] Doppler radar system gives you an immediate
 [3] response. We need immediate response. We cannot
 [4] wait. We seen Iniki. Had we had Doppler system
 [5] then, we would be well advanced.
 [6] And I say this with all sincerity
 [7] to all the ones that are here, and I acknowledge
 [8] your concern. But I spend many Memorial days on
 [9] Hanapepe. I view a lot of our fallen comrades
 [10] that have given their time for you to walk on this
 [11] earth. Yet I challenge you this Memorial day to
 [12] see you down there, to see you say thank you for
 [13] the people that paid the supreme sacrifice.
 [14] We can be thankful in a world of
 [15] technology. We cannot be number two. There is no
 [16] number two when you go to see Saddam, you go to
 [17] Santa Domingo, you go to the places where the
 [18] countries are, including Korea, these are all the
 [19] places that I have served. And I ask the people
 [20] to support these program because it means our
 [21] technology is strong, our defense is strong.
 [22] Thank you.
 [23] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker is
 [24] Judy Naumu Stuart.
 [25] JUDY NAUMU-STEWART: Aloha. Thank

Page 237

[1] you for giving me the opportunity to speak today.
 [2] And also I'd like to thank those who stayed this
 [3] late to hear me because I was expecting just
 [4] myself up here. I was the 102nd speaker.
 [5] My name is Judy Naumu-Stuart. And
 [6] I was born and raised in Hanapepe, Kauai to a
 [7] humble family. Left to be a school teacher and
 [8] came back, retired from the State of Hawaii,
 [9] Department of Education. And it's so great to be
 [10] able to enjoy my retirement.
 [11] And I am here to support this
 [12] project as being co-related with the Niihau
 [13] ownership of the island, the Robinsons, and PMRF.
 [14] I am a beneficiary of the Hawaiian
 [15] Homeland Act of 1920 as amended. I live on
 [16] Hawaiian homelands in Kekaha. And also I have 200
 [17] acres of ranch up in (inaudible).
 [18] I know the Niihau people because
 [19] I've eaten with them, from the same poi bowl with
 [20] them. And I feel very appalled to think that
 [21] there are so many people here today who know so
 [22] much about the Niihau people that they can think
 [23] for their benefit and their disasters and their
 [24] dangers when they had these Niihau people come
 [25] here and express themselves.

Page 238

[1] To think that people have the nerve
 [2] to say that they were forced to do it, they
 [3] wouldn't have done. It is ludicrous. Respect
 [4] these people's wishes.
 [5] They love the aina of Niihau. They
 [6] love their owners, the Robinsons, who have done
 [7] well for them. We looking out - like a fish bowl
 [8] looking in, which we have no business. I am a
 [9] Hawaiian. Hawaiian lands I know.
 [10] But I have no business to go there
 [11] because it's privately owned land or even make a
 [12] decision for it. I thought that way when I came
 [13] home in 1984. I was like that. But I had to
 [14] learn. I had to learn to respect the Niihau
 [15] people and their wishes.
 [16] Because I don't live there. I live
 [17] on Kauai in Kekaha. So my support to you and the
 [18] Niihau people with this project. And I hope you
 [19] all the luck and success. Thank you.
 [20] THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Speaker
 [21] number 103. The next four speakers that I have
 [22] are Jim Sela Benjamina, William Honjiyo. Susan
 [23] Buckwinkle, and Keith Robinson.
 [24] JIM BENJAMINA: Jim Benjamina. I
 [25] born over here, Kauai. I raised Niihau. So I

Page 239

[1] lived over there. That's a good island. Thank
 [2] the Robinsons for support all the Niihau people.
 [3] That's a good island. I lived there -
 [4] (inaudible) - and I agree Robinson like to do -
 [5] what he like. I'm in for that. I move here I
 [6] work in - over here to Garden Island. And I got
 [7] a wife. I got kids. And I know everybody take
 [8] life. Everybody got - (inaudible) - to take
 [9] care. Everybody and me and my family. And thank
 [10] you very much. Aloha.
 [11] THE MODERATOR: William Honjiyo.
 [12] WILLIAM HONJIYO: Good evening.
 [13] It's been a long day. My name is William Honjiyo.
 [14] I'm the president of the Kauai Vietnam Era
 [15] Veterans Association.
 [16] And I'm spoke, like Ed, many years
 [17] ago about the Star Wars. And I'm here to testify
 [18] on behalf of the project.
 [19] I see two major issues here. One
 [20] is the macro-viewpoint or needs of the military.
 [21] And, two, the economic needs of this island.
 [22] If we look at the macro-viewpoint
 [23] of the military's needs, as we all know, the
 [24] military or the defense budget has been shrinking,
 [25] and choices have to be made. Your operational

Page 240

[1] budget has become extremely small. In fact, to a
 [2] point where there's complaints that we cannot do
 [3] everything that is asked by the President.
 [4] However, taking the choice of going
 [5] into research and development, we find that that
 [6] is the way to go. A fine example is like a
 [7] computer. You buy the computer today, it's
 [8] already obsolete.
 [9] To get the finest weapon, as
 [10] expressed by Billy Fernandez, you've got to rely
 [11] on research and development. My personal
 [12] experience back in the mid seventies, I was
 [13] involved with GLIB or whatever the code name was
 [14] at that time which was laser-designated target
 [15] acquisition.
 [16] And at that time I was an
 [17] operations officer for the Fourth Infantry
 [18] Division and followed up the land acquisition
 [19] group that had to negotiate and go through the
 [20] same process that you're going through for this
 [21] laser-guided system.
 [22] And what was the benefit? I think
 [23] it was outstanding. To me as a military officer,
 [24] retired, I see one thing. Nobody loves war. War
 [25] is hell. And in this case here, where my

Page 241

[1] contemporaries - like I knew General Powell -
 [2] (inaudible) - and Storming Norman Schwartzkopf.
 [3] Those people did it right.
 [4] And doing it right means a swift
 [5] war with various surgical strikes where you don't
 [6] have to hurt civilians. But you take them on and
 [7] do it very quickly. And I feel that this project,
 [8] the Navy is doing is doing the same thing. That's
 [9] the reason why I am for this particular project.
 [10] On the economic side of the house,
 [11] I returned about 19 years ago as a young guy aged
 [12] 43 or so. And I think everybody who comes to
 [13] Kauai to live, he looks for his kids to come back,
 [14] to be able to live here, to have a job, and
 [15] continue what a family normally does, get
 [16] together. And I find that we were getting there
 [17] pretty close. Then came the hurricane, and my
 [18] kids said there's no job available, you got to go.
 [19] And I think we have a win/win
 [20] situation here between the Navy and the local
 [21] community here. Jobs have been offered. And I
 [22] don't mean mainland jobs. I mean high tech jobs.
 [23] The middle management expressed by this other
 [24] person. So I feel that definitely it has its
 [25] merits. And I'm for the project. And I thank you

Page 242

[1] very much for the opportunity.
 [2] THE MODERATOR: Again, I will
 [3] pronounce this as well as I can, given that I
 [4] can't make out all the letters. Susan Buckwinkle.
 [5] She may no longer be here. Keith Robinson.
 [6] KEITH ROBINSON: Thank you. I
 [7] would appreciate it if you would give me a
 [8] two-minute warning and a one-minute warning.
 [9] please bear with me. About a week
 [10] ago, I got one of the worst colds of my life. I
 [11] wasn't able - there was too much work. I wasn't
 [12] able to take a rest. I'm not communicable
 [13] anymore. But my voice hasn't come back strongly.
 [14] My name is Keith Robinson. I
 [15] operated the Endangered Species Wildlife Reserve
 [16] in West Kauai. I also serve as the environmental
 [17] advisor to Niihau ranch.
 [18] I fully support this draft of the
 [19] Environmental Impact Statement. As a matter of
 [20] historic familiarity with the problems of managing
 [21] shoreline habitat, I can state definitely that
 [22] this proposed PMRF expansion will not damage
 [23] either the Monk Seal or turtle populations on
 [24] Niihau. Let me explain that a little bit.
 [25] When my brother and I took over

Page 243

[1] management of the Niihau Ranch after Dan Lummer
 [2] died, there were no Monk Seals on Niihau and had
 [3] not been for apparently about a century.
 [4] Niihau island is the only island in
 [5] the entire world in this century that has been
 [6] successfully recolonized by Monk Seals. So Bruce
 [7] and I know a thing or two about taking care of
 [8] Monk Seals.
 [9] The PMRF has been a good neighbor.
 [10] Several Niihau people's lives have been saved by
 [11] PMRF helicopter crews. This brings up an
 [12] interesting story. I didn't know that the Niihau
 [13] people were planning this kind of a demonstration.
 [14] I didn't happen to be here at the time it
 [15] happened. I was home feeding my mother. She's
 [16] old now, not really with it.
 [17] And it happened during my being
 [18] there. But I understand that the final speaker
 [19] was a young olelo. There is something of a story
 [20] behind that. Twenty years ago on the night of
 [21] sheer terror for us and several other people on
 [22] Niihau, the sister of that woman was saved by an
 [23] American helicopter crew that been from Kauai just
 [24] literally with only minutes to spare when they got
 [25] her to the hospital.

Page 244

[1] As I say, several other Niihau
 [2] peoples lives have also been saved by PMRF. PMRF
 [3] - people say, I believe, that the Navy is
 [4] deceiving the Niihau people. That is far from
 [5] true.
 [6] Now, the next point I would like to
 [7] make is that Niihau has been involved in both open
 [8] and clandestine, shall we say, secret, shall we
 [9] say - clandestine sounds sinister - military
 [10] activities -
 [11] THE MODERATOR: Two minutes -
 [12] KEITH ROBINSON: Thank you. Niihau
 [13] has been involved ever since 1933. As a result of
 [14] those preWorld War activities, we were able to
 [15] snag the first Japanese Zero. This was a top line
 [16] Japanese fighter that was far better than anything
 [17] the U.S. had. We were able to snag the first
 [18] operational Zero ever recovered for U.S. research,
 [19] the people who desperately needed it for the World
 [20] War II effort.
 [21] In World War II Niihau also
 [22] supported from a land location a critical
 [23] navigation in the Pacific area for the U.S. fleet
 [24] and navigation generally.
 [25] In 1958 we were deeply involved in

Page 245

[1] the atomic tests at Johnson Islands. Niihau Ranch
 [2] was the detection point to see if the missiles
 [3] launched from Johnson could be detected the.
 [4] Successful outcome of -
 [5] THE MODERATOR: One minute -
 [6] KEITH ROBINSON: The successful
 [7] outcome of that project provided the technology
 [8] that later shielded the U.S. and the free world
 [9] during the Cold War. This was known as the
 [10] Distant Early Warning, and it had its beginning on
 [11] Niihau. I could go on and mention other things.
 [12] My final point is that the Niihau
 [13] community is unlike other Hawaiian activists who
 [14] are looking backwards culturally to an age when
 [15] their ancestors were in a much simpler situation.
 [16] The Niihau community is a
 [17] thoroughly modern and highly adaptable and
 [18] forward-looking community. They know how to
 [19] handle solar planes, military weapons, and things
 [20] like that. They just don't make a big thing of
 [21] it. And it's not generally known because up to
 [22] now we've never had to be involved in an
 [23] Environmental Impact Statement. So during all
 [24] these years, the public never was involved in
 [25] this. Thank you.

Page 246

[1] THE MODERATOR: That brings us to
 [2] the conclusion of the speakers that I have had
 [3] handed in to me. I would like to invite Captain
 [4] Bowlin, if you have any closing remarks you would
 [5] like to make to go ahead and do that now.
 [6] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Are there no more
 [7] speakers?
 [8] THE MODERATOR: There are no more
 [9] speakers. Go ahead.
 [10] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: I really don't
 [11] have any closing remarks. I want to thank
 [12] everybody for participating today. The testimony
 [13] that was given today was very interesting. And I
 [14] know that it really came from the heart. There
 [15] were some good comments made, some good
 [16] suggestions that we will take into consideration.
 [17] There was also some misinformation that was put
 [18] out.
 [19] And we will try to make sure that
 [20] the right information gets out to everybody. And
 [21] I would like to let you know that if you want to
 [22] know more about what we do at PMRF, it's not that
 [23] hard to do. If you want to come out and do a
 [24] tour, if you want to come out and talk to folks,
 [25] we give briefs, we give tours. That's part of

Page 247

[1] Vida's job. Her phone number is 335-4740. Give
 [2] her a call.
 [3] We don't have very many secrets out
 [4] there. I think it's important for the people that
 [5] live on this island to know more about what we do.
 [6] I would like to clear up some of those
 [7] misconceptions about what we do.
 [8] I think we are a good neighbor, and
 [9] we can continue to be a good neighbor. Thanks
 [10] very much for coming today.
 [11] THE MODERATOR: With that we will
 [12] recess at 5:48.
 [13] (Proceedings concluded at 5:48 p.m.)
 [14]
 [15]
 [16]
 [17]
 [18]
 [19]
 [20]
 [21]
 [22]
 [23]
 [24]
 [25]

Page 248

[1] CERTIFICATE
 [2] STATE OF HAWAII)
 [3]) SS.
 [4] COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
 [5] I, WILLIAM T. BARTON, RPR, Certified
 [6] Shorthand Reporter, State of Hawaii, do hereby
 [7] certify:
 [8] That on April 25, 1998 at 10:00 a.m. there
 [9] occurred before me the above proceedings;
 [10] That I am neither counsel for any of the
 [11] parties herein, nor interested in any way in the
 [12] outcome of this action;
 [13] That the hearing contained herein was by me
 [14] taken down in machine shorthand and thereafter
 [15] reduced to print via computer-aided transcription
 [16] under my supervision; that the foregoing
 [17] represents a complete and accurate transcript of
 [18] the English testimony of the proceedings to the
 [19] best of my ability.
 [20] Dated this 8th day of May 1998 at Honolulu,
 [21] Hawaii.
 [22]
 [23] WILLIAM T. BARTON, CSR No. 391
 [24] Certified Shorthand Reporter
 [25]

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Alvarez, Patrick (for Congressman Neil Abercrombie)	Yes	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Anthony, James	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>The public hearing was conducted following normal, well established procedures. We believe that all interested members of the public had adequate opportunity to learn about the proposed action and the EIS and make their comments.</p> <p>The Draft EIS was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (CEQ), Title 40, Parts 1500-1508; Executive Order 12114, Department of Defense Directive 6050.1 and Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS), Chapter 343. The approach included use of an interdisciplinary team of professionals coupled with close consultation with Federal, State and local cultural and natural resource agencies, organizations and experts. Where objective criteria were available and applicable, they were used to measure, in terms of both context and intensity, the effects associated with the proposed action. Other areas, by their nature, are evaluated using a more subjective approach tailored to the specific region of influence involved. In all cases, data were gathered through a combination of literature searches, interviews, and site visits to enable meaningful conclusions to be drawn. The potential safety impacts to humans are addressed in the Health and Safety Sections of Chapter 4.</p> <p>The Congress of the United States has determined that we need to have effective defenses for our armed forces and allies against missile attacks, like the ones that killed many of our young men in Saudi Arabia during the Gulf War. Congress has also recognized that PMRF provides an ideal setting to test these systems because of its established technical infrastructure and the wide ocean expanse to conduct the actual intercept tests.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Baptist, Brian	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Benjamina, Ilei	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Benjamina, Jim	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Bennett, Dave	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Benton, Wendy	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>We share your concern about endangered species, particularly the monk seal and green sea turtle. We do not believe that the proposed activities will jeopardize any species and are in consultation with USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Endangered Species Act as indicated in Volume 2, Appendix K.</p> <p>The Congress of the United States has determined that we need to have effective defenses for our armed forces and allies against missile attacks, like the ones that killed many of our young men in Saudi Arabia during the Gulf War. Congress has also recognized that PMRF provides an ideal setting to test these systems because of its established technical infrastructure and the wide ocean expanse to conduct the actual intercept tests.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Bulatao-Franklin, Barbara	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments of April 25, 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Bullock, Gene	Yes (2)	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments of April 25, 1998 and subsequent letter on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Cannon, Hilda	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written testimony of April 25, 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Chandler, Betty	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Chandler, Jeff	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>While we do not agree with your appraisal of the mission and usefulness of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, we appreciate your right to express your opinion on that subject. Our national leaders must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide this country a strong defense. Congress has recognized the need to test defensive missile systems that will protect our armed forces and allies overseas, as well as PMRF's ideal setting and existing technology base to perform some of this testing.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Chandler, Linda	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>While we do not agree with your appraisal of the mission and usefulness of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, we appreciate your right to express your opinion on that subject. Our national leaders must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide this country a strong defense. Congress has recognized the need to test defensive missile systems that will protect our armed forces and allies overseas, as well as PMRF's ideal setting and existing technology base to perform some of this testing.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Corregador, Michael	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Daley, Richard	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Dalton, Judy	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your letter dated 22 May 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Dawson, Jim	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Diamond, Karen	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>While we do not agree with your appraisal of the mission and usefulness of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, we appreciate your right to express your opinion on that subject. Our national leaders must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide this country a strong defense. Congress has recognized the need to test defensive missile systems that will protect our armed forces and allies overseas, as well as PMRF's ideal setting and existing technology base to perform some of this testing.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Fernandez, William	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Gardiner, Gregg	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and letter of April 25, 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Georgi, William	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written comments of April 25, 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Greff, Clarence by R. Daley	Yes	Thank you for your statement presented by Mr. Daley and your written comments of 20 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Honjiyo, William	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Hopman, Arius	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written comments regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your written testimony dated 25 April 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.
Hughes, Tom	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Hull, Monte	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>We share your concern about endangered species, particularly the monk seal and green sea turtle. We do not believe that the proposed activities will jeopardize any species and are in consultation with USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Endangered Species Act as indicated in Volume 2, Appendix K.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The Congress of the United States has determined that we need to have effective defenses for our armed forces and allies against missile attacks, like the ones that killed many of our young men in Saudi Arabia during the Gulf War. Congress has also recognized that PMRF provides an ideal setting to test these systems because of its established technical infrastructure and the wide ocean expanse to conduct the actual intercept tests.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Irwin, Richard	Yes (2)	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written testimony dated 25 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Isobe, John	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Kagawa, Ross	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Kali, Sr., Benjamin	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Kanahele Jr., Malaki	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kanahele, Douglas	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kanahele, Mileka	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kaohelaulii, Enoka	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kaohelaulii, Leiala	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kaohelaulii, Luano	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kaohelaulii, Paul	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kawamura, Edward	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kelly, Healani	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kouchi, Ron	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written comments of April 25, 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kusaka, Maryanne	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and letter dated 23 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Lawshe, Jim	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Lemke, Paul	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Lloyd, Alan	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written testimony of 25 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Loo, Michael	Yes (2)	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written testimony of 25 April 1998 and your letter of 7 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
MacDonald, Ron	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Makanani, Attwood	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Makuaole, Sandra	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Marston, Nani	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
McGregor, Davianna	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your letter dated 25 April 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.</p>
Measel, Jr., Robert	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Mildwater, Chris	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your written comments submitted on 25 April 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.</p>
Miyamoto, Alton	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and letter dated 21 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Mullins, Robert	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments of 25 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Naumu-Stewart, Judy	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Naya, Seiji	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written testimony of April 25, 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Neering, Hana	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Nekomoto, David	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments dated 25 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Niheu, Welokiheiakeoeloa	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Nizo, Thomas	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Nunes, Wendall	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Papke, Lana	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Partida, Alberto	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your written statement dated 25 April 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.</p>
Peay, Bill	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Prince, Jennifer	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>We share your concern about endangered species, particularly the monk seal and green sea turtle. We do not believe that the proposed activities will jeopardize any species and are in consultation with USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Endangered Species Act as indicated in Volume 2, Appendix K.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Robinson, Keith	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Rogers, Nani	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written testimony regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your written statement dated 10 May 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.
Shook, Dan	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Sihvola, Pamela	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written comments regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your written statement dated 25 April 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.
Stokes, Ken	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written testimony regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your written statement dated 25 April 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.
Sullivan, Patrick	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written testimony dated 25 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-3: Public Hearing, Waimea, Kauai, 25 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment ¹	RESPONSE
Taguma, George	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Taylor, Gabriela	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your letter dated April 25, 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.</p>
Togioka, James	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Trask, Arthur	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
White, Emmaline	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>
Yoshida, Laurie	Yes	<p>Thank you for your presentation and written comments of April 25, 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITIES TAKEN ON APRIL 28, 1998

PAGE 1 TO PAGE 69

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS

(808) 524-2090

CONDENSED TRANSCRIPT AND CONCORDANCE

PREPARED BY:

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC.

*1001 BISHOP STREET
SUITE 2460, PACIFIC TOWER*

HONOLULU, HI 96813

Phone: (808) 524-2090

FAX: (808) 524-2596

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

[1] PUBLIC HEARING ON
 [2]
 [3]
 [4] PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITIES
 [5]
 [6] ENHANCED CAPABILITIES DRAFT
 [7]
 [8] ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
 [9]
 [10]
 [11]
 [12]

[13] Held on April 28th, 1998 at the Disabled American
 [14] Veterans Complex, Harry & Jeanette Weinberg Memorial Hall,
 [15] 2685 North Nimitz Highway, Honolulu, Hawai'i, commencing at
 [16] 5:00 p.m.
 [17]
 [18]
 [19]
 [20]
 [21]

[22] BEFORE:

[23] B. KANOELANI COCKETT, CSR NO. 379
 [24] Certified Shorthand Reporter
 [25]

[1] PROCEEDINGS

[2] THE MODERATOR: Aloha and welcome to today's
 [3] public hearing on the Pacific Missile Range Facility
 [4] Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
 [5] My name is Lewis Michaelson, and I have been asked
 [6] by the Navy to moderate today's meeting. Before I go over
 [7] the agenda and ground rules, I would like to ask Reverend
 [8] Bill Kaina to say a few words.

[9] REVEREND KAINA: Aloha. It is the pleasure to be
 [10] here for this hearing and ask you to pause with me in
 [11] prayer. O ka inoa o ka makua a o ke keiki a me ka uhane
 [12] hemolele, oh, eternal spirit of God who gathers up the many
 [13] threads which make up the separate lives of our people here
 [14] in our Hawai'i nei aina aloha o na kupuna a me na pua, and
 [15] whose spirit continues to weave these threads into a
 [16] glorious tapestry of many colors, culture and traditions,
 [17] pick up here this afternoon the threads of our lives and
 [18] weave us into your purposes for human kind. Pour now your
 [19] spirit of aloha upon our humble gathering in this important
 [20] hearing which may affect our lives throughout all of
 [21] Hawai'i, and especially our sisters and brothers on Kaua'i
 [22] and Ni'ihau.

[23] We acknowledge with depth of gratitude and aloha
 [24] our United States Government, the U.S. Congress, and the
 [25] various U.S. departments which do things for our good and

[1] our safety, both in times of peace and in times of stress
 [2] and war. We thank you, oh, heavenly Father for our nation's
 [3] protection of our islands. Be now with us in this public
 [4] hearing as the Department of Defense through the U.S. Navy
 [5] make their presentations and requests known to us as they
 [6] address their Environmental Impact Statement with us all.
 [7] Oh, God of love and peace, we humbly seek your
 [8] divine presence to help direct and guide, guide us with your
 [9] will, what your will might be for us, throughout all Hawai'i
 [10] nei. Let us speak to each other with sincere aloha, unity
 [11] of purpose, and heartfelt concern for all of our people.
 [12] We offer this humble prayer, oh, Lord in your
 [13] gracious merciful name, on behalf of all the people of our
 [14] Hawai'i nei, for our welfare and our islands' and nation's
 [15] defense and safety. No ka mea, no ke aupuni, a me ka mana,
 [16] a me ka ho'onani 'ia a mau loa aku. For yours is the
 [17] kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and ever.
 [18] Amen.

[19] THE MODERATOR: Thank you. To start the hearing,
 [20] I would like to take a minute to briefly outline the purpose
 [21] of today's meeting.

[22] Today's public hearing has three essential
 [23] purposes. The first is to describe to you the nature of the
 [24] program that is being examined in the Environmental Impact
 [25] Statement, in this case, the Pacific Missile Range Facility

[1] Enhanced Capability Proposal.
 [2] The second is to briefly describe the
 [3] environmental impact statement process and the findings in
 [4] the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS as it is
 [5] known by its initials. These first two items will be
 [6] covered by Captain James Bowlin immediately after my
 [7] introductory remarks.
 [8] The third and primary purpose of this hearing is
 [9] to listen to your concerns and comments on the Draft EIS.
 [10] This last item on the agenda, public comments, is really the
 [11] most important. Remember that the Draft EIS is just that, a
 [12] draft. This is your opportunity to tell the Navy how it
 [13] could improve its analysis of potential environmental
 [14] impacts before the document is finalized and before a
 [15] decision on whether or not to proceed with the proposed
 [16] action is made.
 [17] And now a few administrative comments on how to
 [18] make comments today.
 [19] If you've already signed up to speak, well, that's
 [20] great. If not and you would like to speak today, please go
 [21] to the registration table, which is over here to my right,
 [22] and sign up. Everyone is welcome to speak, but it makes the
 [23] process run more smoothly if I can call on people from a
 [24] sign-up list. In addition, we're going to ask people who
 [25] have signed up to speak, I will read ahead for the first

[1] several names and keep doing that. We have a row here in
 [2] front of me which says "reserved". As I call your name, I'd
 [3] appreciate if you'd come up and be seated in that area to
 [4] make the process run more smoothly.
 [5] In terms of speaking orders and times, these are
 [6] our following ground rules:
 [7] Individuals must sign up to speak in person at the
 [8] hearing. Five minutes is the maximum speaking time for each
 [9] speaker. Each individual may speak only once. Combining
 [10] or
 [11] yielding speaking times with other people is not permitted.
 [12] Elected officials are given the courtesy of speaking first,
 [13] and all other speakers will be called on in the order in
 [14] which they signed up.
 [15] The Navy also has a court reporter here. She is
 [16] seated to my left. She is here today to make a verbatim
 [17] transcript of this hearing so that all of your oral comments
 [18] will be recorded accurately as a part of preparing the
 [19] transcript. An audio video recording of today's hearing
 [20] will be made as well.
 [21] You may also make your comments in writing, and if
 [22] you wish to there are three ways you can do that.
 [23] First of all, you may hand in written comments
 [24] that you brought with you today to me or to the person at
 [25] the registration table. If they are in written form, we
 appreciate if you put your address on them so you can

[1] receive a response. I'll wait just a moment.
 [2] Secondly, you can use written comments. There are
 [3] written comment sheets that are available at the
 [4] registration table. You probably received some when you
 [5] came in. If you want to, you can fill those in and, again,
 [6] hand those in today. And, finally, you may mail written
 [7] comments to the name and address which appear on the How
 [8] You
 [9] Can Be Heard handout you should have received when you
 [10] came
 [11] in. Whichever option you choose, your written comments will
 [12] be entered into the formal record of public comments on the
 [13] Draft EIS, and written comments are given the same
 [14] consideration as oral comments received here today. If you
 [15] choose to mail in comments, please be sure to send them by
 [16] May 26th, 1998, which is the closing date for comment
 [17] period.
 [18] If you would like to receive a copy of the final
 [19] EIS when it becomes available, there are again three ways
 [20] you can do that:
 [21] If you received a Draft EIS in the mail, you are
 [22] already on the list and you will automatically receive the
 [23] final EIS unless you tell us to do otherwise.
 [24] Secondly, if you're not on the list, there is a
 [25] sign-up sheet, again, at the registration table. Fill that
 out and you will be placed on the list to receive the final
 EIS. Or, third, you can mail a written request to receive

Page 7

[1] the final EIS. Copies of the EIS will be also placed in the
 [2] information repositories, and for a list of those repositories
 [3] you can look for your list at the registration table, or
 [4] also it can also be found in Section 9 of the Draft EIS.
 [5] Finally, it is important for you to understand
 [6] that the Navy representatives are not here to make any
 [7] decisions. Their main purpose in being here today is to
 [8] listen to your suggestions and concerns firsthand.
 [9] With that, we will now begin Captain Bowlin's
 [10] presentation.

[11] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Michaelson. Good
 [12] evening to all of you. I'm Captain Jim Bowlin, commanding
 [13] officer of the Navy's Pacific Missile Range Facility.
 [14] Welcome to this public hearing on our Enhanced Capability
 [15] Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and thank you,
 [16] Reverend Kaina, for the opening prayer.
 [17] The purpose of an Environmental Impact Statement
 [18] is to assist government officials in making decisions about
 [19] a major action that has been proposed, and we need your
 [20] help, your comments, your concerns. I really appreciate you
 [21] taking time from your busy lives to participate in this
 [22] democratic process and help us with our decision making.
 [23] I didn't notice any elected officials in the group
 [24] tonight, but if we have any, we'll of course extend to them
 [25] the courtesy of speaking first.

Page 8

[1] I'd like introduce the folks at the table here
 [2] with me. On my right is Mr. Ave Soto. Ave has managed the
 [3] preparation of this Environmental Impact Statement as a
 [4] member of the PMRF Range Operation staff. Also at the table
 [5] is Ms. Vida Mossman, the public affairs officer of PMRF, and
 [6] you've probably seen Vida's name around in various places
 [7] because she's been the focal point for your comments and
 [8] inquiries. We also have with us in the audience Commander
 [9] John Ailes from the Navy's Theater Air Defense Program
 [10] office, and all of us will be listening closely to your
 [11] comments and concerns about these important decisions.
 [12] Your comments will be recorded verbatim so they
 [13] will become a part of the final EIS. I have arranged for
 [14] staff members to remain available to you right outside this
 [15] room. As a matter of fact, they are right outside on the
 [16] lanai. They will provide any clarification that you might
 [17] need on a proposal or the environmental analysis. Feel free
 [18] to visit with them as you need to throughout the meeting,
 [19] but please do it in a way that's not disruptive to the
 [20] hearing.

[21] PMRF is the world's largest ocean range, with
 [22] instrumentation that can recreate and monitor testing and
 [23] training environment for military and advanced technology
 [24] systems to operate on the sea, under the sea, in the air and
 [25] space and on shore. For over 35 years, PMRF has served not

Page 9

[1] only all the U.S. Armed Forces, but nondefense agencies and
 [2] commercial industry as well. Counting testing and training
 [3] evolutions, we support approximately 1,000 individual
 [4] operations per year.
 [5] Federal and Hawai'i State laws require the Navy
 [6] and the State of Hawai'i to look at the environmental
 [7] consequences of our actions before we take them. This
 [8] process assures that both the public and the decision makers
 [9] know what's being proposed and the proposal's potential
 [10] impact on the environment. Our Draft EIS is a joint
 [11] document from the Navy and the State of Hawai'i, satisfying
 [12] both federal and state requirements.
 [13] The minute you first contributed to this
 [14] decision-making process of the public scoping meetings we
 [15] held in June of last year, you helped us identify the issues
 [16] that we should analyze within our Environmental Impact
 [17] Statement. The comments provided by the 430 attendees at
 [18] the scoping meetings are addressed in the Draft EIS.
 [19] Earlier this month we distributed copies of our Draft EIS to
 [20] everyone who had requested them, and also made them
 [21] available at Hawai'i libraries. We asked you to review the
 [22] document. Our purpose here tonight is to again collect your
 [23] comments on the Draft EIS. We want to be sure that the
 [24] final EIS is thorough and complete.
 [25] Your comments at this meeting may be either oral

Page 10

[1] or in writing or both. Your oral comments will be recorded
 [2] by Ms. Kanoelani Cockett, our court reporter here. You may
 [3] hand in prepared comments at the registration desk outside
 [4] which is manned by Miss Shar Castor and Gail Larburns.
 [5] Both
 [6] types of comment will receive full consideration. After the
 [7] meeting we will continue to receive written comments through
 [8] the 26th of May. Any later than that and we can't promise
 [9] their consideration to the final EIS.
 [10] Now, let me tell you a little bit about missile
 [11] defense. The single most deadly aggressive act against
 [12] Americans in the Gulf War came when one of the SCUD
 [13] missiles
 [14] fired by Iraq struck the barracks in Riyadh killing 28
 [15] Americans. By the year 2001, forty nations are expected to
 [16] have built or bought missile forces. Future conflicts will
 [17] likely have missiles on both sides. Under the Ballistic
 [18] Missile Defense Organization, all of the U.S. armed forces
 [19] are involved in developing an effective theater missile
 [20] defense for the United States. It would be used to defend
 [21] U.S. forces overseas and our friends and allies, including
 [22] civilians. The Navy's program is called Theater Ballistic
 [23] Missile Defense, or TBMD. It uses the ship based Aegis
 [24] Combat System and Standard Missile. TBMD would protect
 [25] not
 [26] only Navy ships but also other U.S. and friendly forces in
 [27] coastal areas.
 [28] However, before we can rely on Navy TBMD or other

Page 11

[1] theater missile defense systems, we must test them and train
 [2] on them with the greatest realism possible. One key
 [3] requirement for testing the defensive system is multiple
 [4] targets launched from several different directions. Another
 [5] requirement is for realistic distances between the target,
 [6] missile launch point and the interceptor launch point.
 [7] That's why a large open area is needed for the test like the
 [8] area that's north and west of Kaua'i.
 [9] While PMRF is very well equipped and operated by a
 [10] highly trained group of civilians and contractors from the
 [11] local community, no existing range can currently meet all
 [12] Navy TBMD testing and training requirements. Therefore, the
 [13] need exists to enhance the acknowledged capabilities of
 [14] PMRF. These enhancements will result in only small
 [15] increases in the customary activities of PMRF. Like most
 [16] activities of PMRF, the missile intercept test will take
 [17] place offshore and go virtually unnoticed.
 [18] The enhancements proposed include upgrading the
 [19] existing radar and communication facilities. These upgrades
 [20] consist primarily of replacing electronic components, but
 [21] they also include replacing an existing radar dish and
 [22] construction of small buildings to replace trailers.
 [23] Additionally, the proposed action include the construction
 [24] and operation of some new missile launch sites and some new
 [25] sensors and instrumentation facilities.

Page 12

[1] I hope it's been made clear to you already by the
 [2] document itself, by the press coverage and our earlier
 [3] meetings that not everything we are evaluating is
 [4] necessarily going to happen. Not everything we are
 [5] evaluating is necessarily going to happen. This is not a
 [6] done deal. We are required to evaluate all of the
 [7] reasonable alternatives.
 [8] Areas considered for new sites are Ni'i'hau and
 [9] Kaua'i, and in addition we are considering launching targets
 [10] from aircraft or floating platforms. Since the preferred
 [11] options of air launch and sea based targets are still being
 [12] developed, we're also considering Tern Island and Johnston
 [13] Atoll as possible fall back target launch locations if the
 [14] other options do not work out.
 [15] The proposed action would also modify an existing
 [16] easement over state land to allow continued testing of a
 [17] variety of missiles. The easement term is proposed to be
 [18] extended 28 years to end of the year 2030, making it
 [19] consistent with existing PMRF leases which expire during the
 [20] same time frame. There would be no change in the number
 [21] of
 [22] missile launches allowed each year, the length of time the
 [23] area would be cleared or the number of acres involved.
 [24] Similarly, the EIS proposes amending an existing state lease
 [25] to add no more than 50 acres to accommodate two additional
 earth covered storage facilities at the existing Kalakaua

Page 13

[1] magazine storage site. State land board will make that
 [2] decision. The Navy, on the other hand, must decide whether
 [3] to enhance the capabilities of PMRF to conduct testing and
 [4] training with theater defense missile programs. If that
 [5] decision is yes, the second federal decision is which remote
 [6] sites, if any, to develop to support the programs.
 [7] Let me emphasize to you that I'm not the decision
 [8] maker. The federal decision maker is the Assistant
 [9] Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Environment, Mr.
 [10] Duncan Holiday. It's important to remember that the
 [11] Environmental impact Statement is only one of the factors
 [12] that the secretary will consider in making this decision.
 [13] Others include the program's importance, it's schedule and
 [14] cost and guidance from Congress.
 [15] To assist in their decision making, we evaluated
 [16] the potential environmental consequences at each of 15
 [17] locations against a set of 15 different environmental
 [18] factors, and we did it twice, first for the no action
 [19] alternative to be sure our baseline data were up to date,
 [20] and second, for the proposed action to determine any
 [21] potential changes in environmental consequence. Out of the
 [22] 450 potential consequences evaluated, only nine were
 [23] determined to have any adverse impact, and that's all
 [24] addressed in the Draft EIS.
 [25] Let me tell you briefly what we found when we did

Page 14

[1] those evaluations.
 [2] At Koke'e and Makaha Ridge a water shortage
 [3] presently exists. This would not get worse under the
 [4] proposed action, and we believe the shortage will be
 [5] relieved with a new state well in two years. We acknowledge
 [6] that our long-standing use of just ten acres of the
 [7] southwest end of Ka'ula Island for aerial and gunnery
 [8] training creates an adverse impact on the rock and the
 [9] soil. The proposed action would not increase activity nor
 [10] the impact.
 [11] PMRF has existing instrumentation sites on
 [12] Ni'ihau. All activities are conducted with the agreement of
 [13] Ni'ihau's residents and owners and are governed by existing
 [14] protocol designed to protect the life-style of the
 [15] residents. The proposed action would provide for possible
 [16] future establishment of a northern and southern concrete
 [17] slab which can be used for portable missile launchers. Also
 [18] a small building and a possible airstrip can be constructed
 [19] as well as a graded tethered instrumentation balloon, known
 [20] as an Aerostat, which would require restricted air space.
 [21] Activating the proposed area of restricted air
 [22] space over Ni'ihau would have the potential to adversely
 [23] impact the low altitude airway that crosses the middle of
 [24] the island.
 [25] A second adverse impact potential of Ni'ihau

Page 15

[1] involves landing craft operations that could on occasion
 [2] temporarily disturb Monk seals hauled out on the sandy beach
 [3] areas, or green turtle nesting sites. In any case, this
 [4] potential impact is not expected to affect the viability or
 [5] jeopardize the continued survival of either of these two
 [6] sensitive species.
 [7] At Tern Island, proposed construction of launch
 [8] pads has the potential to temporarily disturb nesting
 [9] seabirds and migratory seabirds, Monk seals and green sea
 [10] turtle, dredging to temporarily increase of water turbidity,
 [11] thus the incidence of ciguatoxins in fish in the area.
 [12] Neither impact will be expected to jeopardize the survival
 [13] of the sensitive species, and we are working closely with
 [14] fish and wildlife services and the National Marine Fishery
 [15] Service to be sure that they are involved in the
 [16] decision-making process.
 [17] As far as beneficial impacts are evaluations to
 [18] determine that both alternatives will continue to benefit
 [19] the economy of Hawai'i and the State, which includes over
 [20] \$100 million a year in direct PMRF expenditures and over \$7
 [21] million from official visitors. The proposed enhancements
 [22] could also contribute to keeping PMRF's ranges and staffs
 [23] fully employed, technically current and viable in a
 [24] declining economy downsize of military environment.
 [25] We are all aware of the truth in the statement

Page 16

[1] that job preservation is as important as job creation. The
 [2] proposed action would have potential beneficial impacts on
 [3] Ni'ihau's economy with jobs. The island's transportation
 [4] infrastructure would benefit from grading and resurfacing
 [5] existing roads from the clearing grading and leveling of a
 [6] runway, if those uses were chosen. The runway could also be
 [7] used as a water catchment area to supplement Ni'ihau's water
 [8] supply.
 [9] I hope you found this information helpful. Thank
 [10] you very much for your patience and courteous attention, and
 [11] thank you again for coming to participate in this important
 [12] decision-making process. Again, our purpose today is to
 [13] listen to your comments, your concern and opinions. As we
 [14] each express our various opinions on this important issue, I
 [15] ask that we all treat each other with respect and give each
 [16] speaker the opportunity to make his or her statement
 [17] uninterrupted. We want to make this decision-making process
 [18] meaningful and beneficial.
 [19] That's the end of my prepared comments, the things
 [20] that I was officially obligated to tell you, but I'd like to
 [21] take just a few more minutes and summarize what I think are
 [22] the important points.
 [23] First point is that we've been doing testing and
 [24] training operations at PMRF involving ships, aircraft,
 [25] missiles and various kinds of ordnance for over 35 years.

Page 17

[1] It's been safely, and without adverse impact to citizens or
 [2] the environment and, for the most part, activity at PMRF
 [3] goes on unnoticed.
 [4] The second point is that the EIS document is
 [5] large, but the actual proposed action is fairly small. It's
 [6] an incremental small increase over what we are now doing at
 [7] PMRF.
 [8] Third point, this is not a done deal. The scope
 [9] of the EIS is broad, but all the ideas being evaluated won't
 [10] necessarily be implemented. For instance, Tern Island is a
 [11] fall back position. If any action is taken at Tern Island
 [12] it will be closely coordinated with the Fish and Wildlife
 [13] Commission and National Marine Fisheries. We need to help
 [14] the decision makers choose wisely.
 [15] Fourth point is that the future of PMRF is at
 [16] stake, the enhancements to PMRF and TBMD program which
 [17] keep
 [18] PMRF technically current and viable for the future. And my
 [19] last point is that this project can be done safely without
 [20] impact to our children and our environment, but the decision
 [21] makers need all of your inputs. Like all of you, I want
 [22] them to make a good decision regarding this EIS.
 [23] As you can tell by my uniform I'm obviously a
 [24] career naval officer, but like most of you, I'm also a
 [25] parent and a taxpayer. Now Mr. Michaelson will provide some
 more instructions as we begin the comments. Thank you.

Page 18

[1] THE MODERATOR: Okay. We're ready to start
 [2] calling the names of those of you who have indicated you'd
 [3] like to make comments today. I have a list of people who
 [4] have signed up so far, and I will be calling you in the
 [5] order in which you've signed up, again, with the exception
 [6] of elected officials, although I don't believe I have any
 [7] signed up in that category. I'll start out by calling out
 [8] the first several names so that you can come up to the front
 [9] here and sit in this reserved seating section. Because we
 [10] want to record your comments accurately and fully, we ask
 [11] that you speak clearly into the microphone and pause when
 [12] the jets go overhead. Hang on a second.
 [13] Actually we will be quite kind if the jets cut
 [14] into your five minutes, we'll add whatever we have to
 [15] make sure you get your full five minutes. In any case,
 [16] because we want to record your comments fully and
 [17] accurately, we ask that you speak clearly into this
 [18] microphone over here at the podium that we've set up, and if
 [19] you would please state your name for the court reporter.
 [20] We kindly request that you observe the five minute
 [21] limit for all comments. We have used these five minute
 [22] limits at the hearings to give everyone a fair and equal
 [23] chance to give your comments. To aid you in knowing when
 [24] your five minutes are up, I have a simple method for
 [25] indicating times. After four minutes I will put up my index

Page 19

[1] finger like this indicating that you have one minute left.
 [2] This should help you find a comfortable place to wrap up
 [3] your comments. At the end of five minutes I will put up my
 [4] closed fist like this, indicating it is time to finish your
 [5] comments. We greatly appreciate your cooperation and
 [6] understanding in observing this limit. Also keep in mind
 [7] again the oral comments are only one way to share your
 [8] thoughts and concerns with the Navy regarding the EIS. You
 [9] can also hand in written comments today or mail them by May
 [10] 26th, 1998, and as I mentioned, written comments are given
 [11] the same consideration as oral comments offered here today.
 [12] The first five speakers I have listed here today
 [13] are James Rothschild, Dick Turlington, Tim Guard, Val Ching,
 [14] Jr., and Richard Irwin. Again, if you could please come sit
 [15] in this first row here, the reserved seating, it will help
 [16] our process go a little more smoothly.
 [17] Mr. Rothschild, you can start us off. If you did
 [18] bring prepared comments with you, it helps to turn those in,
 [19] but it also helps to make sure your address is on them so
 [20] they can be responded to.
 [21] Again, state your name first, okay?
 [22] JAMES ROTHSCHILD: Thank you. My name is Jim
 [23] Rothschild. I'm a business representative for the
 [24] International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union
 [25] 1260. My comments are addressed to whom it may concern,
 the

Page 20

[1] International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers strongly
 [2] supports the proposed enhancements to the Pacific Missile
 [3] Range Facility as described in the Draft Environmental
 [4] Impact Statement published on April 3rd. Our review of the
 [5] proposal to enhance the Pacific Missile Ranges Facility
 [6] indicates that any impacts to the environment will be
 [7] minimum, yet the benefits of the enhancements will be
 [8] substantial. As U.S. military continues to downsize and the
 [9] Pentagon proposes to close 50 military bases in the next few
 [10] years, the island of Kaua'i and the State of Hawai'i are
 [11] fortunate there are plans to upgrade the Pacific Missile
 [12] Range Facility and locate the high priority national defense
 [13] project there. The support that PMRF is being asked to
 [14] provide to the Navy's Theater of Missile Defense Program is
 [15] very similar to the type of work that the base has been
 [16] carrying out for 35 years, launching and drafting missile
 [17] targets safely in a controlled environment. The proposal
 [18] includes enhancing PMRF's equipment, and adding some
 [19] additional launch capabilities, and the project will require
 [20] only small increases in the customary activities at PMRF,
 [21] yet it will help to ensure the future viability of the base
 [22] and a continued employment of the approximately 500
 [23] workers
 [24] that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
 [25] represents there. Many of the jobs are technical and
 require higher skill levels and are, therefore,

Page 21

[1] well-paying. Few employers on Kaua'i can offer the high
 [2] tech job opportunities that PMRF can. It enables more of
 [3] Kaua'i's bright young people to stay on Kaua'i and work in a
 [4] challenging environment or to go off island to college or
 [5] join the military and return to their home with an
 [6] opportunity to put what they have learned to good use.
 [7] Overall the PMRF employs more than 800 people on
 [8] this island and has an annual payroll of \$45 million. It is
 [9] one of the largest employers on the island and the largest
 [10] provider of high tech jobs on Kaua'i. PMRF helps to
 [11] maintain a strong middle class on Kaua'i which is important
 [12] for people who want to earn a good living, buy homes, raise
 [13] families and send their children to school. We strongly
 [14] support that.
 [15] PMRF also contributes to the community by
 [16] supporting local schools with the Adopt a School program,
 [17] the Toys for Tots program, helping to put on Waimea Town
 [18] Celebrations and other volunteer efforts. PMRF is the
 [19] world's largest ocean range with instrumentation that can
 [20] create and monitor realistic research development, test
 [21] evaluation and training environments. Few military and
 [22] advanced technology systems that operate on the sea, under
 [23] the sea, in the air, in space, and on shore safely and
 [24] without harming the environment. PMRF is one of the
 [25] greatest assets to the economy of Kaua'i, to the community

Page 22

[1] as an important asset in maintaining a strong national
 [2] defense for our country.
 [3] Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
 [4] THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Mr. Turlington.
 [5] VIC TURLINGTON: Good afternoon. My name is Vic
 [6] Turlington. I'm going to attempt to leave just a few
 [7] thoughts with you. You will hear these expressed a little
 [8] more eloquently, I'm sure.
 [9] To begin with, the reason that we have defense,
 [10] and the reason we, the nation's leaders in the defense
 [11] department, think defense is important is pretty
 [12] historical. Nations that drop their defenses invite
 [13] aggression. Our state department and our elected officials
 [14] think that a reasonable strong defense is important. Our
 [15] intelligence community tells us what's going on with the
 [16] rest of the world and thinks that defense is important. Of
 [17] course the Department of Defense, we're in the business to
 [18] provide defense for this country, and we think it's
 [19] important. Congress does, the executive branch does and the
 [20] Navy and the people at PMRF think that it's in order.
 [21] We like to do - we do perform everything that we
 [22] do very safely. Mostly the targets that we use are
 [23] refurbished shipboard missiles. When these missiles were
 [24] active and in use, the safety area around these missiles
 [25] when they were fired was measured in feet with sailors in

Page 23

[1] close proximity to them. The areas that we provide
 [2] clearance for, hazard areas we call them, extend to 10,000
 [3] feet and beyond so people cannot go in harm's way. They
 [4] are
 [5] safe in terms of not doing damage to marine mammals. We
 [6] carefully surveil the area that we're going to be operating
 [7] in, whether it's for training or testing, to ensure that
 [8] there are no marine mammals in the area. We don't have any
 [9] record over 35 years of having harmed any of these animals.
 [10] As far as I know we haven't.
 [11] Another aspect of PMRF and the enhancements that
 [12] we intend to do have already been commented on somewhat
 [13] by
 [14] Captain Bowlin, and Mr. Rothschild, and that's the economy.
 [15] We believe, I certainly believe, that the impact at PMRF
 [16] makes on the economy, both the state economy and the
 [17] national economy, and certainly Hawai'i, is very important
 [18] to Hawai'i, to the state and to the country. We bring in
 [19] and spent this past year 75 million in the economy of
 [20] Kaua'i. Some years ago it was significantly higher, up
 [21] around 120, between seven and eight million goes directly
 [22] into the tourism part of our economy, that is people coming
 [23] out to do planning, to do testing, to do evaluation. They
 [24] tend to bring families with them. They stay in town and in
 [25] the hotels, use the restaurants, use rental cars, etcetera.
 [26] Another aspect of economic impact has been
 [27] demonstrated around our country and throughout the world

Page 24

[1] that a close combination or a cooperation between the
 [2] academic world and the people that can use technology and
 [3] can be of great benefit to whole areas of the country. This
 [4] is true, has been shown in the Berkeley relationship with
 [5] high tech business in Silicon Valley. It's been
 [6] demonstrated in the northeast, in the Virginia area and
 [7] Texas with the coalition between the University of Texas and
 [8] business in the Austin area, and all those things have been
 [9] very beneficial to the people in the area, to the areas in
 [10] general and to our country.
 [11] THE MODERATOR: Mr. Turlington, one minute.
 [12] MR. TURLINGTON: Thank you. I thought I was going
 [13] to have good news and finish up in three.
 [14] We have good institutions of higher learning in
 [15] our state. We need a platform to employ the skills that our
 [16] people pick up in higher institutions and allow them to stay
 [17] in the state and find meaningful work, as Mr. Rothschild
 [18] alluded to, and with no further comment, I will take my
 [19] seat. Thank you.
 [20] THE MODERATOR: Tim Guard.
 [21] TIM GUARD: Good afternoon. My name is Tim
 [22] Guard. Perhaps before I begin my remarks, if I could
 [23] comment to put my comments, my remarks into some
 [24] perspective. I'd like to mention that I'm born and raised
 [25] here. I'm a local business owner, employ 350 people, 30 of

Page 25

[1] whom work on Kaua'i. I'm a combat veteran of Vietnam. Of
 [2] course I was Navy, like the captain, and I also am president
 [3] of the Honolulu Counsel of the Navy League representing, as
 [4] of last count, 5502 members. I'd like to extract from and
 [5] comment briefly on my written testimony.
 [6] The local counsel strongly supports a proposal by
 [7] the United States Navy to upgrade the existing installations
 [8] and capabilities of the PMRF. You'll recall during the Gulf
 [9] War the only weapons system we could not adequately
 [10] counter
 [11] were the relatively primitive SCUD missiles, Iraqi SCUD
 [12] missiles. If we are going to ask our young men and women to
 [13] go in harm's way in future military conflicts, we certainly
 [14] must insure that they have the necessary equipment to
 [15] protect themselves.
 [16] Now, the Navy has recognized that the broad open
 [17] ocean areas north and west of Kaua'i to the Na Pali Coast
 [18] with multiple sites for radar tracking stations at high
 [19] elevation are ideal for testing the theater missile defense
 [20] systems that must be perfected over the next several years
 [21] to prevent the occurrence of what happened back in the Gulf
 [22] War. Not only do the assets of PMRF offer a unique
 [23] advantage to our nation and its armed forces, but in
 [24] addition, they also offer a very special advantage to our
 [25] state's economy and to the daily living environment of the
 [26] people who live on Kaua'i and also on Ni'ihau. These

Page 26

[1] advantages include the following:
 [2] In addition to the Navy personnel assigned to
 [3] Barking Sands, PMRF provides 800 civilian jobs, most of them
 [4] of a high tech nature and paying excellent wages.
 [5] Secondly, it's well established that some of our
 [6] nation's best protected and best preserved coastlines are of
 [7] U.S. military installations. These military facilities
 [8] project the shorelines from commercial development and the
 [9] necessary base security requirements protect the historic
 [10] sites from poaching and vandalism. I can assure you this
 [11] has been done in an excellent fashion at PMRF, from my own
 [12] observation.
 [13] The Island of Ni'ihau itself has been preserved in
 [14] a special way by the Robinson family. It's the only island
 [15] where Hawaiian is the spoken language and the only island
 [16] where traditional Hawaiian values are still practiced by the
 [17] entire population. It is very important that this most
 [18] Hawaiian of our state's communities remain viable and intact
 [19] for the foreseeable future. For this to continue, the
 [20] Ni'ihau Ranch must have a steady income that is dependable
 [21] and will minimize the need for subsidy of sugar operations
 [22] on Kaua'i. The Navy and it's relationship with the
 [23] Robinsons and with the community on Ni'ihau provides that.
 [24] I'll close by saying that the Honolulu Counsel of
 [25] the Navy League and its 5500 members supports without

Page 27

[1] reservation the proposal to upgrade the installations and
 [2] the capabilities of PMRF on the Island of Kaua'i and
 [3] Ni'ihau. We completely concur with the draft environmental
 [4] study conclusion that there will be no significant adverse
 [5] environmental impacts on Kaua'i and Ni'ihau resulting from
 [6] the proposed expansion of PMRF. And in our honest opinion,
 [7] we believe the upgrades planned for PMRF and the resulting
 [8] enhancement of its training capabilities are good for the
 [9] Navy, good for the residents of Kaua'i and Ni'ihau and
 [10] ultimately of great benefit to the people of the State of
 [11] Hawai'i. Thank you.
 [12] THE MODERATOR: Val Ching, Jr.
 [13] VAL CHING, JR.: Good day everyone. My name is
 [14] Val Ching. I live here in Honolulu. My ohana, my
 [15] grandmother was born and raised on Ni'ihau, and so were her
 [16] parents Luka and Keainanui. I'm here today in support and
 [17] asking your support to keep things pono and right for the
 [18] Ni'ihauans and trust them that their choices are their
 [19] choices. Respect them. How hard you try to understand
 [20] them, you will not. How hard you try to reach them, you
 [21] will not. For all concerned here, the Navy, Mr. Robinson,
 [22] and those people who is my ohana, and my ohana is about
 [23] 250
 [24] strong off of that island, from here to California, Hilo,
 [25] Moloka'i, Keaukaha, Waimea and wherever, this is not about
 [26] just 200 people. When you criticize them and their choices

Page 28

{1} and treat them as if they are in dispute or they are in this
 {2} microenvironment, that you feel that they are not qualified
 {3} to make their choices, you are wrong. For you to challenge
 {4} these people's decision and cause them just heavy heart,
 {5} struck throat feeling that the Hawaiians struggle every time
 {6} that have they have to come out and explain themselves, no
 {7} one has the right to tell these people explain themselves.
 {8} So as you choose today to see if this marriage comes pono
 {9} with the Navy, Mr. Robinson and the Island of Ni'ihau,
 {10} choose your words, choose your causes and think, think
 {11} before you cause any pilikia among these people. Because
 {12} when they get hurt, that hurt comes home to me and I start
 {13} getting phone calls.
 {14} In my family they call me wala'au, that means talk
 {15} a lot. My family is very big, very quiet. I try not to
 {16} bother people. When people call me and my ohana and say,
 {17} "We need to make this pono," I know what my uncles and my
 {18} cousins are telling me. If you are so concerned about their
 {19} environment, go out there and there is a lot of things you
 {20} can do besides opposing this thing. Plant one ulli, pull one
 {21} weed. If you're concerned about the birds, take out a
 {22} cannibal that's eating birds, these native birds on Hawai'i
 {23} and on these islands. If you're really concerned about
 {24} these Hawaiian people, think before you open your mouth,
 {25} because are you not just talking about Mr. Robinson, one

Page 29

{1} island and 200 people that live there and speak Hawaiian.
 {2} Their ohana is extensive.
 {3} I thank you folks for your time. I hope you folks
 {4} understand what I'm saying. God bless you. I hope
 {5} everything works out, and thank you for the time.
 {6} THE MODERATOR: Thank you. The next speaker is
 {7} Richard Irwin. After him will be Michael Jones, that looks
 {8} like Robert Kihune, Fred Lins, and Jim Pitton. So again, if
 {9} you would make use of this reserved seating up here, I'd
 {10} appreciate it.
 {11} Mr. Irwin.
 {12} RICHARD IRWIN: Good evening, Captain Bowlin,
 {13} ladies and gentlemen. My name is Richard Irwin. I'm
 {14} honored to offer testimony on behalf of Mr. Larry Sakamoto,
 {15} commander, Department of Hawai'i Veterans of Foreign Wars
 {16} representing 4,000 combat veterans. I also speak on behalf
 {17} of Mr. Ed Kawamura, commander of the Kaua'i Veterans
 Counsel
 {18} representing most of Kaua'i veterans.
 {19} We speak from personal experience on the
 {20} battlefield. The experiences of combat have led to us
 {21} believe that a strong defense is the best way to prevent war
 {22} and protect our country. We strongly support the proposed
 {23} action and EIS for PMRF enhanced capability in a theater
 {24} missile defense program and believe it to be in the nation's
 {25} best interest to proceed as soon as possible. Furthermore,

Page 30

{1} we believe that the proposed action will have minimal impact
 {2} to the environment and wildlife because of careful oversight
 {3} by PMRF. Some here today will undoubtedly address these
 {4} issues with hype and distortion, but the facts are clear and
 {5} speak for themselves. PMRF has a proven track record of
 {6} launching missiles for over 35 years with absolute safety to
 {7} the personnel, the community and the environment.
 {8} Some may remember that hysteria associated with
 {9} the STARS program and PMRF, the subsequent four
 successful
 {10} STARS launches, and environmental monitoring showed the
 {11} facts to be as stated in the record of decision, that is
 {12} minimal impact. The island was not covered with toxic gases
 {13} or showered with burning debris and rocket fuel. In fact,
 {14} most residents weren't even aware of the launches.
 {15} The facts are clear the PMRF and the dedicated
 {16} folks who work there are dedicated protectors of the
 {17} environment than most. Just take a walk down pristine
 {18} beaches and look for yourself. The land and the water life
 {19} are well cared for. Endangered species thrive under the
 {20} Navy's protection.
 {21} Some may say the cold war is over and missile
 {22} defense it is not needed. Just ask yourself about the 20
 {23} countries that possess or are developing nuclear,
 {24} biological, chemical weapons on the ballistic missile
 {25} delivery systems, but defense is needed and it is needed

Page 31

{1} now. The real benefit to the theater defense missile
 {2} program, that is PMRF, is to better protect your armed
 {3} forces sent in harm's way, your neighbors, nieces and
 {4} nephews, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters. Would
 {5} you send them into battle ill prepared, without the proper
 {6} equipment? Would you send them to fight without the best
 {7} possible protection against attack from ballistic missiles?
 {8} I think not. The fact of the matter is we cannot adequately
 {9} protect them today. We do not have an effective defense
 {10} against short range ballistic missiles. The theater missile
 {11} defense program at PMRF will result in systems that will
 {12} protect our troops, the ones who lay it on the line for each
 {13} and everyone of us so that we may enjoy the freedom
 {14} guaranteed by the Constitution. Remember them tonight.
 {15} They are in watch, some in harm's way, doing their duty for
 {16} us. Remember that, our sons and daughters, neighbors and
 {17} friends.
 {18} I ask each and every one of you to support this
 {19} program and the dedicated men and woman of the Pacific
 {20} Missile Range Facility. Thank you.
 {21} THE MODERATOR: Michael Jones.
 {22} MICHAEL JONES: My name is Michael Jones. During
 {23} the past ten years I've read and commented on several of the
 {24} EISs involving rocket launches and expanded military
 {25} activities. I usually disagreed with their summaries which

Page 32

{1} is always concluded that there were no significant impacts
 {2} that couldn't be mitigated. I began to wonder why people
 {3} who wrote the EIS documents always reached the same
 {4} conclusion. Was it a standard feature of their text
 {5} processors? Had they been trained that there is no impact
 {6} which is not negavable (sic)? Then it occurred to me that
 {7} maybe they have never seen an example to follow. So in the
 {8} interest of providing a precedent for future EIS documents I
 {9} offer an alternative for the PMRF enhanced capability EIS.
 {10} Having analyzed all the impacts of missile
 {11} launches of PMRF on Ni'ihau and in sites in wildlife
 {12} refuges, we conclude that the proposed action would be so
 {13} potentially damaging to the environment that it be an
 {14} unmitigated disaster. Launching rockets in wildlife refuges
 {15} which are set aside to minimize impact from human activities
 {16} is egregiously inappropriate. Launching rockets on Ni'ihau
 {17} entails a significant risk of large brush fires and would
 {18} inevitably pervert the culture there. The damage might not
 {19} be conspicuous in the short term, but by the time the damage
 {20} became evident, any mitigation measures would be woefully
 {21} inadequate.
 {22} Furthermore, from public comments we have learned
 {23} that the cold war is over. The major threats to U.S.
 {24} security, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and
 {25} ballistic missiles, terrorist attacks cannot be eliminated

Page 33

{1} by a missile defense. The funds that would be spent on
 {2} missile defense would be more effectively used on other
 {3} programs, for example, the Cooperative Threat Reduction
 {4} Program to support Russian efforts to dismantle missiles and
 {5} to store securely the nuclear warheads from them. It
 {6} follows, therefore, that many of the proposed tests are
 {7} unnecessary and that there are better uses, military as well
 {8} as will civilian, for the resources that would be used for
 {9} them. We conclude that the proposed action must be
 {10} rejected.
 {11} We also analyzed the no action alternative which
 {12} would continue operations at PMRF at current levels. The
 {13} restrictive easements for STARS and Vandal launches would
 {14} continue to the end of the 2002. However, no STARS
 launches
 {15} are planned and Vandal missiles are nearly gone.
 {16} Furthermore, none of the testing scenarios described in the
 {17} EIS requires launches of large rockets like STARS from the
 {18} PMRF. Therefore, the restrictive easement would be
 {19} terminated earlier than 2002. We conclude that the no
 {20} action alternative must be rejected because the scope of
 {21} rocket launch activity with PMRF can be reduced.
 {22} Having rejected the proposed action and the no
 {23} action alternatives, we offer a new alternative which
 {24} emphasizes opportunities for civilian research using
 {25} facilities at PMRF which would be renamed the Pacific

Page 34

[1] Maritime Research Facility. As the new name suggests,
 [2] emphasis would be given to oceanographic research using
 [3] facilities at PMRF, improving the underwater
 [4] hydrophonograph. Navy training activities would continue,
 [5] launches of large rockets like STARS and Vandal would end.
 [6] The north end of PMRF could be returned to the State of
 [7] Hawai'i for expansion of Polihale State Park and other uses
 [8] pending an analysis of lead contamination of the soil near
 [9] the Vandal launch site. The alternative would have some
 [10] significant impacts, but we have identified mitigation
 [11] measures for all of them.
 [12] To mitigate the loss of the opportunity to watch
 [13] large rockets blast off, PMRF would sponsor a large
 [14] fireworks show every July 4 and December 31. The Star Wars
 [15] film trilogy would be shown regularly at the PMRF theater.
 [16] Instead of rocket motors, Kalakaua Caves would be used to
 [17] store supplies that would be needed in case another
 [18] hurricane hit Kaua'i.
 [19] Recognizing the important role that PMRF played in
 [20] helping Kaua'i recover from Hurricane Iniki, a rapid
 [21] response team, disaster relief team would be established at
 [22] PMRF. The team could respond to request for aid in the
 [23] aftermath of hurricanes throughout the Pacific. This new
 [24] alternative could have a potentially significant impact on
 [25] important cold war era, cold war era sites at the Kaua'i

Page 35

[1] test facility which was established in 1963 to provide
 [2] facilities to launch sensors to observe nuclear weapons
 [3] test, if the U.S. decided to resume atmospheric testing. A
 [4] possible mitigation measure is to convert the STARS launch
 [5] tower into a memorial to the end of the cold war.
 [6] Finally, the revenue lost because STARS launch
 [7] personnel would no longer visit Kaua'i would be partially
 [8] offset by scientists who would come to use PMRF
 [9] oceanographic facilities. However, these scientists would
 [10] probably spend less than the \$189 per day for food and
 [11] lodging and subsistence which the EIS assumes for current
 [12] visitors to PMRF. Thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Robert Kihune.

ROBERT KIHUNE: Aloha, ladies and gentlemen.

[14] First of all, I'd just like to explain I'm a retired vice-
 [15] admiral. I've spent about eight years in Hawai'i. I've
 [16] commanded a squadron out here on a ship, and I've also
 [17] brought a battle group, a carrier battle group to work here
 [18] on PMRF. I was a commander of the naval forces of the
 [19] Pacific fleet where my units always used the PMRF, and I'm
 [20] very familiar with this range. Various speakers have spoken
 [21] about the range and its benefits, and so I have a prepared
 [22] statement here today and I'm going to submit it for the
 [23] record, but in order not to be redundant on what has already
 [24] been said, I'd just like to read portions of my written
 [25]

Page 36

[1] statement so that I can cut the time down here this
 [2] evening.
 [3] First I'm extremely encouraged and proud when I
 [4] attend a hearing such as this where people have the freedom
 [5] of expressing both their concerns and support for a
 [6] project. We often take our freedoms for granted and forget
 [7] the price of the freedoms we enjoy today. Our military is
 [8] the protector of those freedoms against any adversary from
 [9] without our nation. As such, it must have the best
 [10] equipment and means to overcome any aggressor or conflict
 [11] should all peaceful solutions to prevent conflict fail. I
 [12] do not believe that there is any person in this room who
 [13] would want to see our sons and daughters come in harm's
 [14] way
 [15] from deficient and ineffective equipment and weapons, as
 [16] well as being poorly trained. The mission of the Pacific
 [17] Missile Range Facility, PMRF, is to ensure that this never
 [18] happens.
 [19] Today, the Navy is proposing to enhance the
 [20] capabilities of PMRF to accommodate the change in threats of
 [21] the 21st century. Despite our nation's continuous
 [22] initiatives to eliminate the development and sales of
 [23] weapons of mass destruction such as ballistic missiles that
 [24] are capable of nuclear, biological and chemical warfare,
 [25] high tech weapons such as these are proliferating in many
 volatile nations. Consequently, there is no question that

Page 37

[1] the United States must develop counter measure to these very
 [2] high tech weapons system. PMRF is the facility that can
 [3] best provide the necessary test area with minimal or no
 [4] impact to both the public and the environment.
 [5] The PMRF staff and workers are residents of
 [6] Kaua'i, and are sensitive to the environmental and safety
 [7] concerns of other residents of the island. They have been
 [8] and continue to be committed to preserving a safe and
 [9] culturally sensitive environment within and surrounding PMRF
 [10] including Ni'ihau, Tern Island and Johnston Island. The
 [11] planned for expanse reflects this commitment.
 [12] Thank you very much for letting me testify today.

THE MODERATOR: Fred Lins.

[14] FRED LINS: Good evening. My name is Fred Lins,
 [15] and I'm the owner of a small business here in Hawai'i. I
 [16] employ seven people in technical roles, three of whom are
 [17] students, young students. We develop programs and
 [18] technology for the government, and we sell robotic tape
 [19] libraries to the U.S. government.
 [20] My primary concern as a government contractor is
 [21] that in a hearing such as this gets emotionally swayed from
 [22] the logic of the economic impact statement. In other words,
 [23] an emotional decision on the grounds of the content of the
 [24] EIS may influence other contract officers in other areas
 [25] here on O'ahu that I'm involved in to sort of discount our

Page 38

[1] local businesses here and dry up the source of our funds and
 [2] our payroll funds.
 [3] As a father here, I also get up each morning, pull
 [4] out the Honolulu Advertiser and go through it and look for
 [5] issues, and this has been one of the issue that came up.
 [6] Now, one of the first things I had noted to my son was this
 [7] issue doesn't really involve us. This issue is for the
 [8] people of Kaua'i and Ni'ihau, as the gentleman earlier who
 [9] was the ex-resident of Ni'ihau said, very rightfully so.
 [10] What are we addressing this for? Why am I here? My fear is
 [11] again that some group on O'ahu is going to stand up and
 [12] make

[13] this an emotional argument, and the only way we can
 [14] counteract in a democracy is to stand up ourselves and state
 [15] our emotional opinions, and that's what I'm doing in that
 [16] respect.

[17] Lastly, I'm a tax payer here getting near
 [18] retirement. This state's economy has been dying. It
 [19] continues to look bad out in the future, and the last thing
 [20] we can afford is to see the kind of funding, federal
 [21] funding, go away. Therefore, there is a point when you have
 [22] to stand up and attend hearings like this and take a stand,
 [23] and that's what I'm doing. Thank you very much.

[24] THE MODERATOR: The next speaker will be Jim
 [25] Pitton. He'll be followed by Nani Marston, Nancy Aleck,
 Clyde Pearle, and if they would come up and go ahead and

Page 39

[1] take a seat up here, I'd appreciate it.
 [2] JIM PITTON: My name is Jim Pitton. I'm
 [3] representing the and speaking on behalf of the Rotary Club
 [4] of Pearl Harbor.
 [5] We're here this evening to address the issue of
 [6] how the proposed expansion enhancement and of existing
 [7] capabilities of the PMRF Barking Sands Kaua'i might impact
 [8] the public health, public safety and the environment,
 [9] nothing in the promulgated draft environmental impact study
 [10] indicates that we the public should be unduly concerned.
 [11] As stated earlier, for 35 years PMRF Barking Sands
 [12] has had an outstanding record of doing things right and
 [13] being an excellent steward of the environment. The
 [14] question, can PMRF Barking Sands upgrade its capabilities as
 [15] proposed without causing adverse impact on public health,
 [16] public safety or the environment? The Rotary Club of Pearl
 [17] Harbor believes the answer is yes, and strongly supports the
 [18] proposed enhancement. Thank you very much.
 [19] NANI MARSTON: Mahalo. My name is Nani Marston,
 [20] and I am a private citizen, resident of Kilauea, Kaua'i.
 [21] I'm here to comment on the findings in your Draft EIS
 [22] document per NIMA (phonetic) rules and regulations. There
 [23] are many complex issues which weave their way through what
 [24] I
 [25] believe to be a very thorough study. This document itself
 lists all concerns and proposed actions, and compares them,

[1] as you said, to a normal non-action alternative. I feel
 [2] this allows greater clarity. Quality of life issues are
 [3] paramount to the people of Kaua'i, and safety and
 [4] environment top the list, as far as I am concerned. We all
 [5] raise our children, as Captain Bowlin said, and never was
 [6] there a greater reminder of our vulnerability than September
 [7] 11th, 1992. Our fragile environment has been challenged
 [8] more than one time, and so keeping that balance and the
 [9] strength that PMRF offers is very important to us.
 [10] My overall impression is that the document finds
 [11] no significant impact with the proposed actions. The study
 [12] predicts some adverse impacts for each of the six locations
 [13] mentioned. They range from temporarily disturbing Monk
 [14] seals to possible increases in microscopic algae to
 [15] potential launch noise. These findings, however, say that
 [16] proposed actions are not expected to jeopardize the
 [17] integrity of these species or surrounding area permanently.
 [18] Those of us who witnessed the overwhelming support
 [19] of the Ni'ihau people and their outpouring of emotion and
 [20] trust were very moved over on Kaua'i, and we believe,
 [21] Captain Bowlin, that this was the greatest charge to the
 [22] Navy for upholding the safety. And we believe also that
 [23] anything that we say would be hard pressed to measure the
 [24] emotion and love they gave to you. And so for that reason,
 [25] we know that you will be following through with the same

[1] good record, extraordinary record, that PMRF has had for 35
 [2] years. Exciting are the potential transfers of technologies
 [3] that the test and evaluation community would inevitably
 [4] bring.
 [5] THE MODERATOR: Hold on for a minute for the
 [6] plane. She must hold on. Okay. Why don't you back up a
 [7] sentence.
 [8] NANI MARSTON: The test and evaluation community
 [9] would inevitably bring lots of transfer, and we are looking
 [10] forward to that. Transfers that could help our environment,
 [11] such as the Navy's - I'm sorry, the NASA's Pathfinder using
 [12] Interact's Environmental Research Aircraft Sensor Resource
 [13] technology to perhaps measure air pollution or using
 [14] precision spectral photography to collect data for all kinds
 [15] of applications; mapping, identifying undesirable
 [16] vegetation, perhaps even finding viruses in our
 [17] agriculture.
 [18] Congress has recognized that PMRF is a unique
 [19] potential and it's very valuable, and this TBM program will
 [20] allow steady but solid growth for our island, and we need
 [21] that desperately.
 [22] Every year our lives could be greatly augmented by
 [23] these technologies, as long as safety remains their first
 [24] priority, and the people of Ni'ihau are satisfied with this
 [25] collaborative effort, then I am ready to endorse the Draft

[1] EIS and look forward with the rest of my Kaua'i community in
 [2] rolling up our sleeves, working together to try and harness
 [3] just some of the strengths that this enhancement will
 [4] bring. Mahalo.
 [5] THE MODERATOR: Nancy Aleck.
 [6] NANCY ALECK: Aloha. Thank you. My name is Nancy
 [7] Aleck. I would like to say, first of all, a gentleman
 [8] earlier spoke about speaking from emotion versus speaking
 [9] with logic, and I believe I speak with both. I also
 [10] strongly feel that holding a different perspective than
 [11] perhaps what is the majority of this room does not
 [12] necessarily mean that it is without logic.
 [13] I'd like to address two particular issues that
 [14] have been used as driving forces towards this expansion of
 [15] PMRF. One is national security, and one is economic
 [16] benefits. The communities, particularly on Kaua'i and
 [17] Ni'ihau, have been told that more jobs will become available
 [18] if the proposal moves ahead, and the Hawai'i public has been
 [19] assured that for defensive purposes, the U.S. military
 [20] really must enhance its missile systems. Hawai'i right now
 [21] is in terrible economic shape. People are hurting, families
 [22] are suffering, and we're caught in a place where the promise
 [23] of income becomes more important than how that income
 [24] might be generated. Businesses are going bankrupt, corporations
 [25] are laying off employees. People on public assistance face

[1] deep cuts if they don't find work under the new federal
 [2] welfare reform laws, and the Hawai'i legislature is right
 [3] now trying to balance a severely shortened budget.
 [4] Other places in the United States are seeing
 [5] better times, but whatever the economic times might be,
 [6] there's one group that never suffers, and that's the weapons
 [7] contractors. Building newer and better weapons of all sorts
 [8] is big business. And when federal cuts to the military
 [9] might shut down bases or cut staff, even then, more money is
 [10] given to the weapons contractors, often more than what is
 [11] requested by the Department of Defense or the Pentagon.
 [12] And
 [13] not all of the weaponry that's manufactured is for the
 [14] defense of America. The United States is the largest
 [15] international weapons dealer in the world. So at PMRF we're
 [16] proposing to expand our capabilities to defend America
 [17] against supposed enemies who might well be using weapons
 [18] that they purchased from the United States. And economic
 [19] benefits in the end go back to the same few corporate
 [20] monopolies. If the United States stops selling weapons
 [21] globally and put more energy into conflict resolution,
 [22] America might find far better use of our tax money spent on
 [23] creating jobs that provide meaningful work and promote a
 [24] sustainable future.
 [25] The real enemy is not out there where we can shoot
 missiles at it, but at the root of the military industrial

[1] system that feeds on the people to keep itself alive. Thank
 [2] you.
 [3] THE MODERATOR: Our next speaker will be Clyde
 [4] Pearle, and after him will be Kalamaoka'aina Niheu, Marian
 [5] Kelly, Marilyn Pollock and Ed Pollock.
 [6] CLYDE PEARLE: Aloha. Clyde Pearle from Kapa'a,
 [7] Kaua'i. I manage a large condominium resort in the Po'ipu
 [8] Beach area. We rely on PMRF for quite a bit in the south
 [9] shore and west side of Kaua'i. Comments are made about
 [10] promise of employment, promise of jobs, revenue. We see it
 [11] today. The activity related to enhancement of PMRF has
 [12] already brought us additional revenue, has already brought
 [13] us additional occupancy. Thirty-nine rooms, 39 visitors a
 [14] day do not seem a lot to you here, not in Waikiki, not in
 [15] O'ahu, but in Kaua'i that's an incredible increase. For me,
 [16] for example, I like looking at it at the personal level.
 [17] What does 39 rooms mean? If I had 39 more occupied rooms
 [18] per day, I'd be able to increase my fulltime staff between
 [19] nine and ten people. Okay. That's a ten percent increase
 [20] in my total employment at my resort. That's does not
 [21] include food and beverage, it does not include service
 [22] stations, it does not include purchases made in our local
 [23] stores. Kaua'i is in a world of hurt right now. We need
 [24] PMRF. We need the enhancement, the growth. We need the
 [25] technology, and I can't stress enough that, you know, people

[1] have termed PMRF a good neighbor. It's not. It's a vital
 [2] part of our community. It's not just a neighbor. It's an
 [3] incredibly important part of our economy, our community, our
 [4] sense of ohana on Kaua'i, so please support this. Mahalo.
 [5] KALAMAOKA'AINA NIHEU: E au Kalamaoka'aina Niheu.
 [6] My name is Kalamaoka'aina Niheu, and my ohana also come
 [7] from
 [8] the Island of Ni'ihau. I see some of my ohana in the
 [9] audience right now, some in support of the PMRF and some
 [10] against. There's one thing I agree with Uncle Val in that
 [11] this project has caused a great eha, a hurt for the Hawaiian
 [12] people, not just for the people in Ni'ihau, because they
 [13] have ohana that go out that had to leave Ni'ihau, but there
 [14] are also their families who have spread out and had to go
 [15] all over Hawai'i, all the way to California and beyond. And
 [16] there is an eha that has created within all of us. This
 [17] hurt not only affects the Ni'ihau people, but it affects the
 [18] kanaka maoli, the Hawaiian people of Hawai'i. It also
 [19] affects the people throughout the Pacific because it's not
 [20] just affecting us, it's not just about jobs, and it's not
 [21] just about animals, and it's not just about one place. We
 [22] forget what originally happened. Why was Hawai'i
 [23] overthrown? Why was our queen imprisoned? It was
 [24] because
 [25] of Pearl Harbor and the role that Hawai'i plays in the
 military machine of the United States.
 What happens? What can they offer with this

Page 46

[1] PMRF? They offer us the chance to go out and impress other
 [2] indigenous people throughout the world. What does defense
 [3] mean? Defense means taking over Lili'uokalani, imprisoning
 [4] her in the palace and overthrowing our land and our
 [5] kingdom. That's what defense meant to them. It also means
 [6] oppressing people throughout the Pacific. Where did the
 [7] materials come from when the nuclear testing occurred in
 [8] Tahiti? Where did the guns come from when they massacre
 [9] people in Papua New Guinea and Bougainville? Where does
 [10] this killing machine originate from? One of the heads in
 [11] Hawai'i.
 [12] And then we talk about money. Aia ihea ka wai a
 [13] Kane? Where is the water of life? Aia i ka hikina e ke
 [14] kaia? Is it there in the arrival of the dollar? 'Aole,
 [15] 'aole kaohi. Eia a ka wai a Kane 'ia kakou. The waters
 [16] live within all of us, and the best that the United States
 [17] can offer is money. United States has created an
 [18] international system where it goes out and sucks the
 [19] culture, spirit and resources of the world dry so it can
 [20] support its own life-style. And the very best you guys can
 [21] offer us is the same, that we will become the same blood
 [22] sucking vampires that you have created in yourselves.
 [23] Empires rise and fall, and some day the United States will
 [24] fall. I just hope that there will be people alive when the
 [25] ashes fall upon the earth.

Page 47

[1] THE MODERATOR: Marian Kelly.
 [2] MARIAN KELLY: I am again appalled, but not
 [3] surprised, at the arrogance of the United States military in
 [4] presenting a Draft Environmental Impact Statement with so
 [5] little concern for the environment for the endangered
 [6] animals and for the complete lack of concern for the culture
 [7] and the rights of the indigenous people of these islands.
 [8] Add to that the United States military twisting of the facts
 [9] regarding the rightful claims that the kanaka maoli have on
 [10] the so-called ceded lands. These are lands that were stolen
 [11] from the Hawaiian people when the - with the assistance of
 [12] the guns and the cannon and the hands of the U.S. marines.
 [13] They aimed their cannon at the royal palace, the seat of
 [14] government of the Kingdom of Hawai'i in 1893. All this and
 [15] more is admitted in public law 103150 passed by the U.S.
 [16] Congress and signed by the president of the United States a
 [17] hundred years later.
 [18] In 18 - I've had to cut this down because I have
 [19] five pages of single spaced testimony. I hope you read it.
 [20] The illegal F 1893, the illegal takeover of the Hawaiian
 [21] government that was forced on Hawaiians by the American
 [22] missionaries and their descendants, Laura A. Thurston,
 [23] Stanford B. Dole, William Owen Smith, William R. Castle,
 [24] S.M. Damon and others, and their friends acting in concert
 [25] with the military assistance of the United States marines.

Page 48

[1] After failing to convince the U.S. Congress that it should
 [2] annex the islands immediately, these traitors created the
 [3] so-called Republic of Hawai'i and illegally consolidated the
 [4] king's private lands with the government lands that they had
 [5] stolen and called them the public lands, which then by 1898
 [6] they ceded to the United States. Now, the United States
 [7] knew very well that it did not own those lands, and that's
 [8] why they put them in trust. That's why they placed them in
 [9] trust with the people of Hawai'i being the beneficiaries.
 [10] You really got to get this history straight.
 [11] Even when the United States returned most of those
 [12] trust lands to the State of Hawai'i in 1959, they knew that
 [13] these lands were not free hold lands, and they placed them
 [14] in trust with the state. Thus the United States
 [15] unilaterally diminished the rights of the kanaka maoli
 [16] people when they said that there were five uses for these
 [17] lands and the Hawaiians only had one of those five, 20
 [18] percent. That's outrageous.
 [19] I would like briefly to address the lack of
 [20] concern that they have for the remarkable birds of these
 [21] islands. The devastation of the bird population as a result
 [22] of military activities, particularly airplanes on Midway
 [23] French Frigate Shoals is well-known. That you should stand
 [24] up here and say that they don't have any such history of
 [25] devastation on these birds is outrageous.

Page 49

[1] THE MODERATOR: (Indicating.)
 [2] MARIAN KELLY: One minute more, thank you.
 [3] I won't then list all the other things that I had,
 [4] but I tell you there are some things you might do instead of
 [5] spending this money on missiles. It would be a great day
 [6] for the world's environmental health and that of the ocean
 [7] creatures and the land animals, including birds, if the
 [8] United States military were to clean up Pearl Harbor, remove
 [9] any and all of the nuclear materials, including the nuclear
 [10] ships that they have there, and if it is not too late
 [11] already, allow the once highly productive Pearl Lagoon to
 [12] return to the condition it was in when the U.S. took it
 [13] over. In addition, I would suggest that the U.S. military
 [14] put the money into a thorough cleanup of the island of
 [15] Kaho'olawe that the U.S. military trashed for 50 years. We
 [16] also need to have U.S. Army to clean up Makua Valley and
 [17] return it to the kanaka maoli. The Army once promised to
 [18] return it in the condition it was in when they first took it
 [19] over.
 [20] THE MODERATOR: Miss Kelly, your time is up.
 [21] MARIAN KELLY: Okay. My time is up. Lualuelei is
 [22] another one. I suggest that we cancel this missile
 [23] program. Thank you very much.
 [24] THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Marilyn Pollock.
 [25] MARILYN POLLOCK: Thank you. My name is Marilyn

Page 50

[1] Pollock. I live on Kauai on the north shore, 19 miles as
 [2] the bird flies from Mana, which is terribly frightening to
 [3] me. I oppose the Navy's expansion.
 [4] Some unlucky islands have been targeted by the
 [5] U.S. Navy with financial support of Senator Inouye for
 [6] launch sites for missiles. The Navy is looking to build
 [7] launch sites on Ni'ihau, Tern Island, Johnston Atoll. The
 [8] upgrade is being sold by PMRF at Mana in the name of jobs
 [9] at
 [10] a time the state is so vulnerable and looks to quick fixes.
 [11] An editorial on our Garden Island newspaper on Wednesday
 [12] April 22nd, 1998 tells the readers that our island is known
 [13] for little else than a visitor attraction, and if we allow
 [14] the expansion it will bring us much prestige. What cheap
 [15] statements.
 [16] Of course it is an extraordinary temptation to the
 [17] Navy to disregard protection of irreplaceable natural
 [18] resources. Tern Island is a national wildlife refuge and
 [19] Ni'ihau is Hawaiian land. It was only a few years ago that
 [20] the Hawaiian Island of Kaho'olawe was being bombed on a
 [21] regular basis. So much for the Navy's respect for Hawaiian
 [22] land.
 [23] 1998 has been designated as the Year of the
 [24] Ocean. This designation suggests that there is a growing
 [25] awareness of the intrinsic environmental and cultural value
 of our oceans. Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries

Page 51

[1] Act was passed in the Congress of the United States. I read
 [2] this as a commitment to good management of our ocean
 [3] resources, the coral, the sea life and the submerged lands
 [4] yet to be born. A secure and healthy habitat is not what
 [5] with human domination in mind, especially when the human
 [6] mind is focused on impact by missile launching sites,
 [7] however tempting these islands would be for military
 [8] targets, however tempting these islands would be for jobs.
 [9] Water around the shoals is shallow. It is unknown
 [10] how the tremendous vibrations from launching would impact
 [11] the breeding animals and birds. The ground hazard area, a
 [12] radius of two thousand feet, barely excludes the wildlife
 [13] refuge. Shoals are vulnerable to tsunami action and
 [14] hurricanes. And I may interject right here we met Dr.
 [15] Shinoto from Bishop Museum this afternoon, and he informed
 [16] us Raiatea had just experienced a devastating cyclone
 [17] hurricane and there was much loss of life. I hadn't heard
 [18] about that, but it shows our climate changes are so
 [19] unpredictable that people are totally unprepared. We just
 [20] don't know with these climate changes what's going to
 [21] happen.
 [22] Johnston Island serves as a site for chemical and
 [23] nuclear waste storage. This storage includes mustard gas,
 [24] spilled projectiles, nerve gas and the chemicals that were
 [25] moved to Johnston from Germany. There have been many

[1] serious infractions of the operating conditions set forth in
 [2] the E.P.A. permit. The cost for contracts to operate the
 [3] disposal system exceed one billion dollars. Human error has
 [4] extracted a terrible price at Johnston and to the present
 [5] problems, a launch pad located close to the storage dump,
 [6] you have the potential for disaster.
 [7] I submit that the Navy should be refused the three
 [8] sites, Ni'ihau, Tern Island and Johnston Atoll as the site
 [9] for choice. The ocean is the world's treasure chest of
 [10] immeasurable riches. It is up to all of us as citizens to
 [11] stop habitat destruction and preserve our oceans as a safe
 [12] nonpolluting environment for our future generations. Thank
 [13] you.

[14] THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Our next speaker will
 [15] be Ed Pollock. He'll be followed by George AhTou, Kyle
 [16] Kajihiro and Laulani Teale. Again, if you'll make use of
 [17] this reserved seating area, we'd really appreciate it.

[18] ED POLLOCK: My name is Ed Pollock. I live in
 [19] Waipa Valley, Hanalei, as my wife says, just 19 miles from
 [20] Mana. I - oh, everybody is giving rank and serial number.
 [21] I am a second class electrician. I served on the USS
 [22] PRINCETON in World War II, so I'm with the Navy, but I'm
 [23] against your proposal.
 [24] I am very disappointed in the people of Waimea.
 [25] Money is their prime thought. I am very disappointed, but I

[1] understand the problems on Ni'ihau. I understand the two
 [2] million dollar property value assessment against the
 [3] Robinsons. I understand all of their financial difficulties
 [4] and why. They need money.
 [5] These people in Waimea and on Ni'ihau have stated
 [6] what they want, and maybe they should get it, but nobody is
 [7] an advocate for Tern Island and the French Frigate Shoals.
 [8] That is my concern. I would like to see these islands
 [9] protected as they always have been, and will you please
 [10] think this twice before you set up on these islands.
 [11] Johnston Island has already been polluted, and
 [12] with gas burning out there for years, that can't be a prime
 [13] site anymore, but the French Frigate Shoals have been
 [14] protected from the beginning. I tried to sail there many
 [15] times as an individual sailor, couldn't get permission to
 [16] get near those islands, and I value the fact that nobody has
 [17] been able to. Any ship that has gone near there has been
 [18] confiscated by the Coast Guard in the past. So, please, as
 [19] you think about that island, stay clear. Thank you very
 [20] much.

[21] THE MODERATOR: George AhTou. I guess he's not
 [22] here. Our next speaker is Kyle Kajihiro.

[23] KYLE KAJIHIRO: Aloha. Thank you. My name is
 [24] Kyle Kajihiro. I'm a program coordinator with the American
 [25] Friends Service Committee, which is a Quaker based peace
 and

[1] justice organization. The AFSC has a deep faith that
 [2] conflicts can be resolved nonviolently. As such, we oppose
 [3] the proposed expansion of the Pacific Missile Range
 [4] Facility.
 [5] Before I say more, I just want to acknowledge the
 [6] people of Ni'ihau and Kaua'i, the brothers who spoke earlier
 [7] and raised concerns of the families. I just want to say
 [8] that, you know, there's no disrespect intended for those
 [9] families of Ni'ihau and Kaua'i. Rather - and I don't think
 [10] there's any pilikia there. In fact, I think most people
 [11] would support the claims and concerns that those families
 [12] have, but we also speak from deep convictions and concern
 [13] for the well-being of the people and for the aina.
 [14] You know, one of the main arguments that have been
 [15] used in support of the expansion is that it's an economic
 [16] development strategy. It's like to say that war is not an
 [17] economic development strategy. The proponents argue that
 [18] Kaua'i and Ni'ihau residents, there should be a reason for
 [19] those residents to consider the expansion, but if we are
 [20] really concerned about economic development, we would
 [21] look
 [22] at a full range of options. You know, I would actually
 [23] support that money, taking that millions of dollars and just
 [24] saying to the Ni'ihau people, What would you do with this
 [25] money? Let's take it to the people of Kaua'i. What would
 you do with this money? Consider it reparations, yeah, for

[1] what has been lost for the culture and the lands of native
 [2] Hawaiians. So if we're talking about economic development,
 [3] let's look at the full range of options.
 [4] You know, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
 [5] says that, admits that the overall employment impact will be
 [6] slight. So, you know, what was estimated at 462.7 million
 [7] in fiscal year '98, and 418.9 million in fiscal year '99,
 [8] how much of that is really going to trickle down to the
 [9] community, you know? It's estimated a few million here and
 [10] there for expenditures on hotel rooms and so forth, but as
 [11] Michael Jones I believe commented earlier, you know, we
 [12] could get creative with that money, and it could truly be a
 [13] benefit both for the economy and for our expansion of
 [14] research knowledge. The facility is a tremendous resource
 [15] that way.
 [16] It's also been shown that the same dollars spent
 [17] on education returns many more times to the community than
 [18] dollars spent on defense. One of the problems I have is I
 [19] believe most of this money will likely end up being
 [20] stockpiled in those caves as hardware, which will eventually
 [21] be destroyed in the tests. That's one hell of a way to burn
 [22] up our money, you know, 462 million, 418 million. We can do
 [23] a lot better educating our communities and possibly
 [24] retraining folks for environmental restoration, retraining
 [25] the shipyard workers for other kinds of industry that

[1] utilize their skills, yeah. So I support having that money
 [2] for the community to spend in creative ways that actually
 [3] develop sustainability and look towards our future.
 [4] I want to ask you all to disclose how the money is
 [5] being - slated to be spent on defense contractors. I'd
 [6] like a list of those contractors, what they are contracted
 [7] to produce, and the amounts of those contracts. I believe
 [8] that that's important information for the public to know in
 [9] order to assess, you know, how the benefit is going to reach
 [10] the community.
 [11] Another issue is, you know, we're trying to
 [12] distinguish between what is fact and what is public
 [13] relations spin, and so if you could disclose on documents
 [14] related to your public relations strategy so we can discern
 [15] for ourselves, you know, what sort of messages have been
 [16] doctored and which messages are genuinely coming from the
 [17] community.
 [18] Another concern is if the project goes forward, is
 [19] there a mechanism for the public to evaluate the process of
 [20] development as well as ongoing operations? And if it fails
 [21] to fulfill it's projected benefits, or if the project impact
 [22] exceeds what are anticipated in this Environmental Impact
 [23] Statement, will there be an option for cancelling the
 [24] project? I don't see that addressed in the EIS.
 [25] And then finally, very concerned about the

[1] specialists and experts that have been employed. It's not
 [2] clear who were the contractors, the consultants that did the
 [3] cultural studies, the biological and other scientific
 [4] studies. You know, many of us in the community are very
 [5] concerned that career scientific and culture consultants
 [6] have a conflict of interest when contracted for these types
 [7] of project. I'm being told my time is up.
 [8] So, in closing, thank you. Please oppose this
 [9] expansion of the Pacific Missile Range Facility. Thanks.
 [10] THE MODERATOR: Okay. The last speakers I have
 [11] here listed are Laulani Teale, Thomas Nizo and Bob Mullins.
 [12] LAULANI TEALE: Aloha. My name is Laulani Teale.
 [13] I am the president of the University YWCA, the YWCA of the
 [14] University of Hawai'i, technically. I am a master's
 [15] candidate in public health at the University of Hawai'i, and
 [16] I am a mother. It seems like every time I get up to speak
 [17] at any hearing I end up saying the same thing, and if any of
 [18] you have been to any other hearings, then I apologize if it
 [19] may seem repetitive, but I think it's very important.
 [20] The main concern in all of this in every single
 [21] project which affects this land which we all depend upon for
 [22] life is the children, not just the children of today, but
 [23] the children who will be born next generation, five
 [24] generations from now, ten generations from now. They are
 [25] the ones that we owe the best actions to right now, twenty

Page 58

[1] generations from now. What about fifty generations from
 [2] now? What will the children of that time be saying about us
 [3] about what we did today, you know, about the decisions that
 [4] we make? And when we decide whether to do anything or
 not
 [5] do it, if it is going to affect those children and their
 [6] world, the world that they are going to have to live in,
 [7] that they are going to have to gather their food from in
 [8] that time, then that needs to be our utmost consideration.
 [9] All of us here know deep in our hearts, every single one of
 [10] us know what is right and wrong. We know when something
 is
 [11] going to harm our children, and I believe that deep inside
 [12] of us, whether our logical minds tell us or not, all of us
 [13] know that military expansion and particularly this project
 [14] is threatening the existence of our future generations. It
 [15] threatens the world that they must depend upon for life.
 [16] You know, we don't need more bombs. We don't need any
 more
 [17] of any of these things. We need healthy land, because we're
 [18] in critical danger right now. We are in danger of our
 [19] children not having a world that they can survive upon,
 [20] okay. So that is what we need to consider before all else,
 [21] okay. And I, you know, we can say nice things about Monk
 [22] seals and all that kind of stuff, but, you know, that maybe
 [23] the we can say, oh, these wildlife have looked like they are
 [24] so happy with military projects and stuff, but deep inside
 [25] we know the truth, the truth, the simple truth. We know

Page 59

[1] what makes life thrive, what makes the native species live,
 [2] what makes the Hawaiian people live who are connected so
 [3] deeply to those species, you know. We know what makes
 them
 [4] - what makes them live, what makes them ho'oulu, you know,
 [5] what makes them thrive and what doesn't. And deep inside of
 [6] us, no matter what we say or what we may want to believe,
 [7] all of us know that this kind of expansion, this kind of
 [8] thing cannot carry on indefinitely. There's a limit to it.
 [9] You know, what are we going to do, just keep on making
 more
 [10] and more military establishments, more and more military
 [11] bases on and on and on, you know, until there's no Hawaiian
 [12] anything left, until there's nothing left for our children
 [13] to survive, you know? I don't think so. So, please, you
 [14] know, you folks who are sitting on this panel right now and
 [15] all of you, every single one of you who is in this audience
 [16] look deep, deep, deep inside your heart, look at the truth
 [17] you know. Feel what is really, really true inside of you
 [18] and do the right thing.
 [19] No more. No more. Pau already. Pau with this
 [20] military expansion. We don't need it. We need to do what's
 [21] right. Mahalo.
 [22] THE MODERATOR: Thomas Nizo.
 [23] THOMAS NIZO: My name is Thomas
 [24] Milimilinalaweloilehua Nizo. I come from the Island of
 [25] Kauai and also have ohana on Ni'ihau. As one of my ohana

Page 60

[1] stated previously - and I am in favor of the PMRF Draft
 [2] EIS. As one of my ohana stated previously, it is a big
 [3] sore, an eha on all of our families, but this is not a
 [4] sovereignty issue. As the person just before me said, that
 [5] the decisions that we make today we put on our kids. Well,
 [6] the decisions that the queen made back then to not put up
 [7] force is what we are living with now. Now it's a
 [8] sovereignty issue. You know, this whole thing is not a
 [9] sovereignty issue. This whole thing is about jobs, about
 [10] economics and about the environment.
 [11] The job opportunities that the enhanced EIS
 [12] program the TBMD program is going to provide are for our
 [13] ohana, you know. That's what's going to make them be out
 [14] there, a productive person of society. That can be by means
 [15] of working in an office or by means of being a kanaka
 [16] mahi'ai, working the land. Production is measured in
 [17] various different ways, not only by working in the land and
 [18] being a Hawaiian.
 [19] We talk about economics, about having, you know,
 [20] the quote, unquote, the haole dollar, the kala. We are all
 [21] here wearing clothes. We are voting with that dollar. I
 [22] don't see anybody here with the malo or with the ti leaf
 [23] skirt. We all voting with that haole, quote, unquote, haole
 [24] dollar.

[25] The environment. The environment is another major

Page 61

[1] issue of this EIS. This is why it's here. As a native
 [2] Hawaiian, as a steward of the aina, it's my first priority.
 [3] I was born Hawaiian before I was a PMRF employee.
 Primarily
 [4] I'm here to protect my aina to give to my son who is seven
 [5] years old. We fish those reefs out at PMRF, and that's what
 [6] I'm giving to my son.
 [7] Secondly, as a PMRF employee, I will ensure that
 [8] this does not happen. I am the inside line of the Hawaiians
 [9] at this base proving, educating other Hawaiians that what
 [10] goes on at PMRF is not what you folks are dreaming it up to
 [11] be, toxic waste and other things like that. I'm living
 [12] proof. You folks should come to the base. We have an open
 [13] base policy. Come and get educated, you know, as a
 [14] Hawaiian. And Hawaiian is not a thing. Hawaiian is in your
 [15] heart. Hawaiian will never die. No matter how much bombs
 [16] or anybody or military bases we create, Hawaiian is in the
 [17] na'au. It will never die. Thanks.
 [18] THE MODERATOR: Bob Mullins.
 [19] BOB MULLINS: Evening, Captain Bowlin, everyone
 [20] aloha. My name is Robert Mullins, and I speak today on
 [21] behalf of the 432 members of the Navy League of the United
 [22] States Council on Kauai in favor of this proposed action,
 [23] and we concur wholeheartedly in the findings of the EIS of
 [24] no significant impact of its elements or its actions.
 [25] I've sat here all night and listened with great

Page 62

[1] interest to the commentary of those who are not in favor of
 [2] this proposed action and listened to the issues that they've
 [3] raised and the logic that they've used. And I must say that
 [4] in certainly all cases, the thoughts are felt very deeply,
 [5] and the issues raised, many of them are valid issues. The
 [6] point that I would make is that they are not the issue that
 [7] we're here tonight to discuss. They are not our issue.
 [8] The issue of whether or not the country's money
 [9] can be better spent in other areas, Congress has already
 [10] passed judgment on that. This program that we're here to
 [11] discuss tonight has been authorized and funded and
 mandated
 [12] by the Congress to be carried out in direct response to a
 [13] threat that was very obviously shown during the Gulf War
 [14] back in 1991. That argument is over. The issue before us
 [15] now is whether or not this program authorized, funded and
 [16] mandated by the Congress, the people we elect to stand for
 [17] us in Washington can be done best in the open ocean areas
 to
 [18] the north and west of Kauai controlled by PMRF. The
 [19] answer, as is clearly shown in the EIS, is yes, it can be.
 [20] Congress has selected PMRF to be the lead range for this
 [21] activity because of the guaranteed safety aspect of it and
 [22] the fact that it is shown that it will have minimal impact
 [23] on public health, public safety and the environment. And
 [24] for those of you that doubt that, and there's rhetoric on
 [25] both sides, I would simply invite you to go out to Barking

Page 63

[1] Sands, to take the captain up on his kind invitation and go
 [2] up for yourself and see the work that goes on at Barking
 [3] Sands. That base has a 35 year track record of taking care
 [4] of the trust that they've been involved with out there, and
 [5] it's there for you to see unvarnished, unedited. Just
 [6] please leave your bias at the gate if you show up and go see
 [7] for yourself.
 [8] Therefore, to Captain Bowlin I would say please
 [9] concur in the sentiment of 432 members of the Kauai Council
 [10] of the Navy League, the mayor of the County of Kauai, the
 [11] seven members of the county council of the County of Kauai,
 [12] the Garden Isle Newspaper, every business on the Garden
 [13] Island and the overwhelming number of people who live,
 work,
 [14] vote and hold the island up from nine to five every day and
 [15] let's get on full speed ahead with the aid of Theater
 [16] Missile Defense Testing on Kauai. Aloha.
 [17] THE MODERATOR: Excuse me, is there anyone else
 [18] who's turned in their card to speak?
 [19] Captain, I'd like to invite you to give closing
 [20] remarks if you'd like to.
 [21] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: Well, I'm absolutely amazed that
 [22] we're at the end of the speakers. Is there anybody else out
 [23] there that would like to speak? We have one more. I
 [24] believe it's Chief Petty Officer Kanahahe.

[25] THE MODERATOR: Could we get him a registration
 Page 64
 [1] card? Thank you. You can go ahead and speak. We'll get
 [2] you after you're done.
 [3] CHIEF PETTY OFFICER KANAHELE: Good evening,
 [4] Captain. Good evening, audience. I don't have any prepared
 [5] statement, but I just wanted to speak on behalf of my
 [6] family. I know that my family fully supports this, and when
 [7] issues came up I wanted to ask my dad what was his feeling
 [8] about it and how he felt about it, and the thing that he
 [9] said was, you know, we leave it in God's hand and let's him,
 [10] you know, if it's pono, then God will make it pono. And the
 [11] other thing that I felt was really important when he said it
 [12] was, you know, I know that there's going to be a lot of
 [13] criticism with the Robinson family and their relationship
 [14] with PMRF, but I have to look back, you know, what the
 [15] Robinsons have done for us, you know, all throughout this
 [16] year. And he talked about loyalty. You know, they've
 [17] always been good to us. They have taken care of us. And,
 [18] you know, I'm just here to express that, you know, I wanted
 [19] to be here to be supportive of my family to in some way say
 [20] that we're here, that we're with you, and not allow someone
 [21] from O'ahu, although that they are family, but, you know, at
 [22] the same time that I didn't want to create any hard
 [23] feelings, but, you know, I didn't want anybody else to speak
 [24] out to say what is good for us. You know, we're able to
 [25] make the decisions on our own, and we'll full ahead with the

Page 65
 [1] initiative.
 [2] And on behalf of that, I also wanted to say that
 [3] I've had 17 and a half years in the Navy, and I've been on
 [4] five fast attack submarines, so I know the services that we
 [5] have received from PMRF, you know. Last Saturday, Captain
 [6] Mullins was talking about the sailors that during Iniki, you
 [7] know, there were no complaints, no issues about the sailors
 [8] from PMRF helping out with restoring Kaua'i. And then, you
 [9] know, he asked the question, you know, now, at this point,
 [10] where are those sailors at? Those sailors are out there
 [11] standing the watch to give this great nation of ours, you
 [12] know, the freedom that we have right now, and I really
 [13] wanted to raise my hand and say, "Captain, you know, I'm one
 [14] of those guys that stood the watch out in the gulf." You
 [15] know, it's easy for us to take things for granted, yet, you
 [16] know, I feel proud that I am one of those guys that stands
 [17] the watch, you know. I have to deny my children, I have to
 [18] deny my family, and I have to deny my wife of the holidays
 [19] that you freely enjoy. You know, I deploy on the West
 [20] Bank. I miss Thanksgiving, I miss Christmas, I miss New
 [21] Year's, I miss Easter and what do we get, "Thank you."
 [22] You know, I felt that it's important for me to be
 [23] here and I, you know, to stand on behalf of my family, to
 [24] speak out and say that we're able to make that decision for
 [25] ourselves, and we feel that, you know, we've looked at all

Page 66
 [1] the avenues and we've asked all the questions and we've left
 [2] everything in God's hand, and we believe that, you know, if
 [3] things are to come through, you know, God will make things
 [4] pono for us.
 [5] And Captain, I just wanted to thank you for this
 [6] opportunity, and I speak on behalf of my family that we're
 [7] in full support of the missile initiative. Thank you.
 [8] THE MODERATOR: I've had another card handed to
 [9] me. Shawn Bombard.
 [10] SHAWN BOMBARD: I don't really have anything
 prepared
 [11] other than to say that I'm against the expansion of the PMRF.
 [12] THE MODERATOR: Would you state your name for us.
 [13] SHAWN BOMBARD: My name is Shawn Bombard.
 [14] THE MODERATOR: Thank you.
 [15] SHAWN BOMBARD: I'm against it primarily because
 [16] of the damage that it will do to the environment, to the
 [17] indigenous species, to the culture. Unfortunately we live
 [18] in a society where war is a necessity. It's something that
 [19] we don't like to look at, but it could happen down the line
 [20] somewhere, so we have the need to protect ourselves.
 [21] I really, really get nervous thinking about how
 [22] many missiles or how many facilities do we need to protect
 [23] ourselves? I'm sure covering all our bases is a really good
 [24] idea, I mean that sounds good, no pun intended, but where
 do
 [25] we draw the line? Where do we say, okay, this is enough?

Page 67
 [1] I'm sure nobody wants to go up in a huge, you know, atomic
 [2] whatever. If it did come to that there would be no
 [3] survivors, true. So what really are we dealing with here?
 [4] What is our real approach? What we really want to do is we
 [5] want to not have to go to war. We want not to have to
 [6] build any more bases, have any more systems that can track
 [7] missiles and have systems that can take missiles out because
 [8] we all love our country, we love ourselves, we love our
 [9] families. We want more to work towards how can we - how
 [10] can we live in a world that is geared towards better
 [11] alternatives? More creativity, more imagination, not in any
 [12] way trying to downplay the need for protection, but maybe we
 [13] should just stop, take a look and say, okay, maybe this is
 [14] enough. Maybe it doesn't mean more of something is better,
 [15] especially when it means that that "more" could mean the
 [16] loss of life, the loss of land, the loss of our culture, the
 [17] loss of animals and marine species, stuff like that. We
 [18] need to like weigh it and say, okay, maybe this is where we
 [19] can stop. Thank you.
 [20] THE MODERATOR: Okay. We'll ask one more time.
 [21] Is there anyone else who would like to speak?
 [22] CAPTAIN BOWLIN: I'm just waiting for that
 [23] airplane to go over.
 [24] If there are no more speakers, then that concludes
 [25] this evening's event, and I would like to thank all of you

Page 68
 [1] that came out. I'd particularly like to thank the speakers,
 [2] the people that stood up at the podium and expressed their
 [3] opinions. And I would remind everybody that the reason we
 [4] do an EIS is so that we evaluate all the impacts for our
 [5] actions before we make decision on things. And the reason
 [6] we do a public hearing is to get all of the inputs from
 [7] everybody concerned so that the decisions we make are even
 [8] better. So I appreciate all the inputs that were made
 [9] today, and I remind you that you have until the 26th of May
 [10] to get any written inputs in to us if you have more thoughts
 [11] or take a little bit more time to review the EIS document.
 [12] And since Thomas Nizo and Bob Mullins have already
 [13] invited folks out to my place at PMRF, I would like to go
 [14] ahead and make it official and tell you that if you would
 [15] like to come out, if you would like to learn more about what
 [16] we do, then I'd be delighted to have you come out, and we'll
 [17] show you around, give you a brief. If I have time, I'll
 [18] even personally show you around. I'd like you to come out
 [19] and see what it is that we do out there.
 [20] Thanks very much for participating tonight, and I'm
 [21] sure we're going to end up with a good final product. Thank
 you.
 [22] THE MODERATOR: With that we will adjourn the
 [23] meeting at 6:59 p.m..
 [24] (Whereupon the proceedings were
 [25] concluded at 6:59 p.m.)

Page 69
 CERTIFICATE
 STATE OF HAWAII)
)ss.
 CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)
 I, B. KANOELANI COCKETT, CSR, Notary Public,
 State of
 [6] Hawai'i, do hereby certify:
 [7] That on April 28th, 1998, at 5:00 p.m. that the
 [8] proceedings were taken down by me in machine shorthand and
 [9] was thereafter reduced to typewritten form under my
 [10] supervision; that the foregoing represents, to
 [11] the best of my ability, a true and correct transcript of
 [12] the proceedings had in the foregoing matter.
 [13] I further certify that I am not attorney for any of
 [14] the parties hereto, nor in any way concerned with the
 [15] cause.
 [16] Dated this 12th day of May 1998 in Honolulu,
 [17] Hawai'i.
 [18]
 [19]
 [20]
 [21]
 [22]
 [23] B. KANOELANI COCKETT, CSR NO. 379
 [24] Notary Public, State of Hawai'i
 [25] My commission expires: February 19th, 2001

Table 8-4: Public Hearing, Honolulu, Oahu, 28 April 1998

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment Number ¹	RESPONSE
Aleck, Nancy	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written comments on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your letter dated April 28, 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.
Bombard, Shawn	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>We share your concern about endangered species, particularly the monk seal and green sea turtle. We do not believe that the proposed activities will jeopardize any species and are in consultation with USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Endangered Species Act as indicated in Volume 2, Appendix K.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Ching, Jr, Val	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Guard, Tim	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written testimony on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-4: Public Hearing, Honolulu, Oahu, 28 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment Number ¹	RESPONSE
Irwin, Richard	Yes (2)	Thank you for your presentation and written testimony dated 28 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Jones, Michael	Yes (5)	Thank you for your presentation and written comments regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared responses to your written statements dated 28 April 1998, 3 May 1998, 15 May 1998, 22 May 1998 and 31 May 1998 that address each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.
Kajihiro, Kyle	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written comments regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your letter dated 13 May 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.
Kanahele, Chief Petty Officer	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Kelly, Marian	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written comments regarding the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your letter dated 25 April 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.
Kihune, Robert	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written testimony on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Lins, Fred	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written statement on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Marston, Nani	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written statement on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Mullins, Bob	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written testimony on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Niheu, Kalamoaka'aina	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-4: Public Hearing, Honolulu, Oahu, 28 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment Number ¹	RESPONSE
Nizo, Thomas	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Pearle, Clyde	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Pitton, Jim	No	Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.
Pollock, Ed	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>We share your concern about endangered species, particularly the monk seal and green sea turtle. We do not believe that the proposed activities will jeopardize any species and are in consultation with USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Endangered Species Act as indicated in Volume 2, Appendix K. Tern Island is being considered as a fall-back alternative if development of air- and mobile-sea-platform launch capabilities are delayed or cannot support the technical requirements for Theater Missile Defense testing at PMRF. This consideration is occurring in close consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Prior to a decision by the Department of Defense to use Tern for any of the activities being considered, a compatible use determination must be completed by USFWS consistent with the requirements of the Natural Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act (16 USC § 668dd). Additionally, prior to any dredging activities at Tern Island, biological and geological surveys would be performed in consultation with USFWS and NMFS. If necessary, NEPA analysis will also be conducted for dredging activities at Tern Island.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Pollock, Marilyn	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written comments on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We have prepared a response to your letter dated April 28, 1998 that addresses each of the issues you presented at the public hearing. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain your support and trust.
Rothschild, James	Yes	Thank you for your presentation and written testimony dated 28 April 1998 on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

Table 8-4: Public Hearing, Honolulu, Oahu, 28 April 1998 (Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	Written Comment Number ¹	RESPONSE
Teale, Laulani	No	<p>Thank you for taking the time to participate in the public hearing process for the Pacific Missile Range Facility Enhanced Capability Environmental Impact Statement. Our country was built on the idea that we all should be able to express our views and be heard. Although not all of the programs of the Department of Defense are popular, the purpose of these programs is to protect the freedoms that we all enjoy that make it possible for us to participate freely in our democratic form of government.</p> <p>Particular efforts were made to solicit the opinions and input of the people of Niihau concerning aspects of the Navy's proposal that would involve activities on the island. The residents have been generally supportive of these activities. There has also been a cooperative effort to complete a cultural study of Niihau, and every effort will be made in the future to avoid activities and contacts that would be adverse to the desires of the Niihau residents to preserve their culture, while having a means of livelihood.</p> <p>We share your concern about endangered species, particularly the monk seal and green sea turtle. We do not believe that the proposed activities will jeopardize any species and are in consultation with USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Endangered Species Act as indicated in Volume 2, Appendix K. Tern Island is being considered as a fall-back alternative if development of air- and mobile-sea-platform launch capabilities are delayed or cannot support the technical requirements for Theater Missile Defense testing at PMRF. This consideration is occurring in close consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Prior to a decision by the Department of Defense to use Tern for any of the activities being considered, a compatible use determination must be completed by USFWS consistent with the requirements of the Natural Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act (16 USC § 668dd). Additionally, prior to any dredging activities at Tern Island, biological and geological surveys would be performed in consultation with USFWS and NMFS. If necessary, NEPA analysis will also be conducted for dredging activities at Tern Island.</p> <p>The leaders of our country must make many difficult decisions concerning how and where to conduct activities that will provide us with a strong defense. PMRF already conducts many testing functions vital to our national defense. The Enhanced Capability EIS is analyzing the environmental impacts of enhancing its capabilities to perform testing of missile systems to protect our armed forces and allies.</p> <p>PMRF is proud of its record as a good neighbor to the people of Kauai and will continue to be sensitive to cultural and other issues important to the people of Hawaii. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to gain and maintain your trust and support.</p>
Turlington, Vic	No	<p>Thank you for your presentation on the PMRF Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We appreciate your expression of support for the proposed enhancements at PMRF. Let me assure you that those of us who have the privilege of working at PMRF want to do all we can to maintain your trust and support.</p>

¹See Chapter 9 for written comments and Navy responses.

PETITIONS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PETITION

WE, the undersigned concerned citizens of ^{Hawaii} ~~Oahu~~, support the U. S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3, 1998:

NAME	SIGNATURE	MAILING ADDRESS
ROBERT KAYSUMI	<i>Robert Kaysumi</i>	1935 HAWAII ST. RM 401, HON. HI 96819
POOHANA OMONDINE	<i>Poohana Omondine</i>	94508 Keolakea St. Mililani 96789
KEN KIYASHIMA	<i>Ken Kiyashima</i>	1935 HAWAII ST - 96819
Donald Nishimura	<i>Donald Nishimura</i>	45-547 B Mokualele Dr
MARK MATSUMOTO	<i>Mark Matsumoto</i>	1935 HAWAII ST. RM 401, HON 96819
Franklin Hayashida	<i>Franklin Hayashida</i>	1636 Kame Rd Hon 96819
Thomas Fujikawa	<i>Thomas Fujikawa</i>	1935 HAWAII ST. RM 401, HON. HI 96819
Gerald Yamamoto	<i>Gerald Yamamoto</i>	99-762 Keala St. 96701
Jerry Okuda	<i>Jerry Okuda</i>	1935 HAWAII ST HON 96819
HENRY TAIRA	<i>Henry Taira</i>	2410 WILSON ST. 96819
DENNIS KAWI	<i>Dennis Kawi</i>	92-379 LADUE ST. KAPOHEI HI 96707
Ricky Almadua	<i>Ricky Almadua</i>	1935 HAWAII ST HON 96819
PAT FUKUDA	<i>Pat Fukuda</i>	2305 S. BERKELEY ST.
EDWIN M FRIAS	<i>Edwin M Frias</i>	419 A KAWAIILOA RD, KAILUA, HI 96731
THOMAS LAU HEE	<i>Thomas Lau Hee</i>	291 KOKAHI ST. WAIKUKU HI 96737
GEORGE T. GIBB	<i>George T. Gibb</i>	P.O. BOX 4304 MILI HI 96720
PAUL SIATANA	<i>Paul Siatana</i>	4573 PUA ST WAIKUKU 96766
MITSURU KATO	<i>Mitsuru Kato</i>	275 MONROE ST HON. HI. 96825
Sandra Takehara	<i>Sandra Takehara</i>	94-266 OHIKI PL. MILILANI 96789
Judy M. Kato	<i>Judy M. Kato</i>	275 MONROE ST, HON, HI 96825
Larry Haeana	<i>Larry Haeana</i>	1139 9th Ave #1403 HON HI 96816
PATRICK BETER	<i>Patrick Beter</i>	94-465 HIWAHIWA WAY, WAIKUKU 96797
Jeanne S Ochin	<i>Jeanne S Ochin</i>	265A NIHI ST HON. HI 96819
RON TANAKA	<i>Ron Tanaka</i>	98-1038 MOANALUA RD #107 96701
Joe Alfonsi	<i>Joe Alfonsi</i>	47-786 HUI WILI ST KANEHE 96744

PETITION

WE, the undersigned concerned citizens of Oahu, support the U. S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3, 1998:

NAME	SIGNATURE	MAILING ADDRESS
Lorna Takahashi	<i>Lorna Takahashi</i>	2221 Noah St. Hon. 96816
Russell Takemoto	<i>Russell Takemoto</i>	2100 Date St. #1682
BEN OBAHASHI	<i>B. Obashi</i>	68067 Au ST Uaialua 96791
KEOLA JIMENO	<i>Keola Jimeno</i>	95-1044 POKOU ST
GARY W. OLIVA	<i>Gary W. Oliva</i>	94-1097 KAAHOLO ST. 96797
Wilfred P. Andrade	<i>Wilfred Andrade</i>	91-1007 HULU HULU ST. ^{EWA BEACH HI} 96706
DIANE DIZON	<i>Diane Dizon</i>	95-143 KUAKELANI AVE. ^{#251} MILILANI, HI 96759
Annie FREITAS	<i>Annie Freitas</i>	4730 Maternia Dr. 96816
Richard J. Freitas	<i>Richard J. Freitas</i>	1649 ALA HAWAII ST 96819
ALVIN H. VIERRA SR.	<i>Alvin H. Vierra Sr.</i>	722B PANUI ST. HON. HI 96817
RICHARD KURATA	<i>Richard Kurata</i>	916 4th Ave. Hon. 96816
Gay Yamafuji	<i>Gay Yamafuji</i>	1525 Hoolunui Street, Pearl City, HI 96782
DARLE K. MUKAI	<i>Darle K. Mukai</i>	44-284 KEAOLANI ST. MILILANI 96795
Eleanor Kojima	<i>Eleanor Kojima</i>	45-407 KANALANI PI. KANALANI 96744
ROY S. FRANCO	<i>Roy S. Franco</i>	1450 AIEA ST. HON. HI 96817
JOHN B. JUMALON	<i>John B. Jumalon</i>	99-816 ALIPOE DR. AIEA 96701
Harry H.K. Kameenui	<i>Harry H.K. Kameenui</i>	1242 Lunalilo Home Rd. Hon. HI. 96825
Klauson Baptist	<i>Klauson Baptist</i>	95-1051 HAKA ST Mililani HI 96789
Stacie Cabelinia	<i>Stacie Cabelinia</i>	91057 Pahuhu Way Ewa Beach 96706
Lincoln Chee	<i>Lincoln J. Chee</i>	91-1065 Aawa Dr. Ewa Beach 96706
Patrick Custineo	<i>Patrick Custineo</i>	45089 Lilipuna Rd Kaneohe HI 96744
WILLIAM AGUIAR	<i>William Aguiar</i>	94-1079 HUALAIA ST. WAIKANAHI 96797
John Deai	<i>John Deai</i>	1231 Ulunahale St Kailua HI 96734
PATRICK J. O'NEAL	<i>Patrick J. O'Neal</i>	41-716 ALANI ST. KANEHOE, HI 96744
JAMES ROTHSCHILD	<i>James Rothschild</i>	45-121 MAOLI PL KANEHOE HI 96744

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
William T. Hull	930 Hahaione St	396-1827
Roger A. Fazzari	P.O. 62084 Hon 96837	366-1307
Taney Cho	3489 Manoa Rd.	988-3760
Marilyn Hume	8200 12th Ave	737-4624
R. S. G. G. G.	1735-G YOUNG STREET 96826	946-2926
POL R. SALADINO	728 MOKAUEA ST. HON. 96819	845-6939
Key I. I. I.	44 Pulelehua Way 96817	595-3390
Barrett Koppawa	3328 Martha Street 96815	5372900
Frank W. Allen	1814 MAKUAHINE PL. 96817	848-6529
Dwiley L. L.	796 Isenberg St. Honolulu, HI 96826	—
Derek S. KATAYAMA	2322-C KALIHI ST.	835-2919
Monique M. Olsson	281 Fern St #D Hono HI 96826	521-7737
Wayne Ogata	1132 E 14th Ave	586 -9042
Marjorie Gonzalez	4116 Puunualu Pl. Hon. 96816	737-2471
Doree Takalana	PO BOX 656 Hon 96809	523-2500
Arlin Oteka	2708 Oahu Ave. Hon 96822	978-6174
Baron Hamada	94-1131 Halelehua St. Waip 96797	587-1031
Teru Repalda	277 Merchant St. #300 Hon. 96826	721-0933
Pauline K. Allen	233 Merchant St. #300 Hon 96813	521-0933
	841 Bishop St. #2104 Hon 96813	524-3000

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Yolani M. Hege	47-536 Henoheno St.	586-2062
Reigh McOnis	3060 LIKIUKI Pl.	845-4455
M.A.K.	94-318 Paumotu Pl. Mililani, 96799	623-4148
William L. Saeedon Sr	1129-3 rd Ave, Holo, 96816	Ph. 734-7472
Lorraine Faasili	94-132 Nali St. Waiipahu	676-1467
Josephine	2347 Anumakua St. HAWAII, 96722	456-3080
Carl L. Dyer	1362 Akalan. Pl. Kailua 96754	762-8297
Miriam McKernan	1544 Dominica St #1504 Hwa HI 96822	941-4203
Johanna Aie	44-236 Waikeolu Drive Kaeohu ⁹⁶⁷⁴⁴	287-3988
Rosina Okimoto	2016 Skyline Dr. 96817	595-4466
Donna Kashimoto	45-345 Co'hi St Kaeohu	247 525-8726
Julie Pauline	3121 Pualei Circle #17	922-3162
Allyson	735 Bishop St.	---
Allyson	99-421 Palaiaili Way Area 96701	533-1163 (B)
Rosalee Sprunde	1442 Victoria St #202 ⁹⁶⁷²²	288-3414
Jennie Ann Yano	1128 Ala Napunani St. #201	836-2591
Jennifer May	837-H Lukepau Ave	739-9474
Opie K. Yulishka - Copy	1716 Koaumoku St. Apt 703 ^{Hwa} 96722	536-2331
H. E. T. T. T.	1223 Alha Oe Pr. Kailua HI: 96734	261-8722
Juan J. J.	94-240 Kea Loni St #142 Mililani HI 96722	683-0044

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO:
Dawn Maekawa-Matsushima	1737 S Beretania 402A 96826	942-9426
Sharon Sakauye	944 Uwao St. Hon. 96825	397-5811
TON HEATA	3016 NUMANA RD Hon 96819	523-6372
Beverly Look	1387 Hunaikai St 96816	737-2631
Carmen Harris	1201 Wilder Ave #2006 96822	533-6684
Fred O. Harris	1201 Wilder Ave, Honolulu	533-6684
Debra Schu	911-799 Kime St 96797	676-7788
Yoshiko Nishimoto	1920 Paua Road	537-6240
Patricia Snyder	3138 Waiolae Ave #226 Hon 96816	735-2056
Vicki Piranada	1724 Ahuna St. Hon. 96819	847-0381
Anna Ohukua	112 Jaak Lane Hon 96817	908 538-4569
L. Kijoshita	95-255 Waiolae St 96789	473-3402
Ed She (Garret Hornum)	1300 Honolulu Ct 96825	395-6894
ay Young Jangpungwon	201 South King St Hon. HI 96813	533-4666
Danette Sarajina	1425 Liliha St, Apt 12-D Hon 96817	545-7193
Bernadette F. Kiddle	711 Prospect St Hon 96813	533-1394
Gaspar Lagway Jr	999 Bishop St Hon HI	525-6371
Ann S Keem	35 N KUKUI ST #2802	524-1641
Edith C. Takimura	1555 Piikoi St.	536-8402
W.H.H.H.	666 PROSPECT ST #707	524-1070

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
K. Koolyey	PO Box 375 . Hon. HI 96809	595-3077
No. Sato	P.O. Box 1959 Hon. 96847	837-5008
Alamusa	712 Kamehameha Dr 96816	586-8907
Don Starkey	696 Kihapai St. 96734	263-4017
W. M. M. M.	2474 Lepulemu 96876	536-4036
K. K. Lee	45-766 Naniwahine Way 96744	834-0206
W. F. F.	426 Iolani Ave 96813	531-0259
Maurice K. K.	PO Box 601	697-0322
A. L. L.	P.O. Box 3382 96801	455-9949
Sue Chaweng	1147 Lono St. Kailua 96704	—
J. J. J.	3228 Nimitz Dr. 96815	—
Leeia Shinai	98-566 Kilihoke Ln 96701	486-7571
M. M. M.	P.O. Box 1776 Honolulu 96806	220-8535
Leani Ichi	529 Anala St., 96817	—
Debra Nakaya	3577 Pinali St # 15 Hon 96822	988-2567
Wendy Shira	807 Pumerana St. Hon 96822	944-2201
Alexand Verra	48-1967 Keolu Ln 96701	—
MRS. Bob Tomar	884 Lanihale Ave Rd	96825 359-0294
Tokio Imamura	1147 Lono St Kailua 96734	—
Pedro Cancian	436 Keolu Dr	423-2716

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Verna M. Murakami	99-1045 Lalawai Dr. ^{Area} 96701	488-3301
James H. Mellen Jr.	841 Bishop #156	533-6313
Scott B. Gomes	1001 Bishop #2000	591-5888
Sally Brownell	217 Kopeke St. E-9	599-3792
Lake Jr.	480 *A Wai'anani Place ^{Hon.} 96786	488-1803
Roberta P. Perri	1124 Club Drive ^{Wahiawa} 96786	621-6648
Catherine Joy-Mahi	47-066 KAM-Hwy Kaneohe	247-5307
Wai Matsuda	P.O. Box 4601 Houl. HI 96012	537-2662
Brian Matsuda	85-239 McArthur St. Wai'anani HI 96714	696-4343
Stanley Muka	796 Isenberg Hwy HI	539-2626
Marcel M. Garcia	1888 Kaulano St. Hon., HI	595-2935
Josephine K. Ann	220 S. King St. Ste. 1900 Hon., HI	536-1900
Sally J. Vidal	99-361 Wai Dr. Aiea HI 96701	488-1365
Seiichi Takara	765 Isenberg St. Hon. 98626	946-4609
Esther Ikemoto	Aliipoe St. 96701	487-3634
Doug A. Tully	1001 Bishop St. Suite 300, HNL, HI	538-7474
William J. Anthony	92-532 Kohala St. Kapolei	HI 672-3978
Kelley Joann	30 Mahale Cp Wahiawa HI	621-8535
Morini Cruz Joann	" "	" "
Alman Nd Cohen	47-552 The Pl. Kaneohe ^{Area} 96746	239-4493

Long

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Nancy Cullen	3204 Moloa St Kailua	254-2919
Sam Fukuda	3054 Ala Paha Pl. Hon 96818	543-0003
Sanford Chun	94-1203 Luniada St. JD 96797	536-2351
Diane Shiget	593 Palawiki St Kailua 96734	263-0148
Patricia Nishiki	1190 Kamehame Dr. Hon 96825	3967711
Jasmine Watson	246 Waialeale St Wahiawa 96817	538-4115
Sham Kakusako	1627 Hoopana St. PC 96782	587-8405
Liana Folles	1274 Ulupii St. Kailua 96734	801-2224
WILFRED LUM	P.O. BOX 4711, KONAHE 96744	2391293
Robyn A. Neffeyan	430-F Haleloa Place Hon 96821	396-1069
EMERY G. K. HENDERSON	98-291 UALO St. AIEA, 96701	832-5223
Marissa D. Mull	1210 D Auld Lane Hon 96817	973-4423
James	841 BISHOP ST	543-3717
Richard	1001 Bishop St, Paahi Tur 1300	526-2211
JAMES ESCOBIDO	679 PAIKAU ST., HON. 96816	941-1111
Albert B. JENIS	PO Box 94 KAAAWA, HI 96730	526-2002
Steven Iimamura	5429 Oio Dr. Hono. HI. ⁹⁶⁸²¹	375-2387
Scanlan, John C.	1370 Hoopa St P.C. HI 96782	288-5965
Michael Wang	1509. Little He ST #106 HIGIWA	521-8852
Joe Reed	676 Hahaione St. Hono 96825	503-2550

Tina K

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Rolene Ikehara	2411 Pauoa Rd ^{Hono} 96813	545-8137
Aleini O Asato	1520 Noelani Dr PC 96782	455-7551
Marilyn Winesaki	1777 Honolulu St PC 96782	455-9455
Shay Blackman	91-1176 Aawa Dr, Ewa Beach 96726	681-6314
Kahani L. Pihai	92-130 Ihi Pl Kapolei HI 96707	544-0609
Bruce H. Seals	91-282 Ewa Beach Rd 96706	544-0663
Ronald Chang	95-1019 Anamakua Dr #91	626-2944
Frank A. Fujino	37 Iliahi St #0 Hono. HI 96817	533-3510
Karen Otiwii	1436 Ahamui St #16-E HON HI 96719	741-7825
CARENCE ANA TK	" " " "	" "
Jesse Hunt	2458 Sonoma St, Hon 96822	941-6317
Wesley K.	41-696 KALANIANA'OLE HWY	259-7200
[Signature]	99-801B KAMUNU ST.	539-8700
[Signature]	740 PIKOP ST - B	597-9146
Rosalind R. Anderson	1717 Scott-Smith Dr #1911	521-9968
Michael [Signature]	870 KULANI ST	(6) 220-1034
[Signature]	^{1001 Bishop St} 1600 Palahi Tower 96813	531-8031
[Signature]	1541 Dorris St #602 96822	531-8031
[Signature]	^{1001 Bishop St} 1600 Palahi Tower 96813	531-8031
Linda [Signature]	598 Hahaione 96825	395-8723

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses environmental, hazardous, and other concerns including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Thomas Jan	1047 Lolua Pl. 96817	595-8001
Ralph Murakami	433 Keholo St 96821	373-7663
Jose J...	2152 Holo Kia Cot. 96786	621-6720
Lynn Tenna	605 Hoanani St Pearl City 96702	848-5889
[Signature]	91-824 Lumianan St. DD-101 96797	676-6691
[Signature]	416-189 Noma Coop 96744	235 3532
Offuamaten	3129 Kahako Pl Kailua 96734	262 8854
Mr. Gene Hampton	734-A Ocean View 96816	734-5303
Doreen Nakao	2137 Aunikiwiki St 96782	455-2019
Lulluhulu Grace	94-1033 Aiea St. Waiwae 96797	454-6926
Carett Miller	1561 Kanunu St. #506 Hon 96814	947-9185
Mowei Lee	1561 Kanunu St #506 Hon 96814	947-9185
Juan Kakayn	91-1003 Hokuwekiu St Kapolei 96707	674-9128
Nancy Kabanawa	85-1043 Piikoa Way Waianae, HI 96792	
Gilly Meryon	211 Hoanani St, Pearl City, HI 96702	483-7688
[Signature]	6021 Haleola St Hauai	531-4621
[Signature]	1001 Kamohua Blvd	674-3207
[Signature]	5312 Poola St HON, HI 96821	313-4244
Paul M Sasaki	5312 POOLA ST HON, HI 96821	373-4244
Beverly Markaw	725 Piikoa St. Hon 96814	597-8447

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns, including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Tutomu Kakesaka	3340 Manana Rd Hon.	96822 5364036
Margaret A Nishimura	60 N. Kuakini St #5B Hon.	96817 5364036
Jimmy Okada	1515 Nuuanu Ave	QT10 96817 541-2885
J. K. Ogilby	287 Uluoa St. Hon. HI	96821
John Ichi	529 Queen St. Hon. HI.	96817 5364036
Shizue Nisono	3759 Maunaloa Ave. Hon. HI	96816
Michelle Shirai	807 Punaehana St. Hon. HI	91826 944-2901
John Cousins	3137 Hayden St., Hon.,	96815 734-8961
Robin Imamura	3257 Omi St. Hon HI	96816 734-7003
Edna Kijirami	728 9th Ave Honolulu	96816 7377151
Editha Kijirami	728 9th Ave. Honolulu	96816 7377151
Frank Okada	94450 Hawaii Pl	223 9807
Sumiko J. Ichi	1428 Kaula Ave	932-1137
Edna J. Ichi	5058 Waipuna Ave	96822
Richard Ichi	1426 Lainaia St Hon	96821
Kimiko Ichi	333 Merchant St., #300, Hon, HI	96813 521-0933
NANCY EMERI	653A WYLLIE ST. HOV. HI	96817 595 7650
Clarence H. Ester	2520 Puunui Ave Hon	96817 595-2222
Alvin Ichi	118 Kaula St Kaula	547. 4209 96734
Patricia H. Kato	1610 HOOKANI ST - Pearl City, HI	96782 436-7116

We, the undersigned veterans, their families, friends and residents of the City & County of Honolulu, their testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns, including laws, rules, policies, and ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Dorothy Allen	1074 Ala Moana Blvd	9497828
William C. Dague	618 - The Street	525-7141
Doris Zemus Hiro	1231 Loko St. Kailua	261-4362
Artie Johnson	5350 KAHALAKUA ST HH96821	395-1900
Lots Maeda	98-1784D Kaahumanu St.	450-7501
Valerie Pacheco	400E Kawaihae St	396-9997
Elizabeth Bean	626 Kaimanui St	354-5026
John Uyetake	47-504 Alawiki St. Kaneohe	239-5252
Quinlan Kobata	2648 Ipaia Pl Honolulu	586-9044
Harold A. Dyer	46-429 Holoia St, Kaneohe	235-1736
George Thakayue	98-1004 Pika Pl Aiea	488-3345
Nancy Akahane	98-1004 Pika Pl Aiea,	488-3345
	3138 Waialae Ave, #526, Hon 96816	735-0570
Kathleen V. McDonald	94-1010 Anania Cr., #83, Mililani, HI 96789	625-8961
Gregory L. Shun-yan	3111 Kaloaleaiki Rd Hon 96822	988-6034
Linda W. Hara	45-563 Keneke Pl. Kaneohe, HI 96744	247-1571
GORDON L. KRAMER	94-181 KIAHA LOOP, MILILANI 96789	623-4232
Carson K. Clevenger	1147 Loko Street Kailua HI, 96734	261-5792
Kyle M. Oarki	1709 B Kamaomahu Ave Hon HI	538-3228
Shirley Smith	930 Lunalulu St., Kailua, HI 96734	524-7030

4/28/98

mailed 4/28/98

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
<i>Lelan Nishek</i>	LELAN NISHEK	6603 Kalomau Rd, Kapaa HI
<i>Elisos Reyes</i>	ELISOS REYES	4414 Pio St, Lihue HI
<i>J. Nishek</i>	Jerry Nishek	P.O. Box 1040 Hanalei HI
<i>Gas Franklin</i>	GAS FRANKLIN	166 OAHUA ST KAPAA, HI
ANGELINA E. RAMOS	Angelina Ramos	4036 Palikea St Lihue 96766
<i>Louisa A. Luis</i>	Louisa A. Luis	4266 OAMA PL.
<i>Rosita Cadiz</i>	ROSITA CADIZ	4722 Shiku St Lihue
<i>Rosita Badua</i>	ROSITA BADUA	P.O. Box 684 Eleele HI
<i>Tom Paulsen</i>	TOM PAULSEN	P.O. Box 1086 Lihue
<i>Bernardo Reyes Jr</i>	BERNARDO REYES JR	4414 Pio St, Lihue
<i>Laine Switzer G.</i>	Laine Switzer G.	P.O. Box 2028 Pihai
<i>Esther Ordonez</i>	ESTHER ORDONEZ	4410 Hopema St. Lihue

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
<i>David Teixeira Jr</i>	DAVID TEIXEIRA JR	Puhi, Kauai
<i>Craig Kinoshita</i>	CRAIG K. KANESHIGE	LANN, HI
<i>Antonio Bernabe</i>	ANTONIO BERNABE	Puhi
<i>Michael Corvato</i>	Michael Corvato	Eleele
<i>Tetsumi Asai</i>	Tetsumi Asai	Kauai
<i>Ernest Jaoier</i>	Ernest Jaoier	Kalahou
<i>Mark Allianic</i>	Mark Allianic	Koloa
<i>G. McFarlane</i>	G. McFARLANE	HANAPEPE
<i>Michael Freitas</i>	MICHAEL FREITAS	KALAHOU
<i>Mario Igota</i>	MARIO IGOTA	HANAPEPE
<i>Shawn Yadao</i>	Shawn Yadao	HANAPEPE
<i>Blarren Louis</i>	Blarren LOUIS	Lawai
<i>Joseph Pimental</i>	Joseph PIMENTAL	Kalahou
<i>Alfred Medicinis</i>	ALFRED MEDICINIS	Kalahou
<i>John Shinagawa</i>	JOHN SHINAGAWA	WAINIGA
<i>Gary Allianic</i>	GARY ALLIANIC	KOLOA
<i>Deane Tinger</i>	Deane Tinger	PO Box 672 Eleele, HI 96705
<i>Walter Shaffer</i>	Walter Shaffer	PO Box 1403 Eleele HI 96705
<i>Larry Pimental</i>	LARRY PIMENTAL	PO Box 481 Eleele HI 96705

Please return signed sheets to: KEDEB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROK

263 signatures

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
<i>Derek G. Tokita</i>	<i>2794 Pihake St. Lihue</i>	<i>245-6276</i>
<i>Paul J. Akama</i>	<i>7280 NAWILIKILI RD., LIHUE</i>	<i>245-3775</i>
<i>Whaley M. Kurasaki</i>	<i>P.O. Box 1451 - 96766</i>	<i>245-9340</i>
<i>Masao Tamura</i>	<i>P.O. Box 905, Lihue, 96766</i>	<i>245-2971</i>
<i>Ed J. Munn</i>	<i>2449 ADAPPAHE ST. LIHUE 96766</i>	<i>245-5220</i>
<i>Richard K. Hosh</i>	<i>3921 HOOKUKI ST. LIHUE 96766</i>	<i>246-6646</i>
<i>Clinton J. Shiraihi</i>	<i>2970 Kress St., Lihue HI 96766</i>	<i>245-4880</i>
<i>Robert J. Johnson</i>	<i>3296 EONO ST. LIHUE HI, 96766</i>	<i>245-2632</i>
<i>Clyde K. Kuhn</i>	<i>2614 Alacka St., Lihue, HI 96766</i>	<i>245-9024</i>
<i>Barton H. Nagata</i>	<i>3971 Alala St., Lihue, HI 96766</i>	<i>246-9357</i>
<i>Naotoshi Imkawa</i>	<i>P.O. Box 1133 Lihue, 96766</i>	<i>245-2655</i>
<i>Paul J. Tokita</i>	<i>2794 Pihake St. Lihue 96766</i>	<i>245-6276</i>
<i>Paul J. Tokita</i>	<i>2794 Pihake St Lihue 96766</i>	<i>245-6276</i>
<i>Ray K. Huh</i>	<i>4148 Palamahu St. Lihue 96766</i>	<i>245-3105</i>
<i>John R. O'Connell</i>	<i>5394 KUAPAPA ST LIHUE 96766</i>	<i>823-0882</i>
<i>Mr. W. Yoshin</i>	<i>6038 KoloPua St</i>	<i>823-8845</i>
<i>Paul Yoshida</i>	<i>6038 KoloPua St 96746</i>	<i>823-8845</i>
<i>Al. Kunal</i>	<i>3155 AKAHI ST, LIHUE, 96766</i>	<i>P# 644-4328</i>
<i>Chieji Oyasato</i>	<i>1365 Puna Rd Kalaleo, HI 96741</i>	<i>-332-8668</i>
<i>Ray J. Kuan</i>	<i>1981 Hulaiki Ln, Kapa, HI 96766</i>	<i>823-0244</i>

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROK

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Charles m. Jaiski	5116 KULA RD KAPAA HI. 96746	822-4385
Helen S. Jaiski	5116 KULA RD. KAPAA HI. 96746	822-4385
Alvin Y. Jaiski	7285 AINA BONO ST. KAPAA, HI 96746	822-1094
Benny Jaiski	5815 HONOONO KAPAA, HI 96746	823-0166
Edward C. Shota	5151 KULA RD 96746	822-5139
June Y. Shota	5151 Kula Rd 96746	822-5139
Taduo Yashu	5832 OHE SA PAPERNA	822-1937
Benny R. Gelice	4279 OAMAP LIHUE	246-2490
Pedro Salacny	1970 HANALIMA ST. LIHUE	246-6460
^{YIMAMOTO} Chaito Abizjo	5224-A Hale. I. Ugel Kapaa	822-4191
Alvin Y. Jaiski	4444 HOPKIN ST. PUKI	245-85-3
Nitreegi Wank	5159 C. HAWAIIKI RD	822-4694
Ryota Fukushima	3132 Uluhii St. Lihue	245-324
Arthur Kypago	3296 EONO ST. LIHUE, HI	245-2632
Joshua J. Jaiski	564 Lihue Kama	245-2607
Doug Brown	5447 KUMETAO P.O	822-4225
Makoto Jaiski	Box 823 Kapaa, HI. 96746	822-6127
Missie Jaiski	397 HALE PLACE KAPAA, HI 96746	822-9584
Elmer K. Yoshida	P.O. Box 206 Kealia, HI. 96751	822-2426
	PO BOX 3642 Lihue HI 96706	245-9074

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BRO

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Amy H. Yamada	2983 Puahoke St Lihue	245-6024
Carol Gail Palau	3233 Palau St, Lihue	245-2895
Marlynn E. Nakamine	PO Box 675 Kalaheo	332-8160
Steve Bergin	POB 236 Kaunakani 96747	335-0888
Carl [Signature]	3180 Alohi St. Lihue 96766	245-3000
Fau Hanaka	5881 Ahaka St Kapaa 96746	822-3838
Andrina K. Makahala	PO BOX 641 Kekaha	331-1598
Ether Lanohan	PO. Box 888 Kalaheo ⁹⁶⁷⁴¹	335-5000
Nath Muraolu	Box 1212 Lihue	246-0332
Kosei Tomashiro	5004 Leipo Rd. Kapaa	822-4638
Chokichi Tomashiro	5170 Kula Rd. Kapaa	822-5917
Sueko Tomashiro	5170 Kula Rd. Kapaa	822-5917
Waga Tomashiro	5170 Kula Rd. Kapaa	822-5917
Bobby Kura	405 B Wailana Rd.	822-4793
Hobousi Olan	376 Wailana Rd.	822-4835
Hela Olan	376 Wailana Rd.	822-4835
Arden Ahama	376 Wailana Road	822-4835
K. Olan	5180 Hala Lio Rd, Kapaa	822-0319
Lopka M. Naito	5137 Kula Rd, Kapaa	822-4645
Tomio K. Naito	5137 Kula Rd Kapaa	822-4645

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROK

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
<i>J. Mochy</i>	3220 Umi St. Lihue, HI 96766	245-2073
<i>Mai Hood</i>	P.O. Box 723, Lihue HI 96766	246-6862
<i>Yvoni Watanabe</i>	PO Box 1014 Lawai HI 96765	772-9786
<i>Maude Kikoyama</i>	127 Melia St. Kapaa HI 96746	822-2792
WARREN MIYAO	Box 76 LAWAI HI 96765	241-6857
<i>Joel Smith</i>	6634 ALAHELE ST. 96746	822-1819
<i>Jimmie Mura</i>	P.O. Box 72 Koloa, HI 96756	742-6065
<i>Joe C. C.</i>	P.O. Box 180 Eleele, HI 96705	335-3252
<i>Ruell J. J.</i>	302 Kihapai Kapaa 96746	822-9246
<i>R. K.</i>	P.O. Box 67 HANAPEPE 96716	338-9977
Aileen Higashi	P.O. Box 1342 Lihue, HI 96766	245-682
<i>[Signature]</i> <small>RYAN NISHIKAWA</small>	P.O. Box 148, HANAPEPE, HI	335-3656
<i>[Signature]</i> <small>EDWIN SUGAWARA</small>	PO Box 1135 WAIMEA HI	338-9920
<i>[Signature]</i> <small>TROY K. TANIGAWA</small>	2707 ANAPANE ST. LIHUE HI	245-3235
<i>[Signature]</i>	PO Box 76 Lawai HI	332-8119
<i>[Signature]</i>	P.O. Box 98 Waimea HI	8778-1774
<i>[Signature]</i>	P.O. Box 504 Lihue HI 96766	245-3014
<i>[Signature]</i>	P.O. Box 23 Lawai, HI 96765	332-9936
<i>[Signature]</i>	103 Lihue St, Kapaa 96746	821-2164
<i>[Signature]</i>	2970 Halekapa Rd #202 Lihue 96766	245-3196

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROU

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Lynn Kuwabara	4433 ANONUI ST LIHUE	245-4216
Timothy Albao	P.O. Box 164 Kapaa	822-5685
Patty Lyons	PO BOX 1408 Kapaa	823-6654
CHESTER ALFILER	319 LANAKILA RD KAPAA	822-7092
KEONG TR Villabrille	5814 MELI PL	822-9426
DORIS ABULLOS	P.O. Box 1002, KEKAHA	337-1274
LUCIANI UUIRA	P.O. Box 72, KOLON, HI 96756	742-6065
JURELL ASAKI	P.O. Box 213 Hanamauluhi, HI 96715	245-9091
Bernal Canaval	1814 PUNKIA ST., Kapaa 96746	822-7064
Josa Tallizon	444 RICE ST. LIHUE HI 96766	241-6277
THOMAS TAKATSUKI	5259 Kikei Pl Kapaa, HI	822-4455
Verna Baucus	3214 AKAHU A. LIHU, HI	241-6598
Joyce C. Schuerer	5768A Kuamoo Rd. Kapaa, HI	241-6594
Henry Sumamura	5754 KOALI ST. Kapaa, HI 96746	241-6610
Almazan	P.O. Box 44 Hanalei	826-6284
Annette Ito	185 Pahaa Pl Kapaa 96746	822-0231
Rieky Watanabe	PO Box 1014 Lawai, HI 96765	332-9796
Bliss	P.O. Box 311 LIHUE HI 96766	639-0101
William A.	PO Box 143, KOLON HI 96756	745-1927

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROU

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Vahe Fountain - Tanigawa	2707 Apapane St. Lihue, HI 96766	245-3235
HENRY TAKIGUCHI	P.O. Box 1846 LIHUE 96766	823-0480
Verna Yamase	Box 3025, LIHUE 96766	245-8965
Eugene K. Jimenez	4437 Pi'iwei Pl., Koloa 96756	242-9125
Ronald T. Shuntam	4290 KAILUWA ST. LIHUE 96766	245-7070
Galton K. Kuroki	3157 HARACKA ST LIHUE 96766	245-2450
MYLES I SUBMITAN	3907 PALANI RD LIHUE 96766	246-6166
Brian Younck	5971 Kawaihau Rd. Lihue 96766	822-3808
Oberto King	329 Lanakila Rd Kapaa, HI 96746	822-5353
Philma P. Oda	5132 Kula Rd, " "	822-1933
Yasuko Kano	P.O. Box 1120, Kapaa, HI 96746	822-9882
Byron de Tarach	336 Eggerking Road Kapaa	822-0921
V. Gaike	5100 Kula Rd. Kapaa. HI	822-4685
Tatsuro Odo	5132 Kula Rd Kapaa	HI 822-1933
Richard Kubota	186 Lolo Rd. Kapaa, HI	822-5593
Stanley Wakayama	378 Makani Rd	822-4753
Wallace Shota	300 Eggerking Rd Kapaa	822-5009
Shou N. Shota	300 Eggerking Rd Kapaa	822-5009
Mitsuo Saito	310 Eggerking Rd. Kapaa	822-4353
Asano Saito		

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROKE

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME

MAILING ADDRESS

PHONE NO.

Kaplan Oda

5137 Kala Rd

822-4645

Wiley Yamane

311 Hookepa Pl

822-4095

Edith Hachigane

316 Hookepa Rd

822-3026

Yoshiko Takeuchi

774 Hookepa Rd

822-5007

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROK

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submit this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
George N. Ashita	6053 Oloheua Rd Kapaa	822-4898
Margaret Y. Ostina	6053 Oloheua Rd, Kapaa	822-4898
Dale Muraoka	1993 Hualdi Dr. Kapaa HI	822-4164
Furuta Jamaru	5199 Wili Rd. Kapaa HI	822-5176
MATTHEW TAEZA Matthew Tye	P.O. 1029 Ukumoa, HI 96796	338-1456
Daniel L. Miller	4746 Pelehu Rd, Kapaa, HI 96746	823-6198
Morris A. Va	P.O. Box 570 187 Kealia Dr 96751	
Robert Kuniska	4829-A Iiw. Rd. Kapaa, HI	822-5512
George Makai	4737A Pelehu Rd Kapaa	822-4568
Yvonne Muihai	4737A Pelehu Rd, Kapaa, HI	822-4568
Asaki Iant	4225 Aikepa St Lihue	245-3137
Kenji Matsuoka	3274 Palai St. Lihue	245-4917
William L. Huddy	6008 Kawakaa Rd, Kapaa	822-4650
John Iwamoto	4225 Aikepa St Lihue	245-3137
Weldon Yamate	P.O. Box 3268 PRINCETON, HI 96722	826-6056
Joan Yamane	4940 Eggeling Pl. Kapaa	822-1137
Isichi Kadota	4950 Chu Rd, Kapaa	822-4489
Kenji Okahara	235 Lauone Rd, Kapaa, HI	822-5929
Leo J. Mauer	1668 Hauiki St. Hon. HI 96819	845-4442
Satsumi Aramoto	5312 A Hakilio Rd. Kapaa HI 96746	822-4814

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROK

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submit this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses environmental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Jay M. Mura	P.O. Box 839, KILAUEA, HI	828-2190
Katherine J. Fernandez	5312A Haleiwa Rd Kapaa HI	822-4814
Gladius Oshimoto	218 Kōkōi Ln. Kapaa HI	822-0161
Clara M. Yamate	P.O. Box 3268 Princeville, HI	826-6056
Dorothy Stubbart	1250 Kuhio Hwy, A-101, Kapaa	822-0914
Shizuo Takashi	6274 Kawaihau Rd	822-5192
Ruth I. Yamane	4940 Eggenking Pl. Kapaa 96746	822-1137
Laura M. Hira	4841-Haleiwa Rd. Kapaa 96746	822-5769
Barbara Haruki	1083 Kamali Rd., Kapaa, HI 96746	822-456
Carson G. Oshita	87-230 Maaloa St. Waianae, HI 96792	668-5465
John J. P.C. Baden	5358 Kula Maui Kapaa 96746	823-0206
Shale Huzgan	3-3810 Kuhio Hwy, Lihue 96766	266-2044
Oliver Matsumoto	3022 Pua Pua St Lihue	245-6548
Miguelito P. Miguel	378 Likaka Place Kapaa HI	823-9568
Susan Gami	6894 Waimani St Kapaa	821-2348
Kevin K. Yamaguchi	5731-C Hauiki Rd Kapaa	822-3998
Walter K. Fernandes	5825 Kawaihau Rd. Kapaa	822-0081
Ernest S. Fujita	P.O. Box 203, Makalei	338-1734
Judith K. Fujita	P.O. Box 203, Makalei	338-1734
Lawrence P. Fernandes	5825 Kawaihau Rd, Kapaa	822-0081

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROK

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Patricia A. Kaitane	PO Box 3343 Lihue HI	245 2100
	Bx 115 Hanalei, HI 96716	835-5259
Shelma M. Mianich	Box 1246, Lihue HI 96766	245-336
Ch. T. K.	5860 AHAKEA ST. KAPAA 96746	822-9196
Roger A. Eben	4890 LANI ROAD KAPAA 96746	822-4341
Paul Okamura	Box 823 Kalaleo HI	332-8810
Barbara Dulata-Franklin	POB 610 Kekaha, HI 96762	337-9135
Mamie Ueno	4210 Puuwa Pt. Lihue*	245-6835
Veta S.	820 Mililani St St 820 Hanalei	536-3771
Shaw M.	5031 Heheli Rd. Kapaa, HI	651-0114
Wanda K. Kimura	2446 Postoffice Rd. Kalaleo HI	332-9377
Miriam Takahara	334 Kekaha Rd. Kapaa	822-4887
Sao Sugibayashi	2889 Iliahi St. Lihue	—
Tad Takiguchi	Box 307, Lihue, HI. 96766	245-6678
Robert Takiguchi	" " " " "	245-9042
Suzanne	6394 Ahole Dr. Kapaa HI 96746	823-8062
Gary M.	P.O. Box 403 Lihue, HI	245-7266
Valerie Takiguchi	PO Box 307 Lihue	245-9042
Carlina Murphy	4307 Aikepa St. Lihue	245-8507
Ann M.	P.O. Box 2520 Lihue 96766	246-1774

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROK

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense: We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
David Akama	POB 332 Lihue	2454527
Ann Akama	4140 Mano St Lihue	245-8010
Ernie Akama	2809 Piikake St Lihue	2454527
Young Akama	3120 Jervis St #A6	245-9650
Ernie Young	527-C Lanika St	949-0598
Ann Akama	1970 HANALUA ST #203	2453425
Kurt Medeiros	P.O. Box 1003	unlisted
Mr. William	329 KAMUKILA RD KAPAA	823-0723
Kathleen Shyn	962 Kipuni Way, Kapaa	822-9630
Dale Oshiro	4293 Heuhana St, Lihue	245-3117
Zane Akama	4140 Mano St	245-800
Eric Dang	2776 Piikake St	2460715
BRAD SAIZU	2866 AUKO ST	245-9300
Helen Dennis	2838 ANAPUNI ST LIHUE	2460798
Eldene Pang	2776 Piikake St, Lihue	246-0715
Betsy Akama	4280 Nawiliwili Rd Kapaa	245-3775
Billy Kaneholani	P.O. Box 794 Anahulu Kauai	822-0996
Stanley Quashu	4160 Palau Moku St, Lihue	2456339
Cristina Caday	3880 HOOKUKI ST LIHUE	246-4896
Frankie Thurston	6340 Koahehe St Kapaa	823.6245

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROK

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
<i>Cpl. I. K.</i>	5860 ANAKEA KAPAA	—
<i>Roy J. Doshida</i>	6476 Kaehele St Kapaa	
<i>Mark K. Iannotta</i>	2366 HULEMALU RD LIHUE	245-1651
<i>Ronald Clark</i>	5950 Kapahi Rd Kapaa	822-1888
<i>Stanley J. Dosi</i>	PO Box 984 Lihue	332-8519
<i>Arthur K. DeJure Jr.</i>	P.O. Box 42, ANAHOLA, 96703	822-5868
<i>Stanley J. Dosi</i>	Box 115 Hanalei, HI	335-5259
<i>Eric N. Yama</i>	Box 1714 Lihue HI	245 1918
<i>Steven Nishimura</i>	Box 202 Kalaheo	245-6935
<i>Ann K. Wicks</i>	PO Box 968, Lihue	245-4617
<i>Patrick H. Kahana</i>	PO Box 3343 Lihue	245 2100
<i>D. J. Gail</i>	PO. Box 370 Lawai	742-7300
<i>Betty Matsumura</i>	4716 Iwawana Rd Kapaa	822-4338
<i>Dennis Jr. Gashi</i>	330 Aina Uka Pl. Kapaa	822 0722
<i>Chris Nishimura</i>	4177 Heala St Lihue	96766
<i>Eden Edwin Cadient</i>	1570 Lanfona St. Lihue	96766
<i>Yuzo Urasaka</i>	2801 Pi Kake St., Lihue	96766
<i>Ted Stacey</i>	P.O. Box 278, Hanalei	96715
<i>Julius Jacinto</i>	P.O. Box 1074 Koloa	96756
<i>Christina A. Tomura</i>	P.O. Box 889, Lihue	96766

KAUAI 442nd VETERANS CLUB

LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766



GO FOR BROK

We, the Veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regimental Combat Team, their families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii, to further our National Defense. We believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Sadamu Sachi	3957 Hookana ST Lihue	245-9927
Mitsuru Doi	P.O. Box 15-31 Lihue	245-2365
Takeshi Matsumoto	3394 Hinakina St, Lihue	245-2652
Yutaro Kurasaki	PO Box 1451 Lihue	245-9340
Harold Hiraoaka	335 Kaulana Kapaa	822-5974
Bill [unclear]	4648 S Kala St	246-1083
Chao [unclear]	4572 Eureka St	245-5871
Euila Cao [unclear]	948 Kaulana Rd Kapaa	823-0514
Lawrence [unclear]	673B KAHANUI RD	822-9868
Donald [unclear]	1664 OULANE Kapaa	822-9030
Walter [unclear]	PO Box 1015	245-1015
John [unclear]	PO BOX 683 Hanalei	335-3083
Frank [unclear]	6392 PO Box 20 Kapaa	822-9118
Robert [unclear]	4203-B Hanalei St Lihue	246-2622
Richard [unclear]	P.O. BOX 507 KOKONA HI 96722	822-4926
Raymond [unclear]	PO Box 1366 Lihue	245-3074
Edward J Kawamura	5811 KUALI ST KAPAA HI	822-2544
Clinton M. Kurasaki	6625 ILIKI ST KAPAA HI	822-3707
Michael [unclear]	3228 Fujita St Lihue	245-2030

Comment Sheet

for the
Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF)
Enhanced Capability
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Thank you for attending this meeting. You may use this sheet to write down comments that you have regarding the EIS. Please submit your comments by May 26, 1998 to ensure they are considered in the Final EIS.

Petitions attached

Submitted by:
Mike Corregador

Please place form in the comment box or mail to:

- PMRF Public Affairs Office
P. O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii 96752-0128

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
ARTHUR C. RITA JR		PO BOX 173 KEKAHA, KAUAI, HI 96752
KEITH K. FUJIMURA		BOX 1122 WAIMEA, HI 96796
HARVEY Y. HORITA		P.O. BOX 565 LAWAI, HI 96765
LONNIE ANGELES		P.O. BOX 672 WAIMEA KAUAI, HAWAII 96796
Donna Oshiro		Box 373 Eleele, HI 96705
Julie Brayles		Box 1065 Hanalei, HI 96765
Lisa Liberato-Ariola		P.O. BOX 3806, Lihue, HI 96766
Merv Kimura		P.O. BOX 625, Kalanooa, HI 96741
Randy Seto		P.O. BOX 117 Waimua, Hawaii, HI 96796
PATRICK W. RITA SR		PO BOX 788 HANALEI, HI. 96716-0788
BERNARD J. RITA SR		PO BOX 173 KEKAHA, HI. 96752
Darline M. Rita		PO BOX 173 KEKAHA, HI 96752
ALBERTO A. HOOPY		PO BOX 907 KEKAHA KAUAI HI 96752
STEVEN K PALAMA		BOX 512 LAWAI, HI 96765
Patrick W. Ross		Box 212 KEKAHA, HI 96752
Francis K. Nitta		P.O. Box 1108 Kekaha, HI 96752
DANIEL PEIERLICH		P.O. BOX 258 HANALEI HI 96716
TED K. OKIAC		P.O. BOX 252 Waimua, HI 96796
Carlo D. Salvador		2101 Hanalei St Lihue HI 96766
DALE A. SEMOLA		3306 EONO ST. 96766
H.J. TOLBE		P.O. BOX 453 HANALEI 96716
ALFREDO T. DEMAYO		P.O. BOX 273, Hanalei HI 96716
Ann. Janette M. Toledo		P.O. BOX 396, Kalanooa, HI 96741
















Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Keala Nihon	Keala Nihon	Box 781 Makawehi, HI 96769.
Brian Sakamoto	Brian Sakamoto	Box 22, Hingopepe, HI 96716
Franklin Parragon	FRANKLIN PARRAGON	Box 174 KEKAHA, HI, 96752
Robert A. Ferrer	Robert A. Ferrer	Box 564 Kalaha Kawai HI 96740
LEROY J. GARDNER	Leroy J. Gardner	P.O. 169 Kaiaho, Hawaii 96741
David Akama	David Akama	POB332 Lihoe HI 96766
MAC LAYAOEN	Mac Layaoen	2495 Kipuka St. Koloa, HI, 96756
DAN AGAN	Dan Agan	PO Box 803 Koloa, HI 9675
YAMAMOTO, WAKU	Waku Yamamoto	Waimanalo, KAUI
A. HOEIKAWA	Alan Hoeikawa	ELEELE, KAUAI
ED KIMURA	Ed Kimura	Eleele, HI.
MIKE GREENE	Michael T. Greene	P.O. Box 755 ELEELE 96705
W. R. LAYSA	W. R. Laysa	P.O. Box 405, KEKAHA, HI, 96752
TOM HALL	Tom Hall	105 1059 Kekaha 96752
Gordon Arakani	Gordon Arakani	Eleele, HI
Gordon J. Mattos	Gordon J. Mattos	KEKAHA 96752
MICHAEL M. CARDINEZ	Michael M. Cardinez	3915 HO'OHUKU ST. LIHOE 96766
Mae N. Rivel	Mae N. Rivel	Waimanalo
Douglas Chou	Douglas Chou	P.O. Box 733 HANALEI, HI. 96716
Fayme O Santos	Fayme O Santos	1985 Koku St Lihoe HI 96766
Alto	Alto	Lihoe, HI
KENNETH BLACKSTAD	Kenneth Blackstad	POB502 WAIMANALO HI 96791
STANLEY S. NAGATA	Stanley S. Nagata	P.O. Box 546 WAIMANALO HI 96791
Kaohu Cummings	Kaohu Cummings	P.O. Box 820 ELEELE HI 96705

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Jim K. ANNA		P.O. Box 1062 Waiimea, HI 96796
DENIS LEE		P.O. Box 269 Waiimea HI 96796
STEVE NISHIMURA		P.O. Box 875, KEKAHA, HI 96752
ROD GURTZA		P.O. Box 512 HANAPEPE 96716
BRUCE K. SIIIMADA		P.O. Box 258 WAIIMEA HI 96796
MARVIN REBO		P.O. Box 546, ELEELE, 96705
GABRIEL R. GARCIA		4738 HOOMANA Rd. Lihue, HI 96766
BENN N K NARAHAHIK		P.O. Box 503 WAIIMEA HI 96796
MICHAEL Y. SKINUNARU		P.O. Box 804 WAIIMEA, HI 96796-0804
Marshall D. Ibisou		2746 Broken Lance Dr Norco CA 91760
Ronald Sillwood		813 Newell PL LEESBURG VA 20175
Bernaldo AGOR JR.		P.O. Box 328 Kekaha, HI 96752
LEON GONSALVES JR		P.O. Box 104 KAHUHOE, HI 96741
DALE K. PAHULEHA		P.O. Box 1274 KEKAHA HI 96752
Ronald W. HANASHI		P.O. Box 332 LILUOHI HI 96765
TROY ICHINOSE		P.O. Box 531 HANAPEPE, HI 96716
JAMES A. SATTERFIELD		Box 210 ELEELE HI 96705
GILBERT T. CASTRO		P.O. Box 777 Kekaha, HI 96752
HENRY KAHALE		P.O. Box 1177 Kekaha HI 96752
MILTON YAMASO		P.O. Box 77 Waiimea, (KAUAI) 96796
CHARLES PEREIRA		P.O. Box 381 HANAPEPE 96716
Steenheiki		P.O. Box 1086 Kekaha, HI 96752
SCOTT KOMISHIMA		P.O. Box 211 MAKAHAHI, HI 96769




















Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Manuel Balawro Jr.		P.O. Box 837 Kekaha, HI 96752
Waipua Kobashigawa		P.O. Box 817 KEKAHA 96752
JOEY CHINA		94-457 AIKOA PL P.O. BOX 23 MILILANI, 96789
Ronald Chun		Box 32 Waimea, HI. 96796
PATRICK S LAYFA		4119 POUWAH Rd KALAHEO
BEN B. CASTILLO		P.O. BOX 454 Elele, HI. 96705
KEVIN E. ROBINSON		P.O. Box 124 Kekaha, HI. 96752
GORDIE TACOB		P.O. BOX 309, ELELE, HI
HERBERT MIYAZAKI		BOX 313 LAWAHI, HAWAII
Gerald Higashi		P.O. Box 671 Kekaha, HI. 96752
Patrick Martin		P.O. Box 1146 Kekaha, HI 96752
John W Medeiros		P.O. Box 350 Kalahao 96741
ANTHONY PEREIRA		2294 HAKU HALE ST. 96741
Annelle Hazlett		PO BOX 366 Waimea 96796
Cheryl Bush		PO BOX 148 Elele 96705
JOHN RITA		96741 P.O. BOX 775 KALAHEO
PACIFICO FRANCO		Box 2851 KOLAHO ST. KILAUE
MICHAEL E. KOERTE		BOX 1045 KEKAHA, HI. 96752
ROBERT CASTRO		1121 RICE ST #2511, Lihue HI 96766
Sam Van Gessel		P.O. BOX 3354 LIHUE 96766
PAUL FUENTES		PO BOX 877 WAIMEA 96796
DAVID AYARBE		P.O. BOX 486 WAIMEA 96796
CLAIRE CLORES		P.O. Box 916 KEKAHA HI 96752
BEN AGUI		P.O. BOX 1248 KEKAHA 96752

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
TORRANCE EK CASTILLO		P.O. Box 297 KEKAHA HI 96752
RICHARD KINNAMAN		P.O. Box 913 KALAHEO, HI 96741
CHRIS DE FORGE		5054A KULA Rd KAPAA HI 96746
RIO DETERRIN		P.O. Box 729 Kilauea, HI 96754
W LAYSA		P.O. Box 405 Kekaha HI 96752
MARK VEGAS		P.O. Box 148 LAWAI, HI. 96765
Nelson Odo		P.O. Box 354, Waimea, HI 96796
SHAWN HANK		P.O. Box 1196, Kekaha, HI 96752
DARICK AKITA		P.O. Box 1025 KEKAHA, HI 96752
AUDREY MURAKAMI		3730 AMI ROAD KALAHEO, HI 96741
JAMES UPABE		P.O. Box 138 LAWAI HI 96765
KAIPO PASCUA		P.O. Box # 46 WAIMEA HI 96796
J. Taguma		P.O. Box 91 KALAHEO HI 96741
CHDET. MURAKAMI		3730 AMI RD. KALAHEO, HI. 96741
K AIONA		P.O. Box 1299 KEKAHA HI 96752
Gary Soto		P.O. Box 120 ELEELE HI 96705
Michael S. Kengue		P.O. Box 1141, LAWAI, HI 96765
William Kan		Box 1009 KALAHEO HI 96741
Robert WESTERMAN		P.O. Box 1162 Kekaha HI 96752
George Penner Jr		P.O. Box 394 LAWAI HI 96765
ROBERT BURRZ		P.O. Box 785 WAIMEA, HI 96796
SON Kawamura		P.O. Box 138 waimea, HI 96796
RODEL MINIA		P.O. Box 1046 KEKAHA, HI 96752
David Shimogawa		" " 1046 KALAHEO 96741

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
EDUARDO P. PAGADUAN		P.O. Box 591 96752
Jean Abreu	Jean Abreu	PO Box 160 Makaweli 96769
Sheri L. Apilado	Sheri L. Apilado	P.O. Box 181 Kekaha, HI 96752
John. Oliver		P.O. Box 181 Kekaha, HI 96752
Charles KANAHELE	Charles Kanahele	PO BOX 23 MAKAWELI HI 96769
ELENA ROIZ		P.O. BOX 156 KEKAHA, 96752
TARYN ROSARE		P.O. Box 1083 Lawai HI 96765
Charity Keamoi	Charity Keamoi	P.O. Box 236 Makaweli HI 96769
Volanda Kanahele	Volanda Kanahele	P.O. BOX 140 MAKAWELI HI 96769
		Kekaha Kauai 96752
CARMELITA GANTE		Makaweli Kauai 96769
KEDLA IEE		HONOLULU HI
SHANE BUESIE	Shane Buesie	PO BOX 1230 KALAHOE 96741
James Brown		PO Box 1025 kekaha 96752
Makana Kiz		PO Box 372 Hanapepe 96716
Christopher Provorse		PO Box 1026, Hanapepe, 96746
EUGENIO BISARRA	Eugenio Bisarra	P.O. BOX 1066 Kekaha 96752
JOEY BAGAIN	Joey Bagain	
GARRICK DWANBY	Garrick Dwanby	PO Box 923 WAIMEA 96796
Maryann Kelly	Maryann Kelly	PO BOX 29 MAKAWELI 96769
Maricel Medina	Maricel Medina	P.O. Box 272 Kaimakani Kauai HI 96747
HENRY NAKAHIKI	Henry C. Nakahiki	Box 918 Kekaha 96752
JULIA CELESTINO	Julia Celestino	Box 338-1885-96752 KEKAHA

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
GREG KESSIE	Greg Kessie	P.O. Box 488 Kekaha 96752
GIL SATTLEN	Gil Sattlen	P.O. Box 1165, Waiimea 96796
O. Dumlaio	O. Dumlaio	POB 753 Kekaha, 96752
Quentin Locke	Quentin Locke	P.O. Box 361 Kalaleo Kauai 96741
Ernesto Cezar	Ernesto Cezar	P.O. Box 1126 Waiimea, Kauai
Rodney Taketa	Rodney Taketa	P.O. Box 615 Lihou, HI 96765
Hideo P. Hasegawa	Hideo P. Hasegawa	P.O. Box 165 Hanalei
Joseph L. Makana	Joseph L. Makana	P.O. Box 718 Kekaha 96752
DOLLYAN BASA	Dollyan Basa	P.O. Box 1241, Kekaha 96752
MICHAEL TAMBURO	Michael Tamburo	P.O. Box 943 Waiimea 96796
Ricardo Pineda	Ricardo Pineda	P.O. Box 216 M. Kaula
REMEGIO CASTRO JR	RemeGIO Castro Jr	P.O. Box 421 KEKAHA, KAWAI, HI. 96752
Beverly C. Johnston	Beverly C. Johnston	P.O. Box 295 Waiimea HI 96796
Teddy Pereira	Teddy Pereira	P.O. Box 365 Waiimea 96796
Tammy Pereira	Tammy Pereira	P.O. Box 365 Waiimea 96796
IRINEO EDER	Irineo Eder	P.O. Box 463 Kekaha 96752
MARTIN E. COSTALES	Martin E. Costa	P.O. Box 525, Kekaha 96752
Janet M. Reis	Janet M. Reis	P.O. Box 484 Kekaha 96752
Josephine Alvarez	Josephine Alvarez	P.O. Box 554 Kekaha, Kauai 96752
Mary Tuttle	Mary Tuttle	P.O. Box 173 Kekaha Kauai 96752
DANIEL FERNANDEZ	Daniel Fernandez	P.O. Box 463 Kekaha HI 96752
Mary Fatsa-Tumbaga	Mary Fatsa-Tumbaga	P.O. Box 796, Kekaha HI 96752
Vernice Kuan	Vernice Kuan	Box 684 Waiimea 96796
Joanna Castillo	Joanna Castillo	P.O. Box 47 Waiimea 96796

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Klaine Kupari	Klaine Kupari	Box 269 Wai'analei 96769
Robin Haynes	Roni S Haynes	Box 124 Kekaha Kauai HI
Rizalino Parob	Rizalino Parob	Box 262 Kekaha Kauai 96752
DEON MANGAYAN	Deon Mangayan	BOX 219 KEKAHA 96752
William Saquicio	William Saquicio	Box 812 Kekaha 96752
Sofia L. CASTRO	Sofia L. Castro	P.O. BOX 421 kekaha 96752
THOMAS R BROWN	Thomas R Brown	Po Box 828 KEKAHA HI 96752
LINDA DELOS REYES	Linda DeLos Reyes	P.O. Box 1115 Waimea HI. 96796
Doreen Caberto	Doreen Caberto	P.O. BOX 724 Eleele, 96705
LANI KAJIWARA	Lani Kajiwara	PO Box 223 Kekaha HI 96752
Sarah Silva	Sarah Silva	Po Box 32 Kekaha, HI 96752
Loren Iwamoto	Loren Ito	POB 663 Kalahao HI 96741
Eloy Pascua	Eloy Pascua	P.O. BOX 799 kekaha 96752
Lui Lopez	Lui Lopez	Box 132 ahikani, HI 96769
Emalia Kanabele	Emalia Kanabele	Box 60 Eleele HI 96705
Jack Al Smith	Jack Al Smith	POB 1008 KEKAHA
M. U. Carter	M. U. Carter	Po. Box 617 Lihou HI 96705
Margalena Saco	Margalena Saco	P.O. Box 783 Kekaha HI. 96752
M. Lorenae Bon	M. Lorenae Bon	Box 130 Kalahao HI 96741
Scott L. Matsumura	Scott L. Matsumura	P.O. BOX 855 LAWA 96765
Clifford Hido	Clifford Hido	Po Box 1131 KALAHAO HI 96741
William KASHIWAZAKI	William Kashiwazaki	P.O. Box 1039 Hanalei HI 96714
Kalei VanGieson	Kalei VanGieson	3564 Ulukoi PL Kalahao HI 96741
Rita...	Rita...	

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
RICHARD JOSE	<i>Richard Jose</i>	P.O. Box 612 Eleele HI
Randy Matsuoaka	<i>Randy Matsuoaka</i>	PO BOX 905 LAWAI, HI.
FRANCIS KATAHIA	<i>Francis</i>	P.O. Box 939 Kekaha
ANGELA KAPANOT	<i>Angela Kapanot</i>	PO BOX 939 Kekaha HI
Coria Salazar	<i>Coria Salazar</i>	P.O. Box 204 Kaunakani HI 96747
BEN AGUI	<i>Ben Agui</i>	Box 1241 KEKAHA 96702
Tom Thomas	<i>Tom Thomas</i>	P.O. Box 352 Waimea Kauai HI
Debbie Shimata	<i>Debbie Shimata</i>	P.O. Box 183 Kekaha HI 96752
Bill Kisten	<i>Bill Kisten</i>	P.O. Box 150 Lawai HI 96765
PAT K. LICAYAN	<i>Pat K. Licayan</i>	P.O. Box 86 Kekaha HI 96752
Vivian T. Percira	<i>Vivian Percira</i>	P.O. Box 381 Hanapepe HI 96714
Enicia T. Bajo	<i>Enicia T. Bajo</i>	P.O. Box 43 Kekaha HI 96752
MARIA A. EDER	<i>Maria A. Eder</i>	P.O. Box 93 Kekaha HI 96752
John Kaunani	<i>John Kaunani</i>	P.O. Box 627 Kekaha HI 96752
Heidi Kaunani	<i>Heidi Kaunani</i>	HI 11 11 11
Eeraldine Kaula	<i>Eeraldine Kaula</i>	Kihei
Veda Pasqua	<i>Veda Pasqua</i>	P.O. Box 645 Eleele 96705
Adriada Koerte	<i>A. Koerte</i>	41149 Puae Rd Koloa 96756
Nelly Capino	<i>Nelly Capino</i>	P.O. Box 917 Kekaha 96752
Remedios LANGAMAN	<i>Remedios Langaman</i>	P.O. Box 314 Kekaha 96752
E. Evaristo Egencia	<i>E. Egencia</i>	PO Box 686 Kekaha 96752
Berlin A. Sadler	<i>B. Sadler</i>	P.O. Box 1127 Lawai HI 96765
Mariza delos Reyes	<i>Mariza delos Reyes</i>	P.O. Box 99 Kaunakani HI 96747

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
FAUSTINO PATRICIO	Faustino Patricio	P.O. Box 682 Kekaha, HI 96752-0682
Helen V. KANAHI	Helen V. Kanahi	P.O. Box 1006 Kekaha HI 96752
Valerie Balanoid	P.O. Box 798 Kekaha Hawaii HI 96752	Valerie Balanoid
Anariza G. Brown	Anariza G. Brown	P.O. Box 1026 Hanalei HI 96716
Oliver Medina	Oliver Medina	2603 Alakahe St. Wahi 96766
Lilia Ballesteros	Lilia Ballesteros	P.O. Box 905, Kekaha 96752
Domingo Ballesteros	Domingo Ballesteros	P.O. Box 905, Kekaha 96752
Polly Dunell	Polly Dunell	P.O. Box 818 Wahi HI 96766
Juliet C. Bajit	Juliet C. Bajit	4050 Nawiliwili Rd. 226 Lihue Kauai
Lilia T. Carreira	Lilia T. Carreira	P.O. Box 26 Kekaha HI 96752
Virgil CACAL	Virgil CACAL	P.O. Box 972 Kekaha, HI 96752
Estanislao Lopez Sr	Estanislao Lopez Sr	P.O. Box 854 Kekaha, HI 96752
Jay Zeto	Jay Zeto	P.O. Box 855 Kekaha HI 96752
Agnipina Cabubian	Agnipina Cabubian	P.O. Box 1027 Kekaha 96752
TOM K KANAHEIE	Tom K Kanakale	1970 HANAUMA ST APT # B102 LIHUE HI 96766
DOLores RAQUEL	Dolores Raquel	P.O. Box 77 Wainana Kauai 96796
KEVIN FIGUEIRA	Kevin Figueira	P.O. Box 1265 Kekaha, HI 96752
Malet Akita	Malet Akita	P.O. Box 473 Kekaha, Kauai
Rafael Vermudez	Rafael Vermudez	P.O. Box 802 Kekaha, Kauai
John Walto	John Walto	PO BOX 1228 " 96752
Rocquel GIMATHIN	Rocquel Gimathin	P.O. Box 200 Kekaha 96752
Yolanda Blevin	Yolanda Blevin	P.O. Box 4833 Wainana Kauai 96796
C. Toni Collette Toni	Collette Toni	P.O. Box 92 Kekaha HI

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
HUIAN CHENG	Huian Cheng	P.O. Box 415 Kekaha 96752
C.A. ALTOMARE	C.A. Altomare	Box 813 WAIMEA HI 96796
Cecilia Santos	Cecilia Santos	P.O. Box 364 HI 96752
BRENDA MARIANO	Brenda Mariano	PO Box 299 WAIMEA 96796
Sr Mary Jane Merton	Sister Mary Jane Merton	P.O. Box 277 Kekaha 96752
JOHN TABONAR	John Tabonar	P.O. Box 973, KEKAHA, HI 96752
Rolly Tambis	Rolly Tambis	P.O. Box 943, Waimea HI 96796
D. McMillen	D. McMillen	Box 88, KEKAHA, HI 96752
MARY ANN T. McMILLAN	Mary Ann T. McMillan	P.O. Box 88, KEKAHA, HI 96752
MICHIYO ALTOMARE	Michio Altomare	70 Box 813 WAIMEA HI 96796
Henry Ah San Tze	Henry Ah San Tze	P.O. Box 1209 Kekaha, HI 96752
Lucy Jane Thiis	Lucy Jane Thiis	P.O. Box 295 Kekaha, HI 96752
ELEONORA DE OLIVERA	Eleonora De Olivera	P.O. Box 354 KEKAHA 96752
Marydella Cruz	Marydella Cruz	P.O. Box 354 KEKAHA 96752
Corrina Castro	Corrina Castro	P.O. Box 36 Kekaha 96752
Ruf L Castro	Ruf L. Castro	P.O. Box 36 Kekaha 96752
LIDIA PASCUAL	Lidia Pascual	PO Box 761 Kekaha, HI 96752
Adriano R. Pascual	Adriano R. Pascual	" " " " 96752
Tazuo Takanishi	Tazuo Takanishi	P.O. Box 99, Kekaha, HI 96752
TERESA PERINAKI	Teresa Perinaki	P.O. Box 971 Kekaha HI 96752
MARINO BUTAC	Marino Butac	PO Box 431 Kekaha HI 96752
Estrellita Patricia	Estrellita Patricia	PO Box 682 Kek. HI 96752-0682
Deborah Paray	Deborah Paray	PO Box 273 Kekaha HI 96752

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Jocelyn Elise	Jocelyn Elise	P.O. BOX 1071 Kalaheo HI 96741
Momi Niau	Momi Niau	P.O. Box 85 Makaweli HI 96769
May Kaulani Adams	May Kaulani Adams	P.O. Box 92 makaweli HI 96769
Deborah C. Ponting	Deborah C. Ponting	POB #55 Hanalei HI 96794
Patricia Rabago	Patricia Rabago	P.O. BOX 326 Waiimea 96796
Christina Adams	Christina Adams	
Dwight L. Nagao	Dwight L. Nagao	PO BOX 3636 LIHUE, HI 96766
Owen S. Mae	Owen S. Mae	P.O. Box 656 Kekaha HI 96752
MELIE DELACROIX	Melie Delacroix	P.O. Box 507 Kekaha 96752
Irene Chikahira	Irene Chikahira	P.O. Box 374 Kekaha 96752
Lori Cosier	Lori Cosier	Box 211 Kalaheo HI 96741
Donna Okano	Donna Okano	PO Box 252, Waiimea
Ronnie Castro	Ronnie Castro	P.O. Box 192, Makaweli
RONNIE CASTRO	Ronnie Castro	P.O. BOX 421 KEKAHA 96752
Ronnie Castro	Ronnie Castro	P.O. BOX 421 KEKAHA 96752
Emilia Ledarke	Emilia Ledarke	P.O. Box 13 Waiimea Kauai, HI 96796
Crescencio Lagayo	Crescencio Lagayo	P.O. BOX 345 Kaimakani, KAUAI, HI
Juanita Lagayo	Juanita Lagayo	" " 346 " " "
Sharon Tongo	Sharon Tongo	P.O. Box with Kekaha HI 96752
Cecilia Gotthard	Cecilia Gotthard	PO Box 111 Kekaha HI 96750
Arly Tongo	Arly Tongo	P.O. Box 997 Kekaha 96752
Pedro B. Biana	Pedro B. Biana	P.O. BOX 382 Kekaha 96752
Leonida V. Biana	Leonida V. Biana	P.O. BOX 382 Kekaha HI 96752

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
HARVEY J. KAUAHI	Harvey J. Kauahi	P.O. Box 507 LAWAI HI 96765
BRIAN CAVALLO	Brian Cavallo	P.O. Box 3829 KAUAI HI 96760
GLENN MOSSMAN	Glenn Mossman	P.O. Box 42 Kekaha HI 96752
KENNETH J. SANDER	Kenneth J. Sander	P.O. Box 1102 Kekaha HI 96752
DANNY CANON	Danny Canon	P.O. Box 1872 KOLOA, HI 96756
BILL BIRKHOFF	Bill Birkhoff	P.O. Box 28 ANAHOA HI 96703
Pat. Kaneshiro	Pat. Kaneshiro	P.O. Box 474, Kekaha, HI, 96752
Richard Lavens	Richard Lavens	P.O. Box 1247, Kekaha, HI, 96752
CRAIG WALL	Craig Wall	P.O. Box 267 KILAUEA, HI, 96754
MELISSA PACHECO-AGUIRRE	Melissa Pacheco-Aguirre	PO Box 894 KOLOA, HI 96756
ROBERT M BRONOWY	Robert M Bronowy	P.O. Box 473 KALAHOE HI 96741
ROBERT A. CECCONI	Robert A. Ceconi	6020-A OPAEKAA RD. KAPAA 96746
RANDY L BAAB	Randy L Baab	Box 3283 LIHUE HI 96766
William G. McLaughlin	William G. McLaughlin	P.O. Box 1014 Hanalei HI 96714
TRACY J. SORIO	Tracy J. Sorio	P.O. Box 176 WAIMEA KAUAI, HI. 96796
MARC I. TAMMORU	Marc I. Tammoru	200 EGGERSKING RD. KAPAA, HI 96746
PETER T CAALIM	Peter T Caalim	POB 822 LAWAI KAUAI 96765
EMER RAMELB	Emer Ramelb	PO Box 670 ELEELE, HI 96705
Wesley K. Yadoo	Wesley K. Yadoo	P.O. Box 984 Kekaha, HI 96752
NELSON Y CHIRPA	Nelson Y Chirpa	PO. Box 723 Waimea HI. 96796
MARK MASONATO	Mark Masonato	PO Box 809 Kalalau HI 96741
COLETTE L. KAUAHI	Colette L. Kauahi	P.O. Box 507 Lawai, HI 96765
Richard A. MASJAR	Richard A. Masjar	P.O. Box 370, KEKAHA, HI 96752

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Alonso J. Alvarez	<i>Alonso J. Alvarez</i>	4437 Aniani St Lihue, HI 96761
BRIAN R.T. HIGA	<i>Brian R.T. Higa</i>	5631 KULA MAU ST KAPAA HI 96746
ALAN K. YAMAGATA	<i>Alan K. Yamagata</i>	P.O. Box 93 Hanalei, Kauai, HI 96716
HARRY H. NAGAMINE	<i>Harry H. Nagamine</i>	2555 Hoolulu St Lihue HI 96766
LES SUEYASU	<i>Les Sueyasu</i>	Box 268 WAIMEA, HI 96796
MICHAEL YOUNG	<i>Michael Young</i>	Box 1158 KEKAHA, HI 96752
ROBERT M. MIRAFREITES	<i>Robert M. Mirafreites</i>	1970 HANALIMA ST. UNIT 5106 LIHUE, HI. 96766
Randy Ahrens	<i>Randy Ahrens</i>	P.O. BOX 951 Kekaha HI - 96752
Kenny Youngman	<i>Kenny Youngman</i>	P.O. BOX 1035 Waima 96796
Ray Aoki	<i>Ray Aoki</i>	P.O. Box 869 KEKAHA HI 96752
GEORGE YANGUO	<i>George Yanguo</i>	P.O. BOX 1104 KEKAHA, HI. 96752
MANUEL CABRAL	<i>Manuel Cabral</i>	P.O. BOX 282 Hanalei, HI 96716
Michael Castillo	<i>Michael Castillo</i>	P.O. Box 386 Waima Kauai HI: 96796
EUTENE SHIMAI	<i>Eutene Shimai</i>	P.O. Box 2267 Pihahi HI. 96766
Dwyle Lee	<i>Dwyle Lee</i>	P.O. Box 1191 WAIMEA, HI 96796
Fernando Carillo	<i>Fernando Carillo</i>	P.O. Box 174 KEKAHA HI 96752
TOOD YAMAGUCHI	<i>Tood Yamaguchi</i>	P.O. Box 2417 Waima Kauai HI.
FERNANDO BROWN	<i>Fernando Brown</i>	2915 OHI OHI ST LIHUE
Russell Ruiz	<i>Russell Ruiz</i>	P.O. Box 999 KEKAHA, HI. 96752
Edward Cabral	<i>Edward Cabral</i>	P.O. Box 62 KALAHOU, HI. 96741
CAESAR JARDIN	<i>Caesar Jardin</i>	P.O. Box 725 KALAHOU HI 96741
WALLACE FERREIRA	<i>Wallace Ferreira</i>	P.O. Box 454 KALAHOU HI 96741
MARIO RIVERA	<i>Mario Rivera</i>	1970 Hanalima St. B2D1 Lihue HI 96766

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Dorothy Costa	Dorothy Costa	P.O. Box 198 Kalahou
Beatrice Silva	Beatrice Silva	P.O. Box 238 Kalahou
Stanley Kobayashi	Stanley Kobayashi	P.O. Box 1193, Kalahou
Jack Moffi	Jack Moffi	Box 1150 Lihue
Jodie Silva	Jodie Silva	Box 1150 Lihue
Jean Kakuda	Jean Kakuda	Box 173 Waimea
HELEN CALLAHAN	Helen Callahan	P.O. Box 1038 Hanalei
TATSUO OKIKAWA	Tatsuo Okikawa	Hanapepe
JOEY GRADOK	Joey Graddock	ELEE-
KAREN I. McGUIRE	Karen I. McGuire	Box 13 Kalahou HI.
Shandra Macatee	Shandra Macatee	P.O. Box 251 Eleele
GLENN AYAN	Glenn Ayan	P.O. Box 686 WAIMEA, KAUAI
Orval Smiley	Orval Smiley	Box 43 ELEELE
Marjorie Nakashima	Marjorie Nakashima	P.O. Box 612, Kalahou 96741
Mitsugi Nakashima	Mitsugi Nakashima	P.O. Box 612, Kalahou, HI 96741
Alfred Garcia	ALFRED	P.O. Box 1 Kalahou 96741
Jasper Applegate	Jasper Applegate	General Delivery Lawai
Estela Rodriguez	Estela Rodriguez	PO BOX 206 ELEELE HI 96741
Gertrude Saiti	Gertrude Saiti	P.O. Box 516 Kalahou HI 96741
Tony Yamaguchi	Tony Yamaguchi	Box 201 Eleele 96741
Ramon Garcia	Ramon Garcia	P.O. Box 959, Lawai, 96741
Ray Myers	RAY MYERS	PO BOX 500 HANAPEPE, HI. 96716
Robert Jimeno	ROBERT JIMENO	P.O. BOX 831 ELEELE, HI 96705

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Bernice Omiako	Bernice Omiako	PO. Box 0932 Ele-ele HI
Brenda Lampite	Brenda Lampite	PO Box 6811 Kakaia HI 96752
JANET GROSS	[Signature]	Box 479 Waioli HI 96705
Priscilla Oradelli	[Signature]	P.O. Box 142 Kalaheo Kauai 96705
D. Winchester	[Signature]	P.O. Box 561 Elele 96705
Regina Parao	[Signature]	PO. Box 190 Elele HI 96705
Neil NARSHIMIA	[Signature]	PO Box 354 Kaimukani HI 96747
Marlene Cadiente	Marlene Cadiente	P.O. Box 354 Kaimukani 96747
Arminda P. Abigania	Arminda P. Abigania	P.O. Box 2 Elele, HI. 96705
Luciano Bustillo	[Signature]	P.O. Box 674 ELELE HI 96705
MAEIE F MARIANI	[Signature]	P.O. B. 615 ELELE HI 96705
Annette Kagawa	Annette Kagawa	Kalahou.
Neill Domingo	Neill Domingo	Waiman
Jeanell Cabral	Jeanell Cabral	Kalahou
Monica S. Garcia	[Signature]	Lawai
Lois of Gross	[Signature]	1111
Margaret Simao	Margaret Simao	P.O. Box 00 Elele 96705
PO SHIMONIS	[Signature]	P.O. Box 184 HANATEPE 96716
XIAKAYA Julia	[Signature]	Waiman
Carlens L Peratta	Carlens L Peratta	
Wilfred J. Peratta	Wilfred J. Peratta	
Priscilla Nitta	Priscilla M. Nitta	3794 Kikee Rd Kalahou HI 96702
Masako Nabata	[Signature]	Hanapepe
Trish Patricia	[Signature]	P.O. Box 1034 96716

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Momon Hespanha		P.O. Box 568 Kekaha
KEITH PIGRO		P.O. Box 976 Kekaha HI 96752
JEFFER A. LEE		3419 Aeo St. Kalaheo HI 96741
URSUE ODO		P.O. 129 WAIMEA
GERARDO MARARAGAN		P.O. Box 809, KEKAHA, HI 96752 Kauai, HI, 96769
MEL K. WATANABE		P.O. Box 690-034 Makaweli
DEAN L. ALMEIDA		P.O. Box 921 KALAHEO 96742
GEORGE LOCKE		P.O. Box 361 KALAHEO 96742
DALLACE BURTON		P.O. Box 711 KALAHEO 96741
WARREN GOLDEN		P.O. Box 531 KEKAHA 96752
Helena Oyamot		1612 Japan Pl. Kapaa HI 96746
Sue Ann Char		P.O. Box 746 Hanalei, HI 96716
MICHAEL NAUDEM		P.O. Box 50901 Eke'eke, HI 96705
Karin Barnard		P.O. Box 50900, Eleele, HI. 96705
WAYNE M. RAPOZO		2914 ALO ALO PL. LIHUE 96766
Steve		4396 Malama aina, Kalaheo 96753
Altha Yorkman		POB 201 Kekaha HI 96752
SHANE FERNANDEZ		P.O. Box 572 WAIMEA 96796
Simon V. Alvarez		P.O. Box 346 Kekaha HI 96752
James Nadatani		P.O. Box 301 Eleele, HI. 96705
Howard Odo		5251 Kuaapuni Rd Kapaa HI 96746
XAVIER IGUALIS		P.O. Box 583 Kekaha, Kauai HI
Darlene Casmass		P.O. Box 860, Eleele, HI 96705
DEANIE IKEHARA		4464 KOMOHANA PL. LIHUE, HI 96766

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
GENIE CARVALHO	<i>Genie Carvalho</i>	5258 LUKONA ST. LIHUE
GREGORY PERREIRA	<i>Gregory Perreira</i>	PO BOX 174 HANALEI
EDWARD L. VECOLIO JR	<i>Edward L. Vecolio Jr</i>	5159 LOKOKE ST KAPAA HI
JASON K. NAKAMURA	<i>Jason K. Nakamura</i>	403250 HOOLIMALIMA PT. LIHUE.
S. Chris Yoo	<i>S. Chris Yoo</i>	2088 PUNKA ST KAPAA HI 96706
Henry Nishikawa	<i>Henry Nishikawa</i>	302 GENUA HINE ST LIHUE HI 96706
Priscilla Soares	<i>Priscilla Soares</i>	PO BOX 239, LAWAI HI
Damian De Costa	<i>Damian De Costa</i>	PO Box 913 Waimea
Timothy M. Octavio	<i>Timothy M. Octavio</i>	P.O. Box 667 KAHALA HI 96741
ROBERT A. HEDIN	<i>Robert A. Hedin</i>	PO BOX 649 KAHALA HI 96741
Howard Frank	<i>Howard Frank</i>	P.O. Box 717 KAHALO HI 96741
Joseph Raposo	<i>Joseph Raposo</i>	PO Box 430 Hanalei HI 96716
ROD MOURA	<i>Rod Moura</i>	4259 KAANA ST. LIHUE 96706
Patrick	<i>Patrick Reis</i>	P.O. Box 156 - Kekaha, HI
GODFREY PERREIRA	<i>Godfrey Perreira</i>	4140 WAIAHI ST LIHUE 96706
ERNE FERREIRA	<i>Ernie Ferreira</i>	4363 KAHALO DR KAHALO, HI 96741
THOMAS BAPTISTA	<i>Thomas Baptista</i>	P.O. Box 661 WAIAHEA HI 96796
MARVIN RIBEIRO	<i>Marvin Ribeiro</i>	P.O. Box 306 WAIAHEA 96796
MICHAEL SANTOS	<i>Michael Santos</i>	P.O. Box 1152 Waimea 96796
ELLIOTT GALAZA	<i>Elliott Galaza</i>	4570 KUA RD 96741
Kennii Gibson	<i>Kennii Gibson</i>	5501 KUA RD 96746
RICHARD BEN	<i>Richard Ben</i>	P.O. Box 501 KEEKAHA 96752
Clifton Adolph	<i>Clifton Adolph</i>	P.O. Box 552 LAWAI HI 96761

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
RANDY R. CHINEN	Randy R. Chinen	P.O. Box 1133 Kekaha
Jose. Chinen	Jose Chinen	PO Box 394 Kekaha
Gracelena Baird	Gracelena Baird	5086 PUUWAI Rd KALAEHO, HI 96741
David Lomen	David Lomen	P.O. Box 249 Makaweli, HI 96769
Lyndel Erdmann	Lyndel Erdmann	P.O. Box 1093 Waiimea, HI 96796
Eric Erdmann	Eric Erdmann	P.O. Box 1093 Waiimea, HI 96796
Jacqueline Matsuura	Jacqueline Matsuura	PO Box 225 Waiimea, HI 96796
DAVID KAGAWA	David Kagawa	Box 293 Waiimea, HI 96796
MICHAEL LUI PUA	Michael Lui Pua	Box 227 Makaweli 96769
Helen H. Masaki	Helen H. Masaki	P.O. Box 687 Waiimea, HI 96796
LEONORA C. VIDINHA	Leonora C. Vidinha	P.O. Box 227 MAKAWELI, HI 96769
Elaine Ganeko	Elaine Ganeko	P.O. Box 602 Kekaha Kauai 96752
DORIS CROWELL	Doris Crowell	PO Box 598 Waiimea, HI 96796
Yasuko Sugawara	Yasuko Sugawara	P.O. Box 245 " " 96796
YAEKO SUGAWARA	Yaeiko Sugawara	P.O. Box 254 " " 96796
JOHN HOLT	John Holt	P.O. Box 1012 Kekaha HI 96752
Lakene P. Holt	Lakene P. Holt	POB 1012 Kekaha, Kauai HI 96752
Lillian Hayashi	Lillian Hayashi	3308 Kana Kolu St Lihue HI 96766
Leon P. Holt	Leon P. Holt	P.O. Box 723 Kekaha, HI 96752
William Woodall	William Woodall	PO Box 198 Waiimea
June Woodall	June Woodall	"
Sheri Kataoka	Sheri Kataoka	"
Rose Marie Johnston	Rose Marie Johnston	PO Box 355 Waiimea, HI 96796

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address 96748
Keraton Honma	<i>[Signature]</i>	P.O. Box 315 Kaula, Kauai
Margaret Rita	MR	PO Box 223 Kalahao 96741
William Rita	WR	Po Box 223 Kalahao 96741
Stacie Boucher	Stacie Boucher	4121 Ohi Pl Kalahao, HI 96741
Hilda Perreira	Hilda Perreira	P.O. Box 345 KALAHAO, KAUAI HI 96741
George FERRIERS	George Ferriers	P.O. Box 345 Kalahao Kauai HI 96741
Charlene Amalocin	Charlene Amalocin	Kekaha
Amy Conner	Amy Conner	Eleele
Stephen Matsumoto	Stephen Matsumoto	P.O. Box 811 Kalahao HI 96741
Lei Carineo	Lei Carineo	P.O. Box 180 Hanalei HI 96741
Ernesto Rod	Ernesto Rod	P. O. Box 206 Eleele
Mei Lin Miyashiro	Mei Lin Miyashiro	Eleele, HI 96741
Elma Jagodi	Elma Jagodi	Wahiawa, HI 96796
Larson Garrison	Larson Garrison	Lihue, Kauai, HI 96766
L. J. S. Sr	L. J. S. Sr	Lihue, Kauai 96765
Allan NITTA	Allan Nitta	Kekaha, Kauai 96752
Larry Ragasa	Larry Ragasa	Kalahao, Kauai 96741
Karen Ingram	Karen Ingram	P.O. Box 921 Kekaha HI 96752
STAN SEKIMOTO	Stan Sekimoto	4330 KAUAI BEACH DR #D-9 LIHUE, HI 96766
VATERIE TEXEIRA	Vaterie Teixeira	4330 Kauai Beach Dr. D-9 Lihue HI 96766
Hilda Kamin	Hilda Kamin	Lihue
Byron Watanabe	Byron Watanabe	4721 Waihi Pl Lihue HI 96766
Patrick R. CASRELO	Patrick R. Casrelo	1215 Kamaha Rd. 96746
Michael Corregebra	Michael Corregebra	P.O. Box 1085, Kalahao, HI 96741

Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Elizabeth A. RITA	<i>Elizabeth Rita</i>	P.O. Box 1270 Kalahou, HI 96741-1270
Elton Montomay	<i>Elton Montomay</i>	Box 404 Eleele HI 96705
Betsy A. Shimogawa	<i>Betsy A. Shimogawa</i>	2285 Pelelen St. Kalahou HI 96741
Edwino Shimogawa	<i>Edwino Shimogawa</i>	2285 PELELEN ST, KALAHOU
Maricann K. Ferreira	<i>Maricann K. Ferreira</i>	P.O. Box 504 Kalahou, Kauai, HI 96741
MARIA LUISA YASAGI	<i>Maria Luisa Yasagi</i>	P.O. Box 116 Kaunakakai Kauai HI 96717
Josephine Kuli	<i>Josephine Kuli</i>	P.O. Box 382 Hanalei HI 96746
Annette Ventura	<i>Annette Ventura</i>	Box 855 Eleele, HI 96705
Todd Ozaki	<i>Todd Ozaki</i>	Box 278 Kalahou Kauai 96741
Magdalen Mission	<i>Magdalen Mission</i>	P.O. Box 15 Makaweli, HI. 96769
Arden Wong	<i>Arden Wong</i>	P.O. Box 710 Kekaha, HI 96752
Richard Mission	<i>Richard Mission</i>	P.O. Box 15 Makaweli, HI 96769
Victor Villanueva	<i>Victor Villanueva</i>	P.O. Box 553 Waima, HI, 96746
Glenn M. Jurek	<i>Glenn M. Jurek</i>	P.O. Box 27 Kaunakakai HI 96717
Marie Pausti	<i>Marie Pausti</i>	P.O. Box 428 Eleele HI 96705
Anchalee Mchahy	<i>Anchalee Mchahy</i>	P.O. Box 178 Hanalei, HI 96741
RAY G. ALAYVILK	<i>Ray G. Alayvilk</i>	P.O. Box 26 Eleele HI 96705
NORMAN P. CABRAL	<i>Norman P. Cabral</i>	P.O. Box 342 Hanalei, HI 96746
MANUEL CAMANAN	<i>Manuel Camanan</i>	P.O. Box 647 LAWAI, HI 96765

PETITION







**We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau
support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF
and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's
role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high
technology employer:**

Signature	Print Name	Address
	Robert Mullins	2859 Milo Hae, Koloa 96756
	GENE BULLOCK	BOX 1022 KAWAHEO HI 96741
	Nina Medeiros	P.O. Box 850 Kalahou, HI 96741
	RICHARD IRWIN	3441 AEO St. Kalahou, HI 96741
	RON KOUCHI	4164 H-li St Lihue
	Tim Dawson	PO. Box 912 KALAHOU, HI 96741
	BETTY CHANDLER	3748 KIKEE RD. KALAHOU 96741
	SANDRA GAGE	BOX 428 KALAHOU HI 96741
	REG GAGE	
	Robert Castillo	3442 waha Rd. Kalahou HI 96741
	Ivy M. Rivera	KEKAHA - KAUAI
	JAMES LOCANINO JR	4579 ULUPUA ST. KEKAHA HI 96752
	HUBERT WK BRANDT	WAIHEA HI 96706
	ROBERT R. VALENCIA	PO BOX 727 KEKAHA HI 96752
	EMMA L. VALENCIA	P.O. B. 723 KEKAHA HI 96752

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
	JOE SHINGAWA	4286 KALAHOO DR. ^{KALAHOO} HI 96741
	Jeanne Toulon	3888 Wai Alii St. ^{Kalihiwai} HI 96741
	SARAH HITES	5078 Nani St. ^{Kapaa} HI 96746
	R. JOE KAMAOKULA	PO Box 1318 Kapaa HI 96746
	Jane Goulogas-Youn	5917 Kapahi Rd Kapaa, HI 96746
	MARLA KAIKUAANIA	6118I KOLEPIA RD KAPAA, HI 96746
	STERLITA PAULOS	P.O. Box 2098 Kapaa 96746
	EVELYN TAROC	6377 AHELE DR Kapaa, HI 96746
	Jhyn Silva	4160 Hoala St Apt #2B Lihue, HI 96766
	STACIE L. EUSHIKEN	P.O. Box 1082 Kilauea, HI 96704
	Traeie Jacintho	P.O. Box 211 Kalahoo HI 96741
	CAROL PUCONG	P.O. BOX 1204 KAPAA HI 96746
	ANDREA KANE	PO Box 3202 LIHUE HI 96744
	Annet Peken	1740 Pun Kaa St. Kapaa 96746

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

PETITION

**We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau
support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF
and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's
role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high
technology employer:**

Signature	Print Name	Address
	SUSIE YOUN	4121 Rice St 2710 Lihue HI 96766
	Paula Rivera	4540 Fernandes Road Kapaa
	David Banew	P.O. 292 Cetina
	Don Jimenez	5785 Lanua Pl Kapaa
	Tanya Kano	5035 Kula Rd 9674
	Karen Valpion	POB 354 Anahulu HI 9674
	ETAROC	6377 AHELE DR 96746
	Alike youn	4121 Rice St 2710 Lihue, HI 96766
	Mahealani youn	6025 Richard Kapaa 96746
	Alexander youn	6025 Puka rd Kapaa 96746
	TIFFANY TAROC	6377 AHELE DR 96746
	JAY FURFERO	4030 PAUALI Plc. Hanalei HI 967

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau
support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF
 and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's
 role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high
technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
<i>Daniel Aki</i>	DANNY AKI	5319 MAKAI-24 ST.
<i>[Signature]</i>	DAIS KATSUKA	2454 APOLONE ST.
<i>[Signature]</i>		
<i>[Signature]</i>	URIME VALDEZ	1935 Pnn, Kas ST. Kapaa
<i>[Signature]</i>	Jerry Hawek	5401 Olopaq St Kapaa
<i>[Signature]</i>	Carol Munnery	P.O. Box 281 Kapaa
<i>[Signature]</i>	Kristy Leung, PhD	Kachulua 1737 - Kapaa
<i>[Signature]</i>	Gordon Yoshitani	1641 Kula Hawaii Pl Kapaa
<i>[Signature]</i>	Katherine Post	PO 148, Kapaa HI 96746

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

PETITION














We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
<i>Paul W. Proutfoot</i>	Paul W Proutfoot	3945 Hunaka St, Lihue
<i>Shari E. Ogata</i>	Shari E. Ogata	1970 Hanalima St # 201 Lihue
<i>Tuloufa L. Gaolesi</i>	Tuloufa L. Gaolesi	P.O. Box 1268, Lihue
<i>MICHAEL J. BELLES</i>	MICHAEL J. BELLES	POB 3241 LIHUE, HI
<i>MARTHA J. TEVES</i>	MARTHA J. TEVES	3411 WILCOX RD, F-66 LIHUE HI 96766
<i>D. Maile S. Taniguchi</i>	D. Maile S. Taniguchi	P.O. Box 3215 Lihue HI 96766
<i>Jennifer Uyeda</i>	Jennifer Uyeda	2836 Houlako St. Lihue, HI 96766
<i>Sandra P. Cabral</i>	Sandra P. Cabral	P.O. Box 342, Hanalei, HI 96716
<i>Pamela P. Rask</i>	Pamela P. Rask	2924 Makala St. Lihue HI 96766
<i>Suzanne Metivier</i>	Suzanne Metivier	P.O. Box 2091 Pali HI 96766
<i>WARREN STINE</i>	WARREN STINE	3742 PAPALUA RD KALAHAO, HI 96741
<i>RICHARD FRENZEL</i>	RICHARD FRENZEL	4562 KALAHOS DR KALAHOS HI 96741
<i>Lois FRENZEL</i>	Lois FRENZEL	4282 KALAHOS DR KALAHOS, HI 96741
<i>Kenneth W. Kimoko</i>	Kenneth W. Kimoko	P.O. Box 563 Kekaha, Kauai, HI 96752
<i>Robert T. Inouye</i>	Robert T. Inouye	2639 Aiekea Lihue HI 96766
<i>JAMES ANDERSON</i>	JAMES ANDERSON	P.O. Box 1203 KALAHAO 96741

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766












Petition

We, the undersigned Waimea Business and Professional Association members and concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
Paul Kanoa		5117 Lane St. (Kapaa)
David Miyao		Box 593 Waimea HI 96796
Ann M.K. Wootan		P.O. Box 1162 Kekaha 96752
MURK SCRIBNER		PO Box 884, Lawai, HI 96765
JOSEPH G. BONACHITA		P.O. Box 1271, KALAEHO, HI 96741
CHARLES BOHN		P.O. Box 608 Kekaha 96752
REID TANITA		Box 202 WAIMEA 96796
Daryl Date		PO Box 333 Waimea 96796
DAVID WALKER		P.O. Box 413 WAIMEA 96796
Myles M. Morimoto		PO Box 924 Waimea 96796
DAN HIRATA		P.O. Box 1043 Hanalei 96716
KAREN TUPUOLA		PO Box 1121 Waimea HI 96796
Sherry Walker		P.O. Box 413 Waimea
Samuel Okada		P.O. Box 175 Waimea 96796
Jamie Walker		P.O. Box 413 waimea 96796
Ethel Okada		Box 175 Waimea 96796
Chelsea Walker		P.O. Box 413 Waimea 96796
GARY MICHEASE		1685 PAPA ST. HANALEI 96716
Russell Char		2267 Peleku St. Kalahou
Jan Warren Jan Warren		P.O. Box 711 Elele HI
Wayne Fujimoto		Box 548 Lanika St, Elele 96705
John Blalock		P.O. Box 2011 Kapaa HI 96744
John Thompson		PO Box 285 Kalahou 96741

PETITION








**We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau
support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF
and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's
role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high
technology employer:**

Signature	Print Name	Address
	WAYNE KELLY'S	Lihue
	Jacquelyn Taogoshi	Lihue, HI 96766
	Leslie S. Tamashiro	Hanapepe
	MARVIN MIKASA	LIHUE 96766
	Jose Reyes	OHIO 96765
	RONALD PEEREN	LIHUE 96766
	Janice Ringor	Lihue 96764
	Carnation Harris	KEKaha 96752
	Clover Moniz	KEKaha 96752
	GARRETT HIRONAKA	LIHUE 96766
	Linda Y. Momohara	Hanapepe HI 96714
	JEAN NAITO	LIHUE
	ALFRED A. VILLANUEVA	LIHUE 96766
	Philip A Frost	Kapaa 96746
	MARTHA R. ELLIS	
	C. CABERTO	KOLOA 96756
	Keith S Ebinger	Lihue 96766
	DOUGLAS M. YARED	350 Uni. St. Lihue, HI 96766
	CLARENCE SHIRAKI	4141 PALANI ST LIHUE

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4324 Niza St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96763

PETITION

**We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau
support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF
 and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's
 role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high
technology employer:**

Signature	Print Name	Address
	OCTAVIO G. KING	113 MELIA ST. KAPAA
	ROMANO R. VALENCIA	PO Box 1142 Kekaha
	ORLANDO J. PACHECO	5727 Kaapuni Rd. Kapaemahu
	DETRICK BAUDISTA	PO BOX 1922 LIHUE
	JOANNE GILLESPIE	354 KAHALAELE KAHANA, HI 96766
	BRAD TURNER	2752 Kihue HI NOKEKOLA CR. 96766
	JOSE AZUAGA	2870 KAUAI ST. LIHUE
	JOY S. KAGAWA	POB 266 WAINANA 96796
	JEFF S. CORONA	PO BOX 3315 LIHUE HI 96766
	LOU JOHNSON	BX 664 KAPAHA 96756
	DRA DI LEONARDO	PO BOX 3528 LIHUE HI 96766
	RANARTE AGUIAS	4049 PALIKAN ST. LIHUE HI 96766
	JUANDA DINORA	3980 HALEPEST LIHUE HI 96766
	GEORGE S. VALENTE	PO BOX 512 KAPAA
	WALTON SOUZA	PO BOX 806 KAPAA
	REGGIE BASUEL	336 KOKI RD
	WESLEY UNALIKA	4795 WAIANA RD
	EDWARD BATARA	3822A HO'OHUKI ST.
	MARC K. ROBINSON	9433 KEDUNA ST.

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau
 support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF
 and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's
 role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high
technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
<i>Alton Miyamoto</i>	Alton Miyamoto	Waimea, Kauai
<i>Lynda A. U. Okaupona</i>	Lynda A. U. Okaupona	Kalahou, Kauai
<i>Jackie Cachero</i>	Jackie Cachero	Eleele, Kauai
<i>Linda Fu</i>	LINDA FU	Keolu, Kauai
<i>Fran Nاداتani</i>	FRAN NADATANI	Eleele HI
<i>Aveline Manuyama</i>	Aveline Manuyama	Kekaha, HI
<i>Floridelynn P. Casticimo</i>	Floridelynn P. Casticimo	Lihue, HI
<i>Elnora Yamataka</i>	ELNORA YAMATAKA	HANAPEPE, HI 96716
<i>Alfred Silva</i>	ALFRED SILVA	Kalahou, Hawaii
<i>Dayle Kurokawa</i>	Dayle Kurokawa	Hanapepe HI 96716
<i>Naomi Yamane</i>	Naomi Yamane	Kalahou, HI
<i>Raymond Miercha</i>	RAYMOND MIERCHA	Kekaha HI.
<i>Edwin V. Nakaya</i>	EDWIN V. NAKAYA	Kalahou HI
<i>Lisa Fernandez</i>	Lisa Fernandez	Eleele HI
<i>Dennis Polosky</i>	Dennis Polosky	Kalahou, HI
<i>Jackie Harlow</i>	JACKIE HARLOW	Eleele, HI
<i>Daryl Yasutake</i>	DARYL YASUTAKE	KAPAA, HI
<i>Faye Akasaki</i>	FAYE AKASAKI	Kapaa, HI
<i>Barbara A. Nagamine</i>	Barbara A. Nagamine	Lihue, HI
<i>Gayle A. Rodrigues</i>	Gayle A. Rodrigues	Kalahou, HI.
<i>Linda A. Kawakami</i>	Linda A. Kawakami	Lanai, HI
<i>Vincent L. Cosner</i>	VINCENT L. COSNER	LIHUE, HI.
<i>Ed Madonell</i>	ED MADONELL	Box 29 KAPAA
<i>Allan Nestell</i>	ALLAN NESTELL	4031 PAI ST KALAHOU
<i>Barbara Coan</i>	BARBARA COAN	Kalahou, HI
<i>Roman Tanner</i>	ROMAN TANNER	PO BOX 1118, KAPAA HI 96746
<i>Ed Coan</i>	ED. COAN	KALAHOU











PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau
support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF
 and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's
 role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high
technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
<i>Royden Orsattelli</i>	ROYDEN ORSATTELLI	BOX 285 ELEELE
<i>Gerardo Ruiz</i>	GERARDO RUIZ	P.O. BOX 787 KALANEOA
<i>Dennis Kurokawa</i>	DENNIS KUROKAWA	1300 542, HANAIEPA
<i>Ken Murakami</i>	KEN MURAKAMI	BOX 666 WAIMOEA
<i>R. A. Mata</i>	ROBERT A. MATA	P.O. BOX 531 HANAIEPA
<i>Vicki A. Niura</i>	VICKI A. NIURA	4378 HOPEM ST LIHUE
<i>Carey Koide</i>	CAREY KOIDE	1970 HANALIMA ST C105 LIHUE
<i>Randall J. Hee</i>	RANDALL J. HEE	P.O. BOX 420, KOKAHA
<i>Gustino Fontanilla</i>	GUSTINO FONTANILLA	P.O. BOX 277 ELEELE
<i>Ira Fernandez</i>	IRA FERNANDEZ	P.O. BOX 937 WAIMOEA
<i>Shaun R. deMille</i>	SHAUN R. deMILLE	4865-D NONOU RD KAPAA
<i>Remy de la Cruz</i>	REMY de la CRUZ	4068 Atoni Pl. Koloa
<i>Pedro G. Balisacan</i>	PEDRO G. BALISACAN	4841 PELEHU RD. KAPAA
<i>Alicia N. Sprague</i>	ALICIA N. SPRAGUE	4684 Lihue ST KAPAA
<i>Berald D. Miller</i>	BERALD D. MILLER	P.O. BOX 965 HANAIEPA HI
<i>Dennis W. Bouillon</i>	DENNIS W. BOUILLON	P.O. BOX 991 KALANEOA KAWAII HI 96741
<i>Russ O. Santiago</i>	RUSS O. SANTIAGO	P.O. BX 449 ELEELE, HI 96705
<i>Jesus Tacata</i>	JESUS TACATA	P.O. BOX 786 HANAIEPA, HI 96716
<i>Calvin H. Francis</i>	CALVIN H. FRANCIS	10 BOX 694 ELEELE







PETITION


**We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau
support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF
and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's
role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high
technology employer:**

Signature	Print Name	Address
	STEPHEN N. HANSEN	P.O. BOX 56 KEKAHA
	CARRIE STINE	3742 PAPALINA - KALALEO
	Steve Oliver	P.O. BOX 1266 Koloa
	JERRY RAQUEL	PO BOX 3575 LIHUE
	ROBERT F. QUARESMA	5100 HAWAIIA RD., KAPAA
	Nelson K. Nakaya	Box 310 Kekaha
	Tim Lorenz	4050 Papalina Rd. Kalaleo #10
	Virgie Pascua	DM 461 Kekaha
	Edward Pageduca	P.O. Box 59 Kekaha
	SHARON D. POOTE	P.O. Box 311 Waimea
	Nani Kamae	Niihau
	Kuleimom P	Niihau, Puenia
	CHRISTINE M. HONAKA	P.O. Box 451 Hanalei #11
	Joseph Vanahala	Niihau Puenia
	Harold B. Ward	P.O. Box 955 Kekaha
	Rama Kachelauli	P.O. Box 176 Waimea
	Eugene O. Santos	1985 Kaka St Lihue
	ROBERT WESTERMAN	PO BOX 1162 Kekaha #7

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
	Wayne ORWELL	P.O. 291 Kalahou 96741
	Penny C. Kunishige	PO Box 643 Waimoa, Kauai 96786
	STEWART C. BURLEY	PO Box 284 LAWAIA, HI 96765
	PHILIP MONSON	POST OFFICE BOX 3 KEKAHA HI 96752
	DORIS NEKEMOTO	PORONIA LAWAIA HI 96765
	MICHAEL D. KURASMAN	PO Box 702 Waimoa 96796
	F. Kahoa Kaohelaui	742A Lukepoo Ave HOTI, HI 96876
	Niihau	Niihau
	CRAIG WALL	P.O. Box 267 K. LAUEA, HI 96754
	GEORGE M. TAGUMA	PO. BX 854 KALAHOU 96741
	Kahilihiwa Kipapa	433 Ani St Kapehu HI 96753



46 Signatures

#49



DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

KAUAI CHAPTER NO. 5, P.O. BOX 771, LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766


We, the Members of the Disabled American Veterans, Kauai Chapter No. 5, fellow veterans, families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns, including laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME

MAILING ADDRESS

PHONE NO.

<i>Ly Le Inamura</i>	91 1013 BLEPA ST Kapaei HI 96707	674-0000
DONALD C. JOHNSON	Box 263; KAILUA-KONA, HI 96745	328-8540
ALFREDO TOBIAS	P.O. Box 1 Keolu, Kona HI	322-4093
IVAN LUNA	252 13A St Wailuku HI	944-0612
STEVE KRAWEC	86-153 LEI HOKU ST. ^{in KAILUA} HI 96734	696-5229
Donald Tam Ho	449 Puolo Pl. Kah.	871-4910
<i>John Kaseo</i>	314 Ohe ST. Hilo, HI	957-6217
Robert L. Montague	1590 KILIKUA ST. Hilo, HI	961-2528
Doris Muncer	P.O. BOX 63 Laupahoehoe	962-6067
Wayne F. Hoot	94-643 HEAIIWAA PLACE	671-8044
<i>Jim & Tamara</i>	886 LUNAKILO HAWAII RD	395-0292
Morris Kibara	228. A. KUKUA ST Hilo, HI	935-8984
ART Forcier	PO Box 8818 H-n HI 96830	734-8890
<i>Richard M. Bell</i>	95-303 Ouhale Rd Mililani HI 96789	623-2072
<i>Michael Lee</i>	84 WILIKOKI PL, Kailua, Oahu HI 96734	261-1173
JIM SANTOS	59-518 ALVARO RD. HALEIWA, HI 96712	638-9693
John A. Sheedy MD	34 Nihi St. Hono. HI 96821	373-1718
MASAO TAMURA	P.O. Box 905 LIHUE, HI 96766	245-2971
Alexander Via	P.O. Box 643 Koloa HI	747-6663
Stanley Wakayama	328 Makani Rd. Kapaa	822-4753



DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

KAUAI CHAPTER NO. 5, P.O. BOX 771, LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766

We, the Members of the Disabled American Veterans, Kauai Chapter No. 5, fellow veterans, families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns, including laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME

MAILING ADDRESS

PHONE NO.

John Iwamoto	4225 Aikepa St Lihue	245-3137
George M. Oage	3221 Umi St. Lihue	245-2727
Richard M. Fashwaba	4640 Kapena St, Lihue	245-3042
Joseph S. Oshiro	934 Makamua Rd. Pearl City HI	455-4701
Jokuyi Ono	3825 Pukalani Pl. Honolulu, HI	96816 737847
Kobe Ahoji	2033 NUUANU AVE Apt 21-B	808-521-7153
Edward M. Kahanaka	831 Puu Kula Drive Pearl City HI	(805) 415-7832
Jedward S. S.	1235 Nanea St P.C.	(808) 456-4340
A. Gonsky	1250 Nollui St. P.C.	455-4658
Chelly Aweke	99-811 AIEA HTS. DR.	(808) 488-5353
Teruo Matsumura	95-408 WAI'A LP MILILANI	623-4306
Kunio Fujimoto	829 Nanea Kai Place Pearl City	455-7410
Glenn Matsuda	94-449 KAUOPIA ST, MILILANI	623-0451
Joe Yamamoto	1530 ALA MOANA Blvd #9108	813-0110
Richard I. Uaganda	99-521 Honoana St. Aiea	488-4542
Shizuko Hayashi	1331 Holo Owa Li Pearl City HI	455-2168
Shirley M. Oyam	1428 ALA MAHANE ST	839-4414
Ray S. Mueseliga	1471 OLINO ST Honolulu HI	96818 8347732
Julie Tomie	94-206 Keaukaha Pl. Waip. HI	96797 668-2115
Olson L. Swanson	91-1013 Alepa St., Kapolei, HI	96707 674-0000




DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

KAUAI CHAPTER NO. 5, P.O. BOX 771, LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766

We, the Members of the Disabled American Veterans, Kauai Chapter No. 5, fellow veterans, families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns, including laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
Flor Rabuquen	4306 Puuole St. Lihue	245-8195
Richard Salvan	ELLELE ELLELE KAUAI HI	—
George Crowley	PO 747 Anaholu HI	639-1769
Patrick Magon	GENERAL DEL.	—
Wallu B. Souza	Box 1405 Kaloa	96756
Yasun Matsumoto	Box 39 Koloa	96916
Nicholas Muelke	Box 1210 Kekaha	337-1263
Karen J. Wynn	PO 4256 Hwy St Lihue	245-2495
Larry J. Hiroaki	1090-A Malakoa St, Kapa'a	821-1497 96746
Bob & Kathy Steele	P.O. Box 886 Hanalei, HI	335-0547
Ted V. Castillo	3714 Kikiwi Rd	332-6408
RANDY V. CARTER	5667 KULAMANU KAPPA	823-6636
Mike H. White	4808 Opuka St.	246-6608
BEN MANIHI	BX 772 KIKALIA	337-9781
Angelo Babin Jr.	P.O. Box 237	742 6915
Ross Hasegawa	p.o box 586	742 4707
R. J. FRANKSON	273 Molo ST.	822-2815
TOM BRAY JR	P O BOX 358 KALAHOU	332 8929
DAW ALWEST	P. O. BOX KWAHOLA	822 9135
GREG TARRIAN	5844 A KAWAHI HANA RD.	823-6546



DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

KAUAI CHAPTER NO. 5, P.O. BOX 771, LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766

We, the Members of the Disabled American Veterans, Kauai Chapter No. 5, fellow veterans, families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns, including laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME	MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE NO.
MARK E. HORST	5145 Lipio Rd. Kapaa	822-4599
Jocelyn Miyake	P.O. Box 2216 Puke	246-1784
Bryan Ketekoma	P.O. Box 2216 Puke	246-1784
Berkechi Matuyoshi	P.O. Box 24 WAIMEA	338-1987
James A. Jones	3343 Kuhio Hwy #4	241-3348 241-3388
Adam T. Moe	372 Pua Kapaa	821-0017
Norman L. Braun	2972 Pua Nani St Lihue	245-7215
Lupeo Sakay	4411 Kale Pl #2 Lihue HI	245-6487
Larry J. Rivochi	1690-A Malakia St., Kapaa	96746 821-1417
Donnae Pargura	4147 Hili St Lihue, 96766	245-9699
Yasuo Kijima	4240 DIO ST P - LIHUE KAUAI HAWAII	
Charles Jutz	Kapaa HI	
Clare Amode	Kapaa	
William Papozzo	Kapaa	
Don't go	Anahulu	822-5724
Ray Rapp	P.O. Box 35 ANAHOLO	822-5724
ROBERT NEKAKA	P.O. Box 977 Kapaa	635-1289
Adam Carvello	3166 Faja St. Lihue	245-0193
D. Tomagawa	P.O. Box 1694 Lihue	522-5395
H. Baker	3352 B Elim St.	245-9950



DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

KAUAI CHAPTER NO. 5, P.O. BOX 771, LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766

We, the Members of the Disabled American Veterans, Kauai Chapter No. 5, fellow veterans, families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns, including laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME

MAILING ADDRESS

PHONE NO.

ALLEN D. LEE

4667 APOPO RD KAPAAHI

823-0293

JOHN A. LUSTMAN

4229 OMAO RD KOLEA

742 0861

Ben Manuel

Bx 772 Kekaha 96752

337-9281

ALFONSO GARCIA

5707 LAIKONA ST LIHUE HI 96766

245 2804

ALEXANDRO VEA

P.O. Box 643 KOLEA KAUAI

742 6663



DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

KAUAI CHAPTER NO. 5, P.O. BOX 771, LIHUE, KAUAI, HAWAII 96766

We, the Members of the Disabled American Veterans, Kauai Chapter No.5, fellow veterans, families and friends; respectfully submits this testimony in the form of this petition, to support the E.I.S. to expand the facilities at Pacific Missile Range Facility at Mana, Kauai, Hawaii. We firmly believe that the E.I.S. as submitted, adequately addresses enviromental, hazardous, and other concerns, including laws, rules, policies, ordinances applicable to this expansion.

NAME

MAILING ADDRESS

PHONE NO.

Azoforn A Koji
Renando Manno

PO BOX 20001 LAWAI
5200 PAANAU RD. APT N2-04
KOLOA, HI

3388030
635-1375

Empty table grid for additional entries.

00

PETITION



We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
<i>Ann Blaghton</i>	ANN B LEIGHTON	4555 Paul Rd Kapaa
<i>[Signature]</i>	Larry Palmira	PO PO Box 1477 Kapaa
<i>Kaui Watanabe</i>	Kaui Watanabe	4634 Anolani
<i>Kenneth Watanabe</i>	KEN WATANABE	4634 ANOLANI KAPAA
<i>Tom Leighton</i>	TOM LEIGHTON	4555 Paul Rd. KAPAA.
<i>Mark E Van Tuyn</i>	Kenneth K. Van Tuyn	2904 Pikelio St.
<i>Jerry Daly</i>	JERRY DALY	4211 Puale ST LIHUE
<i>Onorin M. Villalobos</i>	ONORIN M. VILLALOBOS	6111 Haunaula Rd. Kapaa
<i>Kelly Francis</i>	Kelly J. FRANCIS	Box 141 Kapa Hialea
<i>Lloyd Narito</i>	Lloyd Narito	5453 OLUPA ST Kapaa
<i>Mervin Raposo</i>	MERVIN Raposo	445B OLU LD. KAPAA.
<i>R. Machado</i>	R. MACHADO	PO Box 470 Kapaa
<i>Wendell Sandobal</i>	Wendell Sandobal	PO. Box 155 Kilauea
<i>Jackie Hale</i>	JACKIE HALE	P.O. BOX 7112 KAPAA
<i>Brant Hale</i>	Brant Hale	4977 uli uli Rd
<i>Nadia Anabtawi</i>	Nadia Anabtawi	P.O. Box 1044 Kilauea
<i>Thomas E. Slovic</i>	Thomas E. Slovic	P.O. Box 1320, KEKAHA, HI.
<i>Jeffrey W. Mihara</i>	Jeffrey W. Mihara	P.O. Box 592 Kilauea, HI.
<i>Daniel Jones</i>	Daniel Jones	5415 ANAKAUA Kapaa.

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
	Paul Rathbone	Box 664 Kilauea HI 96754
	Clayton Ashita	6454 Palani St. 96746
	JAMES P. FAIN	Po box 14 Lihue HI 96765
	Patrick Rapozo	4255 Ulu Pt Lihue 96765
	LELAN NISHEK	6603 Kalama Rd Kapaa 96746
	Delores Naea	5978 Puka St. Kapaa 96746














Petition

We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Kauai, support the U.S. Navy Pacific Missile Range Facility's proposed enhancements as described in the Enhanced Capability Draft Environmental Impact Statement completed on April 3 1998:

Name	Signature	Mailing address
DAVID S. NEKOMOTO	<i>David S. Nekomoto</i>	Po Box 123 Lawai 96765
PATRICK ALVAREZ	<i>Patrick Alvarez</i>	Po Box 520 KEKAHA 96752
Gayla H. Burns	<i>Gayla H. Burns</i>	Po Box 371 Kekaha 96752
Fred Theijs	<i>Fred A. Theijs</i>	3893 Kilohana St. ^{Kalahoe} 96741
Clay Crawford	<i>Clay Crawford</i>	P.O. Box 1054 WAIMEA HI 96796-1054
<i>J.R. Des</i>	J.R. Des	P.O. BOX 676 HANAPEPE, HI 96716
Kim K. Clift	<i>Kim K. Clift</i>	P.O. Box 628 Kekaha, HI 96752
MICHAEL NIGG	<i>Michael Nigg</i>	P.O. Box 362 Kekaha, HI 96752
ZACH TAYLOR	<i>Zach Taylor</i>	Po Box 399 KEKAHA, HI 96752
STANLEY ARAKAKI	<i>Stanley Arakaki</i>	P.O. Box 841 KEKAHA, HI 96752
KATHY A. RIVEL	<i>Kathy A. Rivel</i>	P.O. BOX 933, WAIMEA, HI 96796
FLOYD NAKASONE	<i>Floyd Nakasone</i>	PO 1092 WAIMEA HI 96796
BARB AMORI	<i>Barb Amori</i>	P.O. 763, KEKAHA, HI-96752
Eatra Acoba	<i>Ehatra J. Acoba</i>	P.O. Box 644 LAWAI, HI 96765
William GEORGI	<i>William J. Georgi</i>	P.O. Box 1256 KEKAHA, HI 96752
GREG MURA	<i>Greg Mura</i>	PO Box 735 EUEUE HI 96705
Ronald T. Fujiwara	<i>Ronald T. Fujiwara</i>	Po Box 309, WAIMEA, HI 96796
DON A. DOWNING	<i>Don A. Downing</i>	1741 Kelaukia St Kaloa, HI 96756
JAMES LAWSE	<i>James Lawse</i>	3825 NANAKAI RD. KALAHOE 96741
Keneth W. Helgeson	<i>Keneth W. Helgeson</i>	3621 Waha Rd, Kalahoe, HI 96741
Thomas Bates	<i>Thomas Bates</i>	P.O. Box 1094 KEKAHA 96752
Paul Daly	<i>Paul Daly</i>	P.O. Box 759 Waimea HI 96796
Ronald Ward	<i>Ronald Ward</i>	P.O. Box 955 Kekaha 96752

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
	Allan A. Smith	4007 Maupu Pl. Lihue, HI 96766
	Michael L. Pyle	4151 NAWILWILI Lihue, HI, 96766
	SANDRA L. DAY	3915 PAPALINA RD KALAEHO HI 96741
	MARY BEAVER	P.O. Box 1373 LIHUE HI 96766
	GUIDO GIACOMONI	2358 AKOHI ST LIHUE
	LISA GASPAR	P.O. Box 704 Hanapepe, HI 96714
	Mucante H. Purokoma	574 MAHEA ST KAPAHA, HI 96746
	Remedios A. Chinen	P.O. Box 768 Kalaheo, HI 96741
	Mark S. Hubbard	2420 Kanio St. Lihue
	Patricia Rabalais	P.O. Box 1657 Koloa, HI 96756
	Leslie S. Bran	P.O. Box 1929 Lihue, HI 96766
	Victor Motilla	3981 Alala St. Lihue, HI 96766
	Alison Moriguchi	3910 MAMAKI ST KOLOA HI 96756
	LEONARD A. RAPOZO	P.O. Box 265 LIHUE, HI 96766
	RICHARD WAALAWI	P.O. Box 798 LAWAHI 96765
	Angela M. Morehead	P.O. Box 1869 Lihue, HI 96766
	SHAARYL LAM YUEN	5312 Kula Mauu Rd. Kapaa HI 96746
	Irene Hironaka	Lihue, HI 96766
	Jose T. QUERUBIN	2450 APAPANE LIHUE HI
	J.S. ROBERTSON	P.O. Box 947, KOLOA 96756

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
<i>David Teixeira Jr</i>	DAVID TEIXEIRA JR	Puhi, Kauai
<i>Craig Koneshige</i>	CRAIG K. KONESHIGE	LAWAII, HI
<i>Antonio Bernabe</i>	ANTONIO BERNABE	Paku
<i>Michael Curvath</i>	Michael Curvath	Eleele
<i>Totumi Asai</i>	Totumi Asai	Kauai
<i>Ernest Jooier</i>	Ernest Jooier	Kalahou
<i>Mark Allianic</i>	Mark Allianic	Koloa
<i>G. Millard</i>	G. MILLARD	HANAPEPE
<i>Michael Freitas</i>	MICHAEL FREITAS	KALAHOU
<i>Mario Igota</i>	MARIO IGOTA	HANAPEPE
<i>Shawn Yadao</i>	Shawn Yadao	HANAPEPE
<i>Barren Lewis</i>	Barren Lewis	Lawai
<i>Joseph W. Pimental</i>	Joseph W. PIMENTAL	Kalahou
<i>Alfred S. Medeiros</i>	Alfred S. Medeiros	Kalahou
<i>John Sauerbawa</i>	JOHN SAUERBAWA	WAINENA
<i>Gary Allianic</i>	GARY ALLIANIC	KOLOA
<i>Daave Troger</i>	Daave Troger	PO Box 672 Eleele, HI 96705
<i>Walter Shaffer</i>	Walter Shaffer	PO Box 403 Eleele HI 96705
<i>Larry Pimental</i>	LARRY PIMENTAL	PO Box 481 Eleele HI 96705









Handwritten note: 11/11/98

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

Received
9/1/16

PETITION

We the undersigned residents of Kauai and Niihau support the Navy's proposed enhancements for PMRF and recognize that this program would secure PMRF's role as a national asset and Kauai's largest high technology employer:

Signature	Print Name	Address
	Charles Kanaokami	4158 Hili St Lihue
	Tammy Paiste	P.O. Box 1018 Kekaha
	CRAIG S. YOSHIMOTO	P.O. BOX 304 ELEELE
	DENNIS K. KIKUCHI	4121 RICE ST. LIHUE
	Krystie Ibos	Po Box 74 clecte 96705
	Dawn M. Cambra	4301-A OMAO RD KOLA
	CALVIN H. SAKAI	1693 Kurego St. Kapaa
	ANNE T. MISHIMA	Box 343, Waimea, HI. 96796
	Jennifer M. Barton	4160 HOALA ST. LIHOE HI 96766
	DANNY OTA	2961 AWA MO PL. LIHUE
		

Please return signed sheets to: KEDB, 4334 Rice St., Suite 204-B, Lihue, Hawaii 96766

May 26, 1998

Captain J.A. Bowlin
Commanding Officer
P.M.R.F.
P.O. Box 128
Kekaha, Hawaii 96752

Aloha kaua,


As this is the last day to submit testimony for the EIS, I am sending copies of the petition being circulated throughout the Hawaiian islands. I have also included the cover letter that goes with the petition. Please include this in the EIS as my testimony. Included are 600 plus signatures. We will continue to circulate the petition and hopefully submit thousands of names in the next two years.

You are now on the mailing list for "ka Moana Nui" and you will be receiving the first copy in the coming month. I want to thank you and your staff for our VIP tour of the base on May 20, 1998. We wish to again extend our invitation to work with us for the conversion of P.M.R.F. to peaceful endeavors. Touring the base, seeing the beauty and feeling the mana only increase our commitment. We also realize more clearly that we must include regular contact with the State Department.

In conclusion, we wish to begin dialogue with you and the U.S. Navy to use part of the base in the year 2000 for a global concert, televised by satellite, with the message of aloha and peace on earth with the music from throughout the world.

There is great disorder under heaven, but the future is bright.

Me ke aloha pumehana,


Sondra L. Field
P.O. Box 372
Anahola, HI 96703
(808) 822-0647

OPEN LETTER

Aloha everyone!

We are a group of concerned Kaua'i residents who have been through the Stars Missile Program resistance, have analyzed our past experience and wish to propose a new approach. In addition, we are very concerned about the proposed expansion of the missile launch facilities on Ni'ihau and the northern islands.

Please join us in gathering signatures on the attached petition. Also join us in putting out a newsletter to educate ourselves (and others) on de-militarization and a nuclear free Pacific.

The Polynesian people call the Pacific Ocean "*Ka Moana Nui*"... and so we wish to give this name to our future newsletter. We invite you to join in the creation of this educational newsletter – whether by writing articles, gathering information, raising funds, helping to publish and distribute ... we need help in all these areas.

When we become well-informed, our commitment to the conversion of PMRF (Pacific Missile Range Facility) to peaceful use becomes stronger. ("Conversion" = transformation from one system to another.) We propose that if PMRF becomes a Center for peaceful training and research to meet the needs of the Pacific, that it will provide more and better jobs for our people. (We are very concerned about the "economic card" always played by the military to our Westside people.) We can also help the military to learn about the past negative effects of their endeavors, to help them to make amends and to think more in the line of building peace – rather than preparation for war.

More and more people realize we must make a major shift in our thoughts and actions. People all over the world look to Kaua'i as a Center for spiritual wisdom. Thus it makes perfect sense to begin the process of de-militarization here on our beautiful, peaceful and spiritual island.

Come join our ohana, write and get on the mailing list, make a donation.

'Ili Noho Kai
PO Box 372
Anahola, HI 96703
Phone (808) 639- 6317

Please make copies of the attached blank petition, get signatures and return them to the above address.

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish: 1) to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau, and 2) to propose an eventual conversion of PMRF to a global model, dedicated solely to peaceful uses of technology.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>[Signature]</i>	TANNA LUSCOMBE	E Lele W1 59738
<i>[Signature]</i>	BOB SHARPE	Lihue, HI
<i>[Signature]</i>	EVAN SHARPE	Lihue, HI
<i>[Signature]</i>	TIFFANY WOODWARD	Kalaheo, HI 96751
<i>[Signature]</i>	DVANE OLIVER	Hanalei, HI 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	LISA ADAMS	Kekaha Id. 93346
<i>[Signature]</i>	Laura Anderson	Hanalei, 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	James Wilson	P.O. 1054 Hanalei
<i>[Signature]</i>	JACKIE TURNER	Kapaa, HI
<i>[Signature]</i>	JANET TAYLOR	Santa Barbara, CA
<i>[Signature]</i>	LARON MURDOCK	Berkeley CA 94704
<i>[Signature]</i>	NATALYAK KOGLER	Berkeley CA 94702
<i>[Signature]</i>	SUSAN MOORE	Estes Park CO 80511
<i>[Signature]</i>	AMANDA WEYENBERG	MONTE, CA 90717
<i>[Signature]</i>	Mette Williams	Downey, CA 90291
<i>[Signature]</i>	Cynthia RIEDEL	HANALEI, HI 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	Michael Riff	HANALEI HI 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	Karnie Frankatch	3500-239 Princetown, HI
<i>[Signature]</i>	Suzanne Dramp	P.O. BOX 984, LAGUNA BEACH, CA 92652 916122
<i>[Signature]</i>	844 6TH ST #2	SANTAMONICA CA 90403
<i>[Signature]</i>	Box 289	Kilauea, HI 96754
<i>[Signature]</i>	Gwendolynne C. Little	Gwendolynne C. Little 1273 Lindell Dr. Walnut Creek CA 94596
<i>[Signature]</i>	2007 La Tanager Cir	Sandara CA 95023
<i>[Signature]</i>	KIM BOYF	2231 W. Sail La VA Bch, VA 23455
<i>[Signature]</i>	NO 279	Hanalei, HI 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	Roula Javar	San Jose CA 95128
<i>[Signature]</i>	ANTHONY NAGAMAN	NEW YORK CITY 10011
<i>[Signature]</i>	HELEN FREADAY-YOUNG	716 N JUNE ST LA. CA 90038
<i>[Signature]</i>	Ryan Orillo	New Bedford, NY
<i>[Signature]</i>	Ryan Mahony	New Bedford, NY

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends.
 When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address:
 PO Box 393, Kapaa, HI 96746

13413
 13413

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish: 1) to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau, and 2) to propose an eventual conversion of PMRF to a global model, dedicated solely to peaceful uses of technology.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS	
<i>Tanya Hashimoto</i>	TANYA HASHIMOTO	P.O. BOX 925, HAWAII, HI	96714
<i>Joshi Hashimoto</i>	JOSHI HASHIMOTO	P.O. Box 203 AHANOLA	96703
<i>Josh Tollett</i>	JOSH TOLLETT	P.O. Box 1558	HAWAII HI
<i>Sam Stelling</i>	SAM STELLING	5125 WEKELA RD	HAWAII 96714
<i>Clyde Stein</i>	Clyde Stein	5125 WEKELA HAWAII	96714
<i>E. S. Evans</i>	MRS E. S. EVANS	22 Kingston rd	Leatherhead England
<i>S. Richardson</i>	S. RICHARDSON	68 Danesree Rd	Epsom England
<i>Catta Hirsch</i>	CATTA HIRSCH	P.O. BOX 779	KILOUA, HI 96754
<i>Rebecca Romanoff</i>	Rebecca Romanoff	Box 819	HAWAII 96714
<i>Jennifer H. Prince</i>	JENNIFER H. PRINCE	Box 346A	PRINCEVILLE HI 96722
<i>Katherine Glenn</i>	KATHERINE GLENN		KILAUEA HI
<i>Lena Rusconi</i>	LENA RUSCONI	28 BATHWEST	NEAS ENGLAND
<i>Anett Allretti</i>	ANETT ALLRETTI	4110 Wailapa Rd.	KILAUEA HI
<i>Leigh Wansley</i>	LEIGH WANSLEY	3231 MT. DIABLO ST.	CONCORD, CA
<i>Christine Melamed</i>	Christine Melamed	Box 1464	HAWAII HI 96714
<i>Linda Easter</i>	Linda Easter	863 Amber Dr.	Cambridge CA 93010
<i>Terry Easter</i>	Terry Easter	863 Amber Dr	Cambridge Ca 93010
<i>Beau Barthel-Blair</i>	PO 421	HAWAII 96714	Beau Barthel-Blair
<i>David D. House</i>	David D. House	2341 Busham	TUSTIN, CA 92782
<i>Andrew Cranford</i>	Andrew Cranford	103 W. 8th Ave	ESCONDIDO CA 92025
<i>Kevin C. Wansley</i>	KEVIN C. WANSLEY	3231 MT. DIABLO ST.	CONCORD CA 94518
<i>John Silver</i>	1901 Sheldene Dr	Merced, CA	95301
<i>Mary Beth Kinder</i>	MARY BETH KINDER	758 NORTH O ST,	LIVERMORE CA 94550
<i>Pennie C. Witmaker</i>	PENNIE C. WITMAKER	758 NORTH O. ST	LIVERMORE, CALIF. 94550
<i>Turid Oliva</i>	TURID OLIVA	P.O. BOX 2107	PAHOA, HI. 96778
<i>Michael Vee</i>	POB 216	KAPAA HI	96746
<i>Lisa Kranitz</i>	LISA KRANITZ	409 S. FRANCISCA AVE	R.B. CA 90277

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends.
 When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address:
 PO Box 393, Kapaa, HI 96746

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish: 1) to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau, and 2) to propose an eventual conversion of PMRF to a global model, dedicated solely to peaceful uses of technology.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>MAREN LOUATO</i>	MAREN LOUATO	BOX 187, HANALEI 96711
<i>Susan DeLozier</i>	SUSAN DE LOZIER	Box 392, HANALEI, 96714
<i>Bettie Tallett</i>	BETTIE TALLETT	PO Box 1558 HANALEI, 96714
<i>Elizabeth Darrab</i>	Elizabeth Darrab	General Delivery Hanalei, 96714
<i>Jim Fields</i>	JIM FIELDS	100 Back Bay Schreier LA 70375
<i>Brad Crocker</i>	Brad Crocker	Gen. Del. Hanalei HI 96714
<i>Lana Chow</i>	LANA CHOW	General Delivery Kilauea 96754
<i>Laura Ferrara</i>	Laura Ferrara	PO BOX 10010 Kapaa 96746
<i>Mia Olmstead</i>	MIA OLMSTEAD	P.O. Box 1703 HANALEI HI 96714
<i>Cielle Kollander</i>	Cielle KOLLANDER	5214 Holoiki, Princeville
<i>Kelley Kiel</i>	Kelley Kiel	P.O. Box 1226 Kilauea HI 96754
<i>Courtney Kiel</i>	Courtney Kiel	P.O. Box 1226 Kilauea HI 96754
<i>Jan Vallejo</i>	Jan Vallejo	41 TIERRA CALIENTE S. BAY, CA 96754
<i>Nicole M. Adamey</i>	Nicole M. Adamey	1988 Kahoehoe St. Kilauea HI 96754
<i>Janice Tiechmy</i>	JANICE TIECHMY	PO 1407 KAPOA 96756
<i>Liz Ronaldson</i>	LIZ RONALDSON	OROWENA RD KAPOA 96756
<i>Mary Lucas</i>	Mary Lucas	PO Box 49 Hanalei HI 96714
<i>Allen M. M. M.</i>	Allen M. M. M.	P.O. Box 1212, Hanalei
<i>Mia Wilke</i>	Mia Wilke	P.O. Box 336 Hanalei
<i>Deborah Burt</i>	DEBORAH BURT	PO Box 1222 Kilauea HI 96754
<i>Joe Satrian</i>	Joe Satrian	1109 Spruce, Berkeley, CA
<i>Pamela R. Satrian</i>	PAMELA R. SATRIAN	1109 Spruce, Berkeley, CA
<i>Buzan M. Wilson</i>	SUZAN M. WILSON	Box 1034 Hanalei HI 96714
<i>Lee Roversi</i>	LEE ROVERSI	Box 723 Kilauea HI 96754
<i>Robert T. Dudley</i>	Robert T. Dudley	73-1228 Ginkwood, Kaha-Kona, HI
<i>Kameron Frye</i>	Kameron Frye	Box 327 Hanalei 96714
<i>Guy Stevens</i>	GUY STEVENS	P.O. Box 3518 PRINCEVILLE
<i>Kathleen Carroll</i>	Kathleen Carroll	1016 Ridgewood Niihau
<i>Catherine Butler</i>	CATHERINE BUTLER	1936 POU KOA CA HI
<i>Jim Huff</i>	JIM HUFF	6165 Alanihi KAPOA HI 96746
<i>Tommy Sweet</i>	Tommy Sweet	Kapaa, HI 96746

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends.
 When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address:
 PO Box 393, Kapaa, HI 96746

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish: 1) to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau, and 2) to propose an eventual conversion of PMRF to a global model, dedicated solely to peaceful uses of technology.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>[Signature]</i>	AVANETANE CABER	PO Box 910 K. LAUEA, HI 96738
<i>[Signature]</i>	AVANETANE CABER	PO Box 1041, Hanalei 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	Ginny Bel-Demos	P.O. Box 263, Boulder Co 80306
<i>[Signature]</i>	Marilyn Ream	W-324 91bhs Rd. Spokane WA 99224
<i>[Signature]</i>	Lana Shea	Genard Delima, Kilauea
<i>[Signature]</i>	BURNE MORRIS	Box 703 Anahola
<i>[Signature]</i>	AERION KIAMILNI	PO BOX 652 KIUEA 96754
<i>[Signature]</i>	Michael Feetan	401 Rinsell St. Manchester, NH 03104
<i>[Signature]</i>	Kathleen Feetan	"
<i>[Signature]</i>	FRANCIS L. BAIRD	60411 ST. BIRCHMOUNT, NE 68101
<i>[Signature]</i>	JANICE TENNEY	12364 Market Rd S Jefferson, OR
<i>[Signature]</i>	Kaulani Hepler	PO. BOX 773 HANALEI HI 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	EMERSON HENSEN	PO BOX 1105 HANALEI HI 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	ANNA MANILI	PO Box 191 FEYCO, WA 98363
<i>[Signature]</i>	Jack Galloway	1114 E. 6th Port Angeles, WA 98363
<i>[Signature]</i>	Rudolph Ziminsk	Box 832, FEYCO, WA 98363
<i>[Signature]</i>	TATIANA BOURDILLON	PO Box 1028, Lihue, 96766
<i>[Signature]</i>	Hannah Carleton	Mahi Mahi Rd. Hanalei.
<i>[Signature]</i>	Sunni Kelsa	PO Box 491 Kapaa, HI 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	Ramy Tingle	POB 181 Kenia HI 96751
<i>[Signature]</i>	Danee McFarr	907 Lokahi St. Honolulu 96822
<i>[Signature]</i>	Graham Ellis	222 Box 4524 PAHIA HI 96778
<i>[Signature]</i>	SUEPPI ELLIS	PO Box 1299 Pahoa HI 96718
<i>[Signature]</i>	DAVID LEIGH	29 E. Fillard's Ave, PAHIA, HI 96778
<i>[Signature]</i>	MARIA GAUO	PO Box 1041 Hanalei, HI 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	Ledie Beerte	PO Box 591 Hanalei 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	BILL OWEN	PO. Box 1161 HANALEI "
<i>[Signature]</i>	Bonnie A Beck	270 Morris Blvd Fremont CA 94536
<i>[Signature]</i>	SUSAN OCHNAT	P.O. Box 3420 Princeville, HI 96702

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends.
 When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address:
 PO Box 393, Kapaa, HI 96746

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish: 1) to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau, and 2) to propose an eventual conversion of PMRF to a global model, dedicated solely to peaceful uses of technology.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Renee Lippmann</i>	Renee Lippmann	PO Box 1043 Kapaa
<i>Richard Brazell</i>	RICHARD BRAZELL	PALHO - KUA I 32E
<i>Kenny Pardo</i>	KENNY PARDO	Palho - KUA I 32E
<i>Edon Zollinger</i>	Edon Zollinger	Kapaa
<i>Mark Hennessy</i>	Mark Hennessy	Wainiha, Kapa
<i>Ivori Soreen</i>	Ivori Soreen	Hanaa, Kauai
<i>Robert Westman</i>	Robert Westman	DRUCEVILLE HI
<i>Wara Cornell</i>	Wara Cornell	1903 Nob Hill Ave N. Seattle 98109
<i>Patricia Berger</i>	Patricia Berger	P.O. Box 2612 98109
<i>Jeffrey Douglas</i>	JEFFREY DOUGLASS	" " " Coeur d'Alene ID
<i>Anita L. Winstead</i>	ANITA L. WINSTEAD	P.O. Box 451 Koloa 96756
<i>Eugen Basic</i>	EUGEN BASIC	PO Box 451 Koloa 96756
<i>Harriet Bass-Luke</i>	4 Library Ln.	Scarborough, ME. 04074
<i>Sharon Prater</i>	Sharon Prater	PO BY 1033 Hanalei 96714
<i>Elisabeth Lilledal</i>	Elisabeth Lilledal	2880 NORD-TORPA NORWAY
<i>Kim Johnson</i>	KIM JOHNSON	73 Crystal Ct, Brunswick, OH
<i>Stephane P. Cathell</i>	Stephane P. Cathell	819 Park Ave #2, Somerville 02142
<i>Ed Cathell</i>	Ed Cathell	819 Park Ave #2, Somerville 02142
<i>Valerius Sowder</i>	VALERIUS SOWDER	1128 Hymettus Ave, Greenwood 96744
<i>Sungz Schloz</i>	Sungz Schloz	190 Hill F Rd. HI 96744
<i>Makinson</i>	Makinson	Box 2290 Stowe, VT - USA -
<i>P. Clark</i>	P. Clark	PO 1630 Hanalei 96714
<i>Mike Kaipata</i>	MIKE KAIPATA	PO Box 181 Hilo 96714
<i>Pat Quistman</i>		Summersville SC 29485

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends.
 When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address:
 PO Box 393, Kapaa, HI 96746

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Paula Chandler</i>	Paula Chandler	P.O. Box 334 Hanalei Kauai 96714
<i>Mr Morton</i>	Mr Morton	PO Box 1121 Volcano 96785
<i>Janya Ashimoto</i>	Janya Ashimoto	P.O. Box 925 Hanalei, HI 96714
<i>Isa Maria</i>	Isa Maria	P.O. Box 1218 Kilauea HI 96754
<i>Christophe R. Banderath</i>	Christophe R. Banderath	PO-Central Delivery Kilauea 96754
<i>Daniel J. Phillips</i>	Daniel J. Phillips	406 Woodst St. Santa Cruz CA 95062
<i>Angela J. Flynn</i>	ANGELA FLYNN	4500 N. WAIKALUA RD KILAUEA, HI 96754
<i>Michael Gona</i>	Michael Gona	4500 N Waikeolu - Rd Kilauea, HI 96754
<i>R. J. Pacey</i>	R. J. Pacey	P.O. Box 567 Anahola HI 96703
<i>Jim Clark</i>	Jim Clark	P.O. Box 698 Kilauea HI 96754
<i>H. M. Wright</i>	H. M. Wright	1103189 ANAHOLA 96703
<i>Joe J. J. J.</i>	Joe J. J. J.	P.O. Box 2589 Kapaa 96754
<i>Kane PA</i>	Kane PA	P.O. Box 215 Lihue Kauai 96766
<i>Anett Albret</i>	Anett Albret	POB 671 Kilauea, Kauai 96754
<i>Qua</i>	Qua	59-608A Kanehamehe Hwy Haleiwa HI 96712
<i>5231 Onels Rd</i>	5231 Onels Rd	KAPAA HI 96746
<i>A. Ray Marshall</i>	A. Ray Marshall	4704 A A Koa St Kapaa 96746
<i>Janya Felix</i>	Janya Felix	874 Niulani Rd, Kapaa HI 96746
<i>Karen Duncan</i>	Karen Duncan	P.O. 1093, Lualaba HI 96766
<i>Eberhard Schulz</i>	Eberhard Schulz	81036 Kriechhansen, Germany
<i>MARC K. MAKIZUCHI</i>	MARC K. MAKIZUCHI	P.O. BOX 606 VOLCANO, HI 96785
<i>LIHI-A KOMEHANA ST</i>	LIHI-A KOMEHANA ST	HILO HI. 96720
<i>Don Kawasubaru Jr</i>	Don Kawasubaru Jr	2470 Nihona St. HI 96720
<i>Marianne George</i>	Marianne George	POB 2227 Lihue HI 96766
<i>Puelani Banta</i>	Puelani Banta	511 Kamokila Rd. Kapaa HI 96746
<i>Fune Wilson Schaefer</i>	Fune Wilson Schaefer	P.O. Box 468, Kilauea, HI 96754
<i>R. L. L.</i>	R. L. L.	REKHA GADSON P.O. Box 830 Hanalei HI, 96714
<i>P.O. Box 751</i>	P.O. Box 751	ANAHOLA 96703 HI.
<i>Susan L. Beckwith</i>	SUSAN L. BECKWITH	6478 HANALEI 96714
<i>Tricia K. Kaji</i>	TRICIA K. KAJI	POB 3265, ASPEN CO 81612

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

28-1932

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Andrea J Field</i>	SONORA FIELD	POB 372 ANAHOLO HI 96703
<i>Sonny Ching</i>	SONNY CHING	4004-B WAAHA RD. KAPAA HI 96746
<i>Carinne Christensen</i>	CARINNE CHRISTENSEN	" " " " " "
<i>Samuel Kamele W</i>	SAMUEL KAMELE W	P.O. Box 113 ANAHOLO HI 96703
<i>Loreta Buccat</i>	Loreta Buccat	P.O. Box 31 Kapaa, HI 96746
<i>Karen Clevenger</i>	Karen Clevenger	Stld-34 Ave 60 Moline, IL 61201
<i>John Groll</i>	JOHN GROLL	POB 233 BUERT. MAKE NY 12812
<i>Mary Russell Groll</i>	MARY RUSSELL GROLL	" " " " " "
<i>Daddy Ham Young</i>	DADDY HAM YOUNG	P.O. Box 845 HANALEI, HI 96714
<i>Hilani Piro</i>		
<i>Kathleen Marguia</i>	KATHLEEN MARGUIA	P.O. Box 375 Kapa, HI.
<i>Momi Yokel</i>	MOMI YOKEL	P.O. Box 404 Anahola 96756
<i>Rachelle N. Haumea</i>	RACHELLE N. HAUMEA	6144 KALAKAUA KAPAA 96766
<i>Quinn Wainwright</i>	4265 One St Kapa HI 96766	
<i>Quinn Wainwright</i>	6280 Kapaehou Rd Kapa HI 96746	
<i>Nanda Deierling</i>	Nanda Deierling	994 Kahakai PO 521
AKO Kima	KU	William E Henning
<i>AKO Kima</i>	KU	William E Henning 2276 Kahaolu KILA
<i>William E Henning</i>	WILLIAM E HENNING	2276 Kahaolu KILA
<i>Flora Rubia</i>	FLORA RUBIA	2276 Kahaolu Kilauea
<i>Timothy M Choy</i>	TIMOTHY CHOY	PO Box 9 BEDERA CA. 94922
<i>Laura Kelle</i>	LAURA KELLE	PO Box Occidental, CA 95465
<i>Judith Phillips</i>	JUDITH PHILLIPS	406 Windsor, SIMTAC, CA 95062
<i>Charlotte Lydgate</i>	CHARLOTTE LYDGATE	POB 3776 LIHUE HI 96766
<i>Deborah "JoB" Spence</i>	DEBORAH "JOB" SPENCE	P.O. Box 1854 96766
<i>T. Burewiski</i>	T. BUREWISKI	2414 Puka St LIHUE
<i>Rekha</i>	REKHA GADSON	P.O. Box 830, Hanalei HI 96714
<i>Karuna Thal</i>	KARUNATHAL	1321 Kioiahi Kapaa
<i>Panthy Wilde</i>	Panthy Wilde	PO Box 185 Niwot, Co 80544
<i>Tim Rysdale</i>	TIM RYSDALE	Box 1305 96746
<i>Bob Sta</i>	BOB STA	Kapaa 96746

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
BERT Bernard Kelikoa	BERNARD KELIKOA	P.O. Box 271 NAWAHI HI 96772
Kuipo K. Kailiawa	KUIPO KAILIAWA	P.O. Box 762 PAHALA HI
Keli W. Soone Jr.	KELI W. JEANE JR	P.O. Box 5174 HILO HI 96720
Kaliko Kamaha	KALIKO KAWAHE SR.	P.O. Box 1509 Keaunohi
Joshua A. Viernes	JOSHUA A. VIERNES	P.O. Box 624 Ala Akela
William Viernes	WILLIAM VIERNES	P.O. Box 834 HI 96772
Athena Peanut	ATHENA PEANUT	PO 181, PAHOA, HI 96778
Kelii Cormack	Manuela MANUELA	
Ronald S. Fujiyoshi	RONALD S. FUJIYOSHI	1176 W. KAWAIHUI, HI 96720
	Kuupuumakamae Swain	270 ULULANI ST #26 96720
Belarmino Antonio, Jr.	Belarmino Antonio, Jr.	15-2716 Palani St. 96778
Puukiaani Kali Kelana	Puukiaani Kali Kelana	KAU, MAKUA KEAHE
Bonnie Bator	Bonnie Bator	P.O. Box 565 Kurtistown Hawaii 96760
M. Leimomi Viernes	M. Leimomi Viernes	PO Box 834 Naelekuhi 96772
Annenue Viernes	Annenue Viernes	4 IKAWA PL NAELEHU 96772
Leinani Hashimoto	LEINANI HASHIMOTO	P.O. Box 454 NAWAHI HI 96772
Denese E. Fierro	Denese Fierro	HCL Box 5613 96749
Calvin K. Kalaniana'olani	Calvin K. Kalaniana'olani	P.O. Box 185 Volcano Hawaii
Mattie Furiado	Mattie Furiado	General Del. KEAUA 96785
Tereso L. Revira	Tereso L. Revira	PO Box 5831 HI HI 96780
Francis Malani	FRANCIS MALANI	P.O. Box 26 LAUPAHOE HOE HI
Donna-Mae T. Kalii	Donna-Mae T. Kalii	P.O. Box 5204 HILO HI 96720
Malina Bonk	Malina Bonk	PO Box 6899 Keaunohi 96749
Adatchie K. Eikon	Adatchie K. Eikon	POB 1231 Kaula Kaula KONA 96750
Kapulani Antonio	Kapulani Antonio	15-2716 Palani St Pahoa 96778
Rolande Paleka	Rolande Paleka	PO Box 551 PAHOA 96778
Eva Mathews	EVA MATHEWS	HCR 2 Box 6217 Keaunohi 96749
Keiko Bonk	Keiko Bonk	PO Box 1316 HILO 96720
Nick Sheku	NICK SHEKU	PO Box 43L VOLCANO, HI
Jandra Bonk	JANDRA BONK	PO 919 Mt View 96771
Oliver Semmes	Oliver Semmes	P.O. Box 791 PAHALA 96777

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>[Signature]</i>	BEAUX IVEY	6505 KAHUANA RD
<i>[Signature]</i>	Angela Gusa	7181 Koolau Rd Anahola HI 96703
<i>[Signature]</i>	Claudia Trask	P.O. BOX 492 Anahola 96703
<i>[Signature]</i>	Suzanne Pia Pose	P.O. Box 367 Anahola HI 96703
<i>[Signature]</i>	Wendy Wolton	Box 1016 Hanalei (Opposite 10)
<i>[Signature]</i>	Cynthia Thompson	POB 111 Anahola <i>any development on Niihau</i>
<i>[Signature]</i>	GAIL A. KERLEY	P.O. Box 2003 Kapaa
<i>[Signature]</i>	Rene RUTAN	4838 Puuwa Rd Kalahao
<i>[Signature]</i>	LYNNE MACK	6817 KAHUANA RD, KAPAA HI
<i>[Signature]</i>	M. H. HULL	137 KAHANI-KAHOA HI 96734
<i>[Signature]</i>	Kimba Adem	6477 Kahuna Rd Kapaa HI 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	CARL STEPETH	POB 599, Hanalei 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	Andi Pisacano	5631 B Hanalei Rd 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	Ave Finch	5631 B Hanalei Rd 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	Jon ANDERTON	P.O. Box 1308 Hanalei 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	John FITZ	P.O. Box 4120 Kapaa 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	Tim KOPESKY	6111 Lokomei Kai Kapaa 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	Don Pixler	2009 Pomaikai Kapaa HI
<i>[Signature]</i>	Momi Tokel	P.O. Box 404 Anahola HI
<i>[Signature]</i>	HELENE MONCREIF	Helena Ln. Kapaa, HI
<i>[Signature]</i>	Richard S. K. Hoopes	Halena Ln. Kapaa HI
<i>[Signature]</i>	DARREN PALMEIRA	219 Koili Lane Kapaa HI 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	SUSAN LUBEL	5926 OHE Street Kapaa 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	BLAIR GOLDBERG	Box 1380 KILAUEA HI 96751
<i>[Signature]</i>	CATHIA RIEDEL	POB 597 HANALEI HI 96714
<i>[Signature]</i>	Renee Ann Milton	6938 Pomaikai Kapaa 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	Theresa Lull	6927 Pomaikai St Kapaa 96746
<i>[Signature]</i>	Ocean M. Muller	POB 1362 Kapaa
<i>[Signature]</i>	Misty Tamaguchi	6590-9 puu pili Rd. Kapaa
<i>[Signature]</i>	Toel Coleman	5821 Kaapuni rd Kapaa

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
JANEI	Lui	P.O. Box 791 PAHALA HI 96717
Ricia Shema	Ricia Shema	Box 432, Volcano 96785
Jim Good	JIM GOOD	PO 927, Keaau, HI 96749
Pat Ritter	ROBT RITTER	PO BOX VOLCANO HI 96785
Pat Sims	PAT SIMS	PO Box 1109, Keaau, HI
Fumie Bank	Fumie Bank	PO Box 1648 Kamaoia HI 9674
Michael Christopher	Michael Christopher	Box 1386 Hilo 96721
Olivia Ling	Olivia Ling	PO Box 505 Naalehu HI 96772
Sottor Hansen	Sottor Hansen	PO Box 156 Volcano HI 96785
William J Bank	WILLIAM J BANK	Box 1648 Waiman 96743
Jeanella Bingham	Jeanella Bingham	PO BOX 463 Volcano, HI 96788
Sandra E Kelley	Sandra E Kelley	P.O. Box 636 Mt View, HI 96771
Mary Gueble	Mary Gueble	Box 177 Kurtistown HI 96760
Mary M Porter	Mary M Porter	Box 10702, Hilo HI 96721
Roluh Chan	Roluh Chan	19A WALKER, HIL0 HI 96720
Edward S. Clark	EDWARD S. CLARK	17-466 IPU'AUATA ST., KEAHO, HI. 96749
Caroline P. Clark	CAROLINE P. CLARK	" " "
Rates	P.O. Box 977 479	Kailua-Kona 96745
Robert	PO B 900	Kurtistown HI 96760
Fairfield	PO Box 475	Kurtistown HI 9670
Paul	PO Box 475	Kurtistown HI 96760
Anne L Maguire	Anne L. Maguire	2439 A Palima Dr. Hilo 96720
Michael L Maguire	MICHAEL MAGUIRE	"
Donald W Cox	D.W. Cox	111 PLAINFIELD ST 405 Hilo 96720
Carol Gillette-Wenner	C Gillette-Wenner	Box 95, Volcano, HI 96785
Kathleen Montvel-Coffen	KATHLEEN MONTVEL-COFFEN	PO Box 783 Hilo HI 96721
Julie Hedgecock-Jacobson	Julie Hedgecock-Jacobson	POB 900 Kurtistown HI 96760
Ethel Moore	ETHEL L. MOORE	7547 29th Ave SW, Seattle, WA, 98126
Alan D. McNamee	Alan D McNamee	PO Box 143 Volcano HI 96721
Florence M. Kaler	Florence M. Kaler	PO Box 516 Mt View HI 96771
Kevin Kelley	Kevin Kelley	PO BOX 636 Mt View HI

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE

NAME

ADDRESS

	W.W. DECKER	5792 LAUKANAST Lih
	Rainy Cruz	P.O. Box 2045 Kapaa
	Joanna Blake	P.O. Box 1024 Kapaa
	MAJIA	PO Box 2141 Kapaa
	LEONORA ORR	P.O. Box 603, HAMAUI, 96714
	Andrew Crawford	6120 Olohena Kapaa
	Norma R. Cutler	4701 Kawaihau Rd Kapaa
	Jody Shimpach	P.O. Box 751 Hanapepe
	MICHAEL SHIMPACH	751 Hanapepe
	Terence Scaletos	35 Exton NY 11779
	Ann Hermosura	P.O. Box 1043 Kilauea
	Karri Ann Hermosura	P.O. Box 1043 Kilauea
	MICHAEL MANNING	P.O. Box 413 96703
	JANE RAYTER	PO Box 1043 Kilauea
	CLAY E. HANSEN	4605 HANAALA RD. Kapaa 96746
	SUSAN J. Hymas	4605 HANAALA RD KAPAA
	Nomi Sweetfire	3134 Kuhio Hwy #26 Lihue 96766 96740
	C. H. Connerman	PO BOX 3500 Prineville
	LESLIE ANN LAING	PO Box 989 Kapaa HI 96746
	EDIE SAKAMOTO	1619 U.A. Dr. Han. 96811
	Kainalu Kaluhiki	Box 1366 APO AP 96555
	LISA M. WILLET	5998 Olohena Rd Kapaa 96756
	Fran Tyson	4563-B Kuli Rd Kula, HI 96714
	Linda Rosenthal	P.O. Box 1863 Kapaa 96746
	Vanessa Textelano	P.O. Box 309 Hanapepe 96716
	Craig Allmendinger	Box 444 Lihue 96766
	JEANENE STEFFEN	PO Box 297 Kapaa 96746
	Merritt Hurley	401 Waiaco Rd Kapaa 96746
	Karen vonBettcher	PO Box 1045 Kapaa 96746

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Kikue Iwane</i>	KIKUE IWANE	87-230 HOLOMALIA PL
<i>Mandy Iwane</i>	MANDY IWANE	(())
<i>Patrick Papas</i>	PATRICK PAPAS	(())
<i>Pat Souki</i>	Pat Souki	87-221 Holomalia Pl.
<i>Fred Dodge</i>	Fred Dodge, MD	86-024 Glenmeyer ST, Wai'anae
<i>Alex Wai</i>	Leandra Wai-Rodrigues	PO 1218 Makua, Wai'anae, 96792
<i>James J. Rodrigues</i>	JAMES J. RODRIGUES	86-722 Puuhawai Pl 96792
<i>Roger Furrer</i>	ROGER FURRER	84-710 Kahaina St. 96792
<i>Judith M. Gross</i>	Judith M. Gross	16-924 Kiekonea Way 96791
<i>Honeygil Hoomanawanui</i>		P.O. Box 871, Hanalei 96714
<i>Ethel Linda Clark</i>	ETHEL LINDA CLARK	7230 Aiea Pono Street 96746
<i>Gihel Freely</i>		7230 Aiea Pono St 96746
<i>Les Jones</i>	LES JONES	PO BOX 1114 KAPPA HI 96746
<i>Fred Jagan</i>	Fred Jagan	P.O. Box 239, Koloa HI 96756
<i>Diane Jager</i>	Diane JAGER	PO BOX 234 Koloa 96756
<i>Courtney Boules</i>	COURTNEY BOULES	(57 DEER) TERIL NORTH
<i>Herb Linden</i>	HERB LINDEN	GREENWOOD LAKE, N.Y. 10925
<i>Faya de Wapirava</i>	Faya de Wapirava	5512 Kawaihau RD Kapaa
<i>I. Martin</i>	I. Martin	BOX 502 ANAHOLA 96703
<i>M. Martin</i>	M. MARTIN	PO BOX 503 ANAHOLA 96703
<i>J. Po</i>	J. PO	PO BOX 24 ANAHOLA 96703
<i>Glen Silva</i>	Glen Silva	PO BOX 851 KUCUKU 96705
<i>Destiny Duarte</i>	Destiny Duarte	(())
<i>Charles Trumbath</i>	Charles Trumbath	Lihue Hawaii
<i>Eubone H. Middle</i>	EUBONE H. MIDDLE	P.O. BOX 9 ANAHOLA HI.
<i>Panagiotis Kouris</i>	PANAGIOTIS KOURIS	P.O. Box 521 WAIMETA KAUAI
<i>Rick Luftmann</i>	Rick Luftmann	ESK, ALASKA
<i>Rick Pompilio</i>	RICK POMPILIO	984 KAMALU RD
<i>Carolyn Pompilio</i>	Carolyn Pompilio	984 Kamalu Rd
<i>Luella Churchill</i>	LUELLA CHURCHILL	5394 KUAPAPA ST. KAPAA 96746
<i>John R Churchill</i>	JOHN R CHURCHILL	5394 KUAPAPA ST

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

KAPAA
96746

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Reni Bello</i>	Reni Bello	107 Kilea Pl, Waihuanu 96786
<i>Carol Aiken</i>	CAROL Aiken	1330 Waiolu #113, Honolulu, 96822
<i>Pua'ala McElhenny</i>	Pua'ala McElhenny	45-535-1391 Luluku RD Kaula HI 96744
<i>Yolanda Brown</i>	Yolanda Brown	608 Naale St HI 96744
<i>Bua Hilo</i>	BUA HILO	608 Naale St HI 96744
<i>Jean Fukui</i>	Jean Fukui	1335 Moi Way Hon 96816
<i>Stephen Posen</i>	Stephen Posen	45-111 Kapahe Dr 96789
<i>Arlene Pai</i>	ARLENE PAI	98-1667 APALA LP. Aiea 96701
<i>Justin Lanu</i>	Justin Lanu	9059 Salt Lake Blvd.
<i>Geraldine Fairbanks</i>	Geraldine Fairbanks	99-626 Hoia St Honolulu HI 96711
<i>Karen L. Booth</i>	KAREN L. BOOTH	98-147373 -KAHUNA ANU'ULU
<i>Leonard J. Wilson</i>	Leonard J. Wilson	1030 Aohai Pl 303D 96734
<i>Margaret M. Kato</i>	Margaret M. Kato	1320 Hoolanua St PC 96763
<i>Diane S Kawashima</i>	Diane S Kawashima	94347 Kapuki St Hil 96789
<i>John Tamashira</i>	John Tamashira	768 Huikehi St 96789
<i>Richard O'Flynn</i>	Richard O'Flynn	679 Bay St 96789
<i>Rose D. Villanueva</i>	Rose D. Villanueva	19 P.O. Box 2588
<i>M.A. Glover</i>	M.A. GLOVER	MID. 87-226 Holoana Pl. Nantuli 96792
<i>James R. Moore</i>	James R. Moore	PO Box 953 Waiolu HI 96741
<i>Debra L. Figueroa</i>	Debra L. Figueroa	67-448 Puuki St Waiolu
<i>Richard H. Hironaka</i>	Richard H. Hironaka	67-448 Puuki St Waiolu
<i>Rise Wiley</i>	Rise Wiley	298 Wilikina Dr. Apt 207
<i>Hattie S. Hironaka</i>	Hattie S. Hironaka	248 Wilikina Dr. Apt 207
<i>Debra L. Figueroa</i>	Debra L. Figueroa	67-448 Puuki St Waiolu
<i>Cynthia R. Silva</i>	Cynthia R. Silva	94-115 Puanani Lp. Mililani 96789
<i>Jon Agsalot</i>	JON AGSALOT	112 MORE PL Waiolu 96786
<i>Clifford Mendoza</i>	Clifford Mendoza	P.O. Box 413 96791
<i>Karen Hillstrom</i>	KAREN Hillstrom	4760 Alianana 96703
<i>Louis K. Hoomanawanui</i>	LOUIS K. HOOMANAWANUI JR	P.O. Box 209 Kealia HI 96757
<i>Jean Hall</i>	Jean Hall	P.O. Box 97 KEALIA, KAUAI HI 96757

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Carol D. Bain</i>	CAROL D. BAIN	P.O. Box 2320, Lihue HI 96766
<i>Edward Coll</i>	EDWARD COLL	POB 2320 Lihue, HI 96766
<i>Liz Randol</i>	Liz Randol	po 685 Kilauea, HI 96746
MARY NOONAN	Mary Noonan	PO 3500-184-PRINCEVILLE
<i>Frank J. Burt</i>	FRANK J. BURT	Box 381 Hanalei HI 96714
<i>Chuck Tesmer</i>	Chuck Tesmer	Box 468 Kilauea HI 96754
<i>Georgina Burt</i>	Georgina Burt	Box 381 Hanalei Hawaii 96714
<i>Edwin R. Pollock</i>	EDWIN R. POLLOCK	PO Box 312 Hanalei 96714
<i>Marilyn Pollock</i>	Marilyn Pollock	P.O. Box 312 Hanalei 96714
Eugenia Chuan	EUGENIA CHUAN	P.O. Box 1183, HANAIEI 96714
<i>Raymond Chuan</i>	RAYMOND CHUAN	Box 1183 Hanalei, HI 96714
<i>Pamela Hernandez</i>	PAMELA HERNANDEZ	PO BOX 1746, Hanalei
<i>Billy W. Butler</i>	BILLI BUTLER	Box 697, HANAIEI
<i>James Kimoko</i>	JAMES KIMOKO	P.O. Box 15 Anahola HI 96703
<i>Ida Kimoko</i>	IDA KIMOKO	P.O. Box 15 ANA'ANA HOLA HI 96703
<i>Mary Kimoko</i>	MARY KIMOKO	2281 Nalo Rd Koloa HI 96756
<i>Yvonne Pa</i>	Yvonne Pa	Box 26 Anahola 96703
<i>Iwatori Martin</i>	Iwatori Martin	Box 502 Anahola 96703
<i>Michael T. Martin</i>	Michael Martin	Box 502 Anahola 96703
<i>Angelina K. Koli</i>	Angelina K. Koli	P.O. Box 422 Anahola 96703
<i>Sam Pa</i>	Sam Pa	P.O. Box 26 Anahola 96703
<i>Luliki Koli</i>	Luliki Koli	P.O. Box 422 Anahola 96703
<i>L. D. JOHNSON</i>	L. D. JOHNSON	P.O. Box 742 HANAIEI
<i>Richard A. Miller</i>	RICHARD A. MILLER	P.O. Box 1452 HANAIEI
<i>Karen E. Bottasso</i>	Karen E. Bottasso	P.O. Box 1323 Hanalei
<i>Caren Diamond</i>	Caren Diamond	PO Box 536 Hanalei 96714
<i>Mike S. Bottasso</i>	MIKE S. BOTTASSO	P.O. Box 1323, Hanalei 96714
<i>Jimmy A. Ledward</i>	JIMMY A. LEDWARD	P.O. Box 735 Hanalei HI 96714
<i>Patty Jones</i>	Patty Jones	PO 30135 Kapa, HI 96722
<i>Michelle L. Graef</i>	MICHELLE L. GRAEF	POB 372, ANA'ANA, HI 96703

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
Shalanda Abbey	Shalanda Abbey	POB 1195 Kapa'ea 96746
Meryl Bloxam	Cheryl Bloxam	General Delivery 96703
Laura Schonen	Laura Schonen	6178 Helena Lane Kapa'ea 96746
Hinda Shigeta	Suda Shigeta	2105 Ehee Pl Heliye 96766
Gabriela Taylor	Gabriela Taylor	5620 Keppoua Ln. Kapa'ea
Laurel Peterson	Laurel Peterson	133 Royal Dr. Kapa'ea HI 96746
Antion Meredith	Antion Meredith	PO Box 866 Kilauea HI
Patricia Summer	Patricia Summer	PO Box 983 Kilauea HI
Leske Dancose	Leske Dancose	PO Box 3338 Kilauea HI 96766
KAREN LIBERMAN	KAREN LIBERMAN	2190 Puhe 96766 Kapa'ea
Simon	Simon	6172 Kala Kea Pl Kapa'ea 96746
Star	Star	POB 167 Anahola HI 96763
Stolor Homan	Stolor Homan	5241 Kumu Rd. Kapa'ea HI 96746
Uoiana Grace	Uoiana Grace	P.O.B. 1551 Koloa, HI 96756
Harmony	Harmony	Box 1551 Koloa HI 96756
Kalamikumai	Kalamikumai	KA MAKA UNALI' HANOHANA Box 1551 Koloa HI 96756
Charles E. Schumel	Charles E. Schumel	Box 1551 Koloa HI 96756
Ken Bigelow	Kenneth Bigelow	P.O. Box 64 Hanapepe HI
D. Shakra Freeman	D. Shakra Freeman	PO Box 247 Kilauea HI 96754
LATIFA ANDURZ	LATIFA ANDURZ	PO Box 1232 Hanalei HI 9674
DAVID "DAKAN" ALLISON	DAVID "DAKAN" ALLISON	BOX 684 Kilauea 96754
Sady Ragan	Sady Ragan	P.O. Box 3284 Kilauea
SHAYENE ISERI-CARONATO	SHAYENE ISERI-CARONATO	6539 KAWAIIANILLO KAPA'EA 96746
DESTLY ISERI-CARONATO	DESTLY ISERI-CARONATO	6539 KAWAIIANILLO KAPA'EA 96746
Marilyn Summer	Marilyn Summer	6174 C Hauiki Rd Kapa'ea HI 96746
Moog Gray	Moog Gray	502-A Lower Kimo Rd. Kula HI 96790
9315 Kilauea Ave	9315 Kilauea Ave	Kilauea, HI 96766
Marilyn Jay Axtell	Marilyn Jay Axtell	P.O. Box 3816 Lihue 96766
Lisa Breen	Lisa Breen	Box 493 Kilauea HI 96754
Don Carlos	Don Carlos	P.O. Box 279, Anahola Kapa'ea
SAMM HUAN	SAMM HUAN	PO Box 900 KAPA'EA HI

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Janet Mello</i>	JANET MELLO	Hanalei 96714
<i>Mary Lucas</i>	Mary Lucas	Wainiha 96714
<i>Kath Olanau</i>	KATH OLANAU	WAINIHA 96714
<i>James Pellegrine</i>	James Pellegrine	Hanalei 96714
<i>Kata Alexander</i>	Kata Alexander	" "
<i>Keoni Olanau</i>	Keoni Olanau	Wainiha 96714
<i>Mike Green</i>	MIKE GREEN	HAENAI 96714
<i>Wayne Buch</i>	WAYNE BUCH	John
<i>Kiva Manguchei</i>	Kiva Manguchei	" "
<i>Peter Kelly</i>	PETER KELLY	PO. 1753 Hanalei
<i>Dai Aragojo</i>	5-1665 Kuhio Hwy	Wainiha HI 96714
<i>Patricia Olanau</i>	Patricia Olanau	P.O. Box 1553 Hanalei
<i>MIKE MILLER</i>	WAINIHA	P.O. Box 1443 HAANALEI
<i>Williama Fasilki</i>	"Wainiha"	P.O. Box 394 Hanalei 96714
<i>Susan Mitnik</i>	Susan Mitnik	PO Box 1589 Hanalei HI.
<i>Tracy Clayton</i>	Tracy Clayton	PO Box 1151 Kilauea HI 96754
<i>Holly Young</i>	Holly Young	PO Box 311 Prineville HI
<i>Nadia DeLeye</i>	Nadia DeLeye	P.O. Box 810 Hanalei, HI 96714

Please xerox (*before signatures*) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Nancy Heck</i>	Nancy Heck	PO Box 212 Hono 96839
<i>Elizabeth Jordan</i>	ELIZABETH JORDAN	84-688 ALA MAHIKU DR. MAKAHA 96792
<i>Nanihelehuia Napoleon</i>	NANIHELEHUIA NAPOLEON	2455 Wilder Ave #6 Honolulu HI 96822
<i>Ilona G. Sai</i>	Ilona G. Sai	850 Kapiolani St. #303 Hahaione 96827
<i>Jane Shimokawa</i>	Jane Shimokawa	1244-D Huhakai St. Hahaione 96822
<i>Richard Salvador</i>	Richard Salvador	2424 Maile Way #1640, Hahaione HI 96822
<i>John Fullbright</i>	JOHN FULLBRIGHT	1415 Punahoa St, #1001, Hahaione, HI 96822
<i>Joshua Cooper</i>	Joshua Cooper	3524 Campbell Ave Honolulu, Hawaii 96815
<i>Joseph A. Wigfall</i>	Joseph A. Wigfall	84-755 Ala Mahiku Dr #70-B 96792
<i>Malina P. Wigfall</i>	Malina P. Wigfall	84-755 Ala Mahiku Dr #70B, Waiianae 96792
<i>Melvin V. Merritt</i>	Melvin V. Merritt	85-298C Ala Hahaione St. Waiianae 96792
<i>Darlene Popoalii</i>	Darlene Popoalii	6770 CCALIF AVE Utahona
<i>Kandellynn Kauwala</i>	Kandellynn Kauwala	11111 Kapiolani St. Hahaione HI 96822
<i>Jackie Gualdarama</i>	Jackie Gualdarama	86-280 Kuwale Rd
<i>Patricia L. Patterson</i>	PATRICIA L. PATTERSON	84-755 ALA MAHIKU #72-A WAIANAE, HI 96792
<i>D.N. TAVARES</i>	D.N. TAVARES	85-761 FORTINGTON HWY WAIANAE HI 96792
<i>Kyle Kajihira</i>	Kyle Kajihira	1133A Davenport St Hahaione 96822
<i>Peter Insana</i>	PETER INSANA	5265 OLIMPA MAHAIONE HI 96792
<i>MARY ISABELL STONE</i>	MARY ISABELL STONE	2916 Palu St #7 Lihue CA 96766

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Grace Talo</i>	Grace Talo	P.O. BOX 2237 Hanalei, HI 96798
<i>Raelyn T. Asato</i>	Raelyn T. Asato	84 803 Leleina St. Wai'anae, HI. 96792
<i>Daniel Kealoha</i>	DANIEL KEALOHA	89-179 NANAIKALAST WAI'ANA'E
<i>Colleen Kealoha</i>	COLLEEN KEALOHA	89-179 NANAIKALASI WAI'ANA'E 96792
<i>Lydia K. Thrower</i>	Lydia K. Thrower	84-254 Alanihale Dr. #10B Wai'anae HI 96792
<i>Nova Naputi</i>	Nova Naputi	89-179 Nanaikalasi St.
<i>Dawn Jones</i>	Dawn Jones	89-376 Pua Ave Wai'anae
<i>Katherine K. Sotelo</i>	Katherine K. Sotelo	87-1640 Ulehewa Rd. Wai'anae, 96792
<i>MARJORIE K. CORDS</i>	MARJORIE K. CORDS	89611 POMAKUINI HI 96792
<i>Janet H.</i>	Janet H.	87-120 Pualekani St. Wai'anae 96792
<i>CELILIA HESIA</i>	CELILIA HESIA	45-1026 #311 Kamae PL Kapa'ula HI 96764
<i>Flordelisa Z. Crede</i>	Flordelisa Z. Crede	1211 Pua Ln #33C Hon. HI 96817
<i>Derys Coruison</i>	Derys Coruison	350 SUMNER ST.
<i>Carol Sato</i>	Carol Sato	P.O. Box 7 Pearl City, HI 96782
<i>Justin Kaneshiro</i>	Justin Kaneshiro	3515 AKOHA PI.
<i>Poumikai Kamapu</i>	Poumikai Kamapu	7211 Kaula'au St.
<i>Meta Nicola</i>	Meta Nicola	589 Pepeecked Pl. Hon. HI 96825
<i>KAONOHI MALAMA</i>	KAONOHI MALAMA	431-C KAMAHA ST.
<i>REKUNI BLAISDELL</i>	REKUNI BLAISDELL	KANEA HI 96734
<i>DAVID A. PAPKE</i>	DAVID A. PAPKE	3333 Kaohinani Dr. Hula 96817
<i>JAMES KIMOKO</i>	JAMES KIMOKO	P.O. Box 911 Hula 96754 *P.O. Box 752 Anahulu HI 96703
<i>BENJAMIN C. KEHOI</i>	BENJAMIN C. KEHOI	41288 NAGANI ST. 96795
<i>AHLWA K. WATANABE</i>	AHLWA K. WATANABE	89-341 MOKIAU ST. 96790
<i>JOHN KEKAHLI</i>	JOHN KEKAHLI	2773 Manamaua 9 96783
<i>ANNE M. DAWOVAN</i>	ANNE M. DAWOVAN	2080 KAUAU RD KAPAA P.O. Box 411111 HI 96766

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahoua, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Alicia P Booth</i>	ALICIA P BOOTH	6412 KAAHELE ST, KAPAA HI 96746
<i>Flora Bukoski</i>	FLORA BUKOSKI	P.O. Box 521, Koloa HI 96756
<i>Bonnie P. Poonas</i>	Bonnie Poonas	P.O. Box 713 - Koloa HI 96756
<i>Alice Fix</i>	ALICE FIX	3-3400 Kuliou Lihue 96766
<i>Bruce Kanop</i>	BRUCE KANOP	3-4250 Kuliou Hwy 96766
<i>Carrie Callahan</i>	CARRIE CALLAHAN	987 LEWIS 96742
<i>Barbara Kaiwi</i>	Barbara Kaiwi	3-4280 Kuliou Hwy 96766
<i>Sally Ooty</i>	Sally Ooty	P.O. Box 1822 Koloa HI 96756
<i>Leslie Kaiwi</i>	Leslie Kaiwi	P.O. Box 414 ANAHOLA
<i>Ed Cain</i>	TRADITIONAL NATIVE HAWAIIAN RELIGIOUS LEADER	P.O. Box 414 ANAHOLA
<i>Lowell Strombeck</i>	Lowell Strombeck	P.O. Box 791 KALAHOOE 96741
<i>Dixie Belcher</i>	DIXIE BELCHER	P.O. Box 791 KALAHOOE 96741
<i>PAMELA SIHVOLA</i>	PAMELA SIHVOLA	P.O. BOX 1022. KOLOA, HI 96756
<i>Butch Kekaha</i>	Butch Kekaha	" " 182 Koloa HI 96756

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

PETITION

We, the undersigned, wish to state our opposition to the establishment by the military of a missile base on the sacred Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and to propose the conversion of PMRF to a global model and Center for the healing of our planet.

SIGNATURE	NAME	ADDRESS
<i>Fred Dente</i>	FRED DENTE	6335 B WAIPOLI RD. KAPAA HI 96746
<i>Mari Dente</i>	MARI DENTE	6335 B WAIPOLI RD. KAPAA HI 96746
<i>Juan Britton</i>	JUAN BRITTON	PO BOX 82 KEALIA HI 96751
<i>John Kekahu</i>	John Kekahu	3773 Mauna Waiawa Kilauea HI 96703
<i>Andy Parks</i>	Andy Parks	PO BOX 753 Kapaau HI 96746
<i>Kirstin Morris</i>	Kirstin Morris	6335-B Waipouli Rd. Kapaau, HI. 96746
<i>Jamie Gilleran</i>	JAMIE GILLERAN	220 NAHAPALI PL. KAPAA, HI 96746
<i>Dixie Belcher</i>	DIXIE BELCHER	1991 HUGHES WAY, JUNEAU, AK 99801
<i>Jonathan Vaughn</i>	Jonathan Vaughn	4655 Kanaele Rd #2 Kapaau, HI 96746
<i>Angela Fynn</i>	ANGELA FYNN	GENERAL DELIVERY, KILAUEA, HI 96754
<i>Michael Gam</i>	Michael Gam	Gen Delivery, Kilauea, HI 96754
<i>Montes Hill</i>	MONTES HILL	PO BOX 458 KOLOA, HI 96756
<i>Katrina Wilson</i>	Katrina Wilson	PO BOX 230, KILAUEA 96754
<i>John R. Barnett</i>	John R. Barnett	4701 Kauhau Rd, A201 Kapaau 96746
<i>Arius Hopu</i>	Arius Hopu	PO Box 1032 Hanalei HI 96716
<i>Arusha Abrahamson</i>	Arusha Abrahamson	PO 1706 MAKAWAO MAUI 96768
<i>Bryce Smallin</i>	Bryce Smallin	P.O. Box 936 Kapa HI 96746
<i>Joseph R.H.K. John</i>	JOSEPH	PO Box 1213 "I"
<i>Marilyn Sumner</i>	Marilyn Sumner	PO Box 784 Kapaau HI 96746
<i>Maureen Fodale</i>	Maureen Fodale	BOX 1215 Hanalei 96714
<i>Shawnie Aki</i>	Shawnie Aki	P.O. Box 447 Hanalei HI 96714
<i>Cathy Han Young</i>	Cathy Han Young	Box 232 Hanalei 96714
<i>ARTHUR K. TRASK SR.</i>	ARTHUR K. TRASK SR.	8230061
<i>ARTHUR K. TRASK JR.</i>	ARTHUR K. TRASK JR.	3144 ELUA ST. LIHUE HI 96714
<i>HAROLD BRONSTEIN</i>	HAROLD BRONSTEIN	3144 ELUA ST LIHUE, HI 96714
<i>HARMINE MORIN</i>	Harmine Morin	PO BOX 791 Hanalei 96714
<i>Karen E. Bottasso</i>	Karen E. Bottasso	PO Box 1323 Hanalei 96714
<i>MIKE S. BOTTASSO</i>	MIKE S. BOTTASSO	P.O. Box 1323, HANAIEI 96714
<i>Rob Culbertson</i>	Rob Culbertson	2400 HULEMAN RD, LIHUE 96766
<i>John Pica</i>	John Pica	P.O. Box 341 Kilauea HI 96703
<i>Edward M. Otter</i>	Edward M. Otter	PO Box 355 Hanalei 96714

Please xerox (before signatures) and distribute to your friends. When this sheet is filled with names, mail to the following address: 'Ili Noho Kai, PO Box 372, Anahola, HI 96703

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK