



MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY

Enhanced Integrated Air and Missile Defense System on Guam Environmental Impact Statement

Public Involvement Scoping Summary Report

Final

January 2024

Department of Defense
Missile Defense Agency
5700 18th Street
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5573

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Summary of Activities	2
1.1 Public Notification.....	2
1.2 Public Information	4
1.3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments.....	8

List of Tables

Table 1. Newspaper Publications for Public Scoping Period.....	3
Table 2. Stakeholder Briefings.....	5
Table 3. Summary of Public Comments.....	8

Enhanced Integrated Air and Missile Defense System on Guam Environmental Impact Statement Public Involvement Scoping Summary Report

This report includes a summary of public involvement and stakeholder outreach activities conducted by the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), with the United States (U.S.) Department of the Army, U.S. Department of the Navy, U.S. Department of the Air Force, and the Federal Aviation Administration as cooperating agencies, during the public scoping period for the Enhanced Integrated Air and Missile Defense (EIAMD) System on Guam Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The proposed action to be analyzed in the EIS is to deploy, operate, and maintain a comprehensive, persistent, 360-degree EIAMD system to defend the entirety of Guam against the rapidly evolving threats of advanced cruise, ballistic, and hypersonic missile attacks from regional adversaries (Proposed Action).

The scoping phase began May 5, 2023, which started the period in which the public could submit scoping comments. Open house scoping meetings were to be held in June 2023, and the public comment period was intended to close June 27, 2023. However, Guam was struck by Typhoon Mawar May 24, 2023, causing widespread damage to the island. Due to the effects of the typhoon, public scoping meetings were postponed until August and the public scoping period was extended to August 18, 2023.

The purpose of public involvement and outreach during the public scoping period was to 1) notify and inform stakeholders and the public about the Proposed Action and the intent to prepare an EIS; and 2) provide the opportunity for stakeholders and the public to submit comments on the scope of the EIS, potential alternatives, environmental concerns, issues that should be addressed in the EIS, and the project's potential to affect historic properties pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966.

Outreach and involvement efforts were conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and MDA and cooperating agency guidance.

1.0 Summary of Activities

1.1 Public Notification

MDA prepared materials to notify the public about the project and upcoming public involvement opportunities. All public notices included information about the intent to prepare an EIS, the Proposed Action, the purpose of the open house public scoping meetings, how to submit public comments, and the project website address.

1.1.1 Federal Register Notices

A Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register May 5, 2023. This notice also provided information about how to submit comments and the comment close date of June 27, 2023.

A Notice of Scoping Comment Period Extension was published in the Federal Register June 9, 2023, announcing the extension of the comment period to August 11, 2023, in response to ongoing Typhoon Mawar-related recovery efforts. The notice also stated that open house public scoping meetings would be rescheduled. A second Notice of Scoping Comment Period Extension was published July 21, 2023, announcing another extension of the comment period to August 18, 2023, and the rescheduled open house public scoping meetings dates, August 2-4, 2023.

1.1.2 Newspaper Advertisements

Display advertisements announcing the preparation of the EIS, scoping comment period, and public scoping meetings were published in both the Guam Daily Post and the Pacific Daily News three times beginning May 5, 2023, through May 9, 2023. Additional ads were published July 17, 2023, through July 31, 2023, announcing the rescheduled public scoping meetings and extension of the comment period. Table 1 lists the publications and dates.

Table 1. Newspaper Publications for Public Scoping Period

Newspaper	Newspaper Coverage	Publication Schedule	Publication Dates
Pacific Daily News (online)	Hagåtña, Guam; and neighboring islands	Monday-Friday	Friday, May 5, 2023 Monday, May 8, 2023 Tuesday, May 9, 2023 Monday, July 17, 2023 Friday, July 28, 2023 Monday, July 31, 2023
Guam Daily Post (print)	Harmon, Guam	Daily	Friday, May 5, 2023 Saturday, May 6, 2023 Sunday, May 7, 2023 Wednesday, July 19, 2023 Sunday, July 30, 2023 Monday, July 31, 2023

1.1.3 Stakeholder Letters

The MDA Director of Real Property Investments and Deployments signed notification letters to 111 federal and local elected officials and government agencies and nongovernmental organizations announcing the public scoping meetings and public comment period. The MDA outreach team mailed the letters first-class May 4, 2023. The then-Director, a Navy Vice Admiral, signed an additional notification letter to four Congressional Defense Subcommittees and the Governor of Guam. MDA sent these letters May 4, 2023.

On June 6, 2023, MDA Congressional Affairs emailed four Congressional Defense Subcommittees to announce the delay in the public scoping meetings and extension of the comment period. MDA emailed an additional letter July 13, 2023, announcing the rescheduled scoping meetings and comment extension period.

1.1.4 Postcard Mailer

The MDA outreach team mailed postcards first-class May 4, 2023, to 92 aviation groups, community/business groups, nongovernmental organizations, academics, and libraries.

1.1.5 Stakeholder Database

The MDA outreach team developed a stakeholder database to manage and document the distribution of project notices.

1.1.6 News Releases, Public Service Announcement, and Media Distribution

The Public Affairs Officer (PAO) for Joint Region Marianas (JRM) distributed a news release and public service announcement to local and regional print and broadcast media outlets May 5, 2023. The PAO distributed an additional news release July 14, 2023, announcing the rescheduled public scoping meetings and extension of the comment period.

1.2 Public Information

1.2.1 Project Website

MDA established a project website to provide the public with project information including fact sheets, posters, frequently asked questions, references, and a link to submit comments electronically. The project website address is www.mda.mil/system/eiamd.html. The website address was included in all public notifications and informational materials.

1.2.2 Stakeholder Briefings

MDA and JRM personnel offered to provide courtesy briefings to key stakeholders about the Proposed Action during the scoping period. Table 2 includes a summary of outreach briefings conducted during the scoping period. Outreach to stakeholders will continue throughout the development of the EIS to ensure they are kept informed.

Table 2. Stakeholder Briefings

Stakeholders	Conducted By	Form of Outreach	Date
Governor’s Office, Adjutant General, and Cabinet Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDA • JRM • USA • INDOPACOM 	In-person brief	July 31, 2023
Delegate for Guam to the U.S. House of Representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDA • JRM • USA • INDOPACOM 	In-person brief	July 31, 2023
Guam Legislature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDA • JRM • USA • INDOPACOM 	In-person brief	July 31, 2023
Guam Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDA • JRM • USA • INDOPACOM 	In-person brief	August 1, 2023
Mayors Council of Guam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDA • JRM • USA • INDOPACOM 	In-person brief	August 1, 2023

Notes: INDOPACOM = United States Indo-Pacific Command, JRM = Joint Region Marianas, MDA = Missile Defense Agency, USA = United States Army.

1.2.3 Open House Scoping Meetings

MDA held three public scoping meetings on Guam from August 2, 2023, through August 4, 2023. The purpose of the scoping meetings was to inform the public about the Proposed Action and accept scoping comments. The meetings were held in an open-house format and included poster stations staffed by project representatives who provided information and answered questions about the Proposed Action and the upcoming environmental impact analysis. MDA encouraged the public to arrive at any time between 4 and 7 p.m. The public scoping meetings were held at the following locations:

August 2, 2023
Hilton Guam Resort
 Micronesia Room
 202 Hilton Rd.
 Tumon Bay, GU 96913

August 3, 2023
Micronesia Mall
 2nd Floor, Near Macy’s Women’s
 1088 W. Marine Corps Dr.
 Dededo, GU 96929

August 4, 2023
Hågat Mayor’s Office
Community Center
 Building 393, Route 2
 Hågat, GU 96928

Staff at the welcome station greeted guests and encouraged meeting attendees to sign in and to be added to the project mailing list. Greeters provided a fact sheet available in English or CHamoru and a comment form to attendees, along with verbal direction on the general flow of the poster stations and commenting methods. Poster stations were set up around the room and subject matter experts staffed each poster station to answer questions and provide project information. A CHamoru translator was available at the scoping meetings.

Meeting staff set up a comment station with tables, chairs, pens, and comment forms to facilitate the public completing and submitting written comments at the meeting. Individuals could submit completed comment forms at the meeting or by mail to the address provided on the comment form. Comments could also be submitted electronically via the project website or email. A digital voice recorder was available to record oral comments.

In total, 204 people attended the three open house scoping meetings. Thirty-one written comments and one oral comment were submitted at the scoping meetings.

Hilton Guam Resort, Tumon Bay

- 114 attendees
- 12 written comments

Micronesia Mall, Dededo

- 60 attendees
- 14 written comments

Hågat Mayor's Office Community Center, Hågat

- 30 attendees
- 5 written comments, 1 oral comment

1.2.4 Media Availability

MDA held a media availability session at the first open house scoping meeting on Wednesday, August 2, 2023, at 6:00 p.m. in a separate room at the Hilton Guam Resort. Six media outlets attended the media availability session, including the Marianas Variety, Pacific Island Times, Guam Pacific Daily News, Guam Daily Post, KUAM News, and Public Broadcasting System (PBS). Attendees received media kits and project staff answered questions about the project.

1.2.5 Posters

The MDA outreach team developed nine posters and included the following topics:

- MDA History, Mission, and Strategic Goals
- Need for Missile Defense on Guam
- Proposed Action
- Candidate Sites
- Airspace Management
- System Components
- Environmental Resources
- NHPA Section 106 Process
- National Environmental Policy Act

The project website included downloadable copies of the posters.

1.2.6 Fact Sheets

The MDA outreach team developed an eight-page fact sheet in English and a two-page summary fact sheet in CHamoru that were made available at stakeholder briefings, the media availability session, on the project website, and during open house public scoping meetings. The English fact sheet included the following topics.

- Introduction
 - Intent to prepare an EIS
 - Purpose and need
 - Cooperating agencies
- Proposed Action
 - 360-degree Enhanced Integrated Air and Missile Defense System
 - Potential airspace modifications
- About MDA
 - MDA mission
 - MDA strategic goals
- Enhanced Integrated Air and Missile Defense (EIAMD) System
 - Components of EIAMD system
 - Candidate sites for EIAMD system
- Environmental Resources to be Analyzed in the EIS
 - Resource areas
 - Cumulative impacts
 - Supporting studies and surveys
- NEPA and Public Involvement
- NEPA Process and Timeline

The outreach team also developed a two-page fact sheet on the NHPA Section 106 process to provide information the regulatory process, a glossary of terms, and how to request to be a consulting party.

1.2.7 Public Commenting

The public was able to submit comments in several convenient ways:

- Website
- Email
- In person at the public scoping meetings (written or oral)
- U.S. postal mail

Scoping comments could be submitted on the project website. An electronic comment form (up to 5,000 characters) was made available and one attachment (up to 5 MB) could be uploaded. The public could also submit comments to a dedicated email address, info@EIAMD-EIS.com.

A printed comment form was available at the open house scoping meetings and an electronic version was posted on the project website for the public to download. Comments could be turned

in at the meetings or mailed to PMB 403, 1270 N. Marine Corps Dr., Suite 101, Tamuning, Guam 96913-4331.

1.3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments

This section is intended to illustrate the main issues heard from the public during the scoping period; it is not meant to capture all aspects of the comments or to serve as a legal record.

The public scoping period was open from May 5, 2023, to August 18, 2023. MDA received 136 comments during the scoping phase. MDA received 77 comments via email, 27 comments via the project website, and 32 comments at the open house scoping meetings [written comments (31) and oral comments (1)]. Please note that if a comment was submitted by the same person or group more than once via different methods, e.g., the same comment was submitted by U.S. mail and via the website by the same person, it was only counted once. Please note that one comment may include comments on multiple resource areas or topics.

Table 3 includes a summary of the public comments to provide a brief overview of the general issues or concerns expressed by the public.

Table 3. Summary of Public Comments

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Protection of Guam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that Guam will become a greater target for war (31). • Questions about the ability of the EIAMD system to defend against missile strikes (20). • Concern that Guam will become a “first strike community” (29). • General belief that this project goes against the mission statement of the Department of Defense (DoD) to use force to deter war. • Questions about the partnership between Guam and the military (7). • Concern that this project does not protect Guam but further militarizes the island (2). • General support of the project due to Guam already being a target (4). • Questions about a specific plan in place to protect Guam in the event of an attack (2). • Questions regarding who is the threat to Guam. • Concern for possible system damage caused by natural disaster. • Question about whether nuclear microreactors will be on Guam and if so, how many, what size, where will they be located, and for what purpose (7). • Question regarding the expectation that these sites would be targeted in the event of conflict. • Concern whether this system really is intended to protect the people of Guam. • Question whether the 360-degree EIAMD system is a sword or shield. • Question about passive methods of defense and why aren’t shelters being made a priority (6). • Question about number of workers expected to operate the system (both military and contractor personnel). • Concern that many of the component parts are already years behind schedule or yet to be deployed (3). • Question on the impact of a nuclear or biological missile being shot down over islands or islands downwind.
Air Quality (including Climate Change)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that explosive ordnance poses a risk to air quality (12). • Concern that the air will become toxic to breathe (4).

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Public Health and Safety Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions on the blast radius of the missiles carried in relation to villages outside of the base (7). • Concern for any nuclear micro-reactors having accidents or being damaged by warfare (15). • Concern for any nuclear impacts on current residents and future children (5). • Do not feel safe or secure in their own homes anymore. • Concern for radar impacts on both human and animal health (6). • Question regarding if the Department of Public Health and Social Services has been contacted regarding potential impacts on health or additional health and safety requirements. • Request for the incorporation of redundant safety systems and fail-safe mechanisms into the design of any micro-nuclear reactors. • Concern for a lack of public awareness about the presence of any micro-nuclear reactors. • Concern that Guam is a small island that in the event of a nuclear accident, there would be nowhere to evacuate. • Concern that medical facilities on Guam are ill-prepared to take on a large number of injured individuals at the same time. • Concern that future generations will be survivors of war similar to the elders (4). • Question regarding the composition of the propellants being used.
Transportation Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with road access near new sites (3). • Concern for traffic near the sites (2).
Socioeconomics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that this project threatens the economic recovery from the recent typhoon (18). • Concern that visibility of weapons and military personnel will impact tourism due to a fear for safety (10). • Request that the money for this project be diverted to fund healthcare and other resources that would benefit the citizens of Guam (5). • Questions whether this project will result in local jobs or hiring opportunities (2). • Request for more funding towards Guam Customs to handle increased security needs (3). • Concern that housing prices will increase.
Environmental Justice and the Protection of Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that this project presents dangers and threats to Guam’s older, younger, and future generations (7). • Importance of early engagement with local communities and considerations for tailoring outreach and engagement with respect to local demographics. • Impact assessment should consider specific vulnerabilities of the community when identifying and discussing impacts, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Heightened disease susceptibility or health disparities ○ Socioeconomic vulnerabilities such as reliance on a particular resource that may be affected by the Proposed Action ○ Disruptions to community mobility and access ○ Cultural elements such as effects on traditional cultural properties and ceremonies ○ Fish consumption practices ○ Exacerbation of any climate change concerns
Mitigation Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions regarding the emergency response in the event of an attack, particularly shelters or aircraft (3). • Questions about specific mitigation measures for the intercept missiles. • Questions on how endangered species impacts will be mitigated (2). • Concern for how natural resources will be protected (2). • Request for a specific mitigation plan for each site (16). • Request for the establishment of independent oversight bodies to monitor the operation and safety of any micro-nuclear reactors.

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
Cultural Resources / NHPA Section 106 Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that ancestral burial grounds and sacred sites will be desecrated (22). • Questions whether funding will include a cultural resources artifact depository (2). • Question whether the EIS under NEPA will incorporate NHPA’s Section 106 process or will a separate process be conducted (2). • Requests to be Consulting Parties for Section 106 process. • Question whether State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO) have been contacted yet about the candidate sites and potential archaeological impacts. • Assertion that the Naval Base Guam (NBG) Apra View/Apra Palms site is a heritage reserve and does not qualify due to cultural resources. • Assertion that the NBG Tenjo Vista site is a heritage reserve and does not qualify due to cultural resources. • Request the DoD to seek guidance from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. • Questions asking why historical lands on Guam are not protected like the National Parks on the mainland if Guam is truly a part of the U.S. • Request for SHPO staff have access to all 20 sites during every phase to ensure diligent monitoring and preservation of culturally and historically significant items.
Water Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the explosive ordnance poses a threat to groundwater (12). • Concern that the systems will pollute the oceans (11). • Concern for the unaddressed need to protect aquifers (6).
Airspace Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern of the impact on private flights and drone use (4). • Request for maps of aviation corridors (2). • Concern for flight delays and overall congestion of the airspace (4). • Questions whether flight paths that promote fuel efficiency and reduce noise impacts will be suspended or terminated. • Concern whether radar systems will interfere with carefully calibrated Federal Aviation Administration navigation systems. • Question regarding what type of fuel will be used in these systems and if that fuel use will impact the availability of fuel for flights and drones.
Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the military already owns 30% of the land and doesn’t deserve to take any more (26). • Concern that these weapons will only spark the need for more weapons and more of a need to take land (8). • Concern that Guam is too small to sustain and carry these 20 proposed sites (3). • Questions on what the combined hard and soft footprint of the system will be (2). • Concern on what environmental buffers will be established (5). • Questions why these components cannot be co-located (2). • Questioned the identified amount of private and public lands impacted. • Concern that there may be land and housing issues that are the Department of Land Management’s purview being affected by the site selections. • Request from the Guam Preservation Trust for information on how this will affect land use. • Questions that are specific to certain sites include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the NBG Dandan site: what is the planned access road? ○ For the Malessso site: what is the planned access road? ○ Will any of the northern sites fetter existing access to private landowners in Jinapsan? ○ Is the NBG Former Nimitz Hill Housing Area site near the Turner Road private residential areas? Will access to this area be fettered? ○ Is the NBG Apra View/Apra Palms site contiguous/near the private residential areas? ○ Is the NMS Northeast site contiguous/near private residential areas? ○ Is the Malessso site in the municipality of Malessso or is it in Inalahan or is it in

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	Humatak?
Visual Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern for visual resource degradation due to missiles and military structures being imposed upon the landscape (5). • Request from the Guam Preservation Trust for information on how this will affect visual resources.
Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions on the possible impact on access to recreational, hunting, and fishing grounds (4).
Noise and Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about noise impacts at the sites (2).
Geological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the systems will destroy soil quality leading to the inability to survive independent of shipped goods (8). • Request for information on how geological resources would be affected.
Terrestrial Biological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern deforestation will worsen due to the need to clear new land (19). • Question about the specific size of the plots of land to be cleared (6). • Protected species are vulnerable to land clearing (17). • Question regarding how environmental issues would be treated under the Guam Environmental Protection Agency’s purview. • Question whether the Guam Department of Agriculture has been contacted and made agreements concerning conservation. • Question whether the Guam Department of Agriculture has been contacted about the identified candidate sites.
Infrastructure and Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the people of Guam are still trying to recover from the structural damage of Typhoon Mawar (13). • Request for more information on the overall impact on infrastructure assets. • Questions on potential impacts on the power grids, roadways, and reservoirs (3). • Questions how waste will be disposed of from the sites (6). • Concern that the power grid will be unable to support this project with its current capacities (4). • Request for more funding to the local government of Guam to be used on infrastructure (2). • Concern that the energy needs will cause an increase in the use of fossil fuels (2). • Concern for who will pay for and build the needed housing, transportation, and other public infrastructure requirements. • Request for a construction timeline.
General Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that Guam is being used as a test site for developing EIAMD technologies (11). • Concern that not enough information or details have been made available to the public (20). • Stated that this project threatens sovereignty and Guam’s right to self-determine its political future (21). • Stated that war is not inevitable, and conflict must be resolved through diplomacy and disarmament (18). • Concern that the people of Guam have come last in the U.S. interest, and this will continue with this project (2). • Reminded the committee of the horrors the people of Guam people faced during WWII (12). • Concern that the airfield being built at the Tinian airport is for escape should Guam be attacked, proving the knowledge of the risk (15). • Question if the reason for putting these systems on Guam was due to the feeling that the locals have no choice. • Stated that if Guam was controlled by locals that it would be a more well-rounded and

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<p>thriving economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that there is too much of an information gap to support the EIAMD (2). • Questioned why the people are being asked to address the impact of the EIAMD rather than the reason for its existence. • Request for more respect for the island’s culture. • Questions regarding whether land and sea-based systems will be linked (2). • Questions on how the U.S. Space Force be involved (2). • Question about the more specific EIS process and timeline (2). • Request for a map showing how the radars will be set up and the directions they will point (2). • Concern that the public meeting format did not provide a good enough presentation or allow for all questions to be heard. • Appreciation for the information being presented to the locals with transparency (4). • Request for increased communication with non-profit, environmental, and women’s groups. • General feeling of being much more knowledgeable after attending the public meetings. • Stated that this project is in direct violation of the United Nations Declaration of Indigenous Peoples Article 10 (3). • Recommended that prayer is more powerful than any missile defense. • Question whether the Guam Environmental Protection Agency has been in contact about the candidate sites. • Concern that critical elements are caught up in interservice disputes. • Questions about the instruments the military will use to secure all easements at each site. • Concern that if there are many issues with the system already, why was Guam chosen at all. • Request for the reveal of any contracts for an Initial Deployment Capacity for the 360-degree EIAMD system. • Request for the reveal of any contracts for an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity contract for multi-discipline Architect-Engineer Services for projects relating to the 360-degree EIAMD system. • Question whether the Department of Land Management has been contacted about the candidate sites. • Question regarding whether there are any non-federal properties being considered for the system. • Request for the DoD to update the 2015 Supplemental EIS to determine Guam Historic Properties Inventory 66-04-2757 National Register of Historic Places eligibility as it was not evaluated (4). • Concern that the public comment period did not meet its goals and that the public scoping meetings should occur at the very beginning of the scoping period (2). • Concern for the potential of high rates of adverse impacts. • Request for the sites to be more clearly defined and presented to the community (3). • Concern that the mobility of the sites will cause additional impacts (3). • Public criticism should be welcomed due to its benefit in prior operations. • Belief that all wars are fake, unnecessary, and bad for everyone involved (2). • Questioned the current role of Government of Guam with MDA. • Concern over the increase of food insecurity. • Request for a study of seeds at the selected sites to determine dietary impacts. • Question if there was a plan to airlift all people on Guam to the U.S. in the case of an attack. • Concern that due to the scale of potential disaster, there will need to be a plan that involves U.S. and other international entities for assistance, expertise, and resources to

Resource Area/Topic	Issue/Concern
	<p>support emergency response and recovery efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question regarding who would pay for the cost of repair and recovery in the event of a catastrophic attack.

Notes: DoD = Department of Defense, EIAMD = Enhanced Integrated Air and Missile Defense, EIS = Environmental Impact Statement, MDA = Missile Defense Agency, NBG = Naval Base Guam, NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act, NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer, U.S. = United States.

The EIS project team will consider the impact, significance, and relevance of the comments, as well as the substantive issues and concerns of the community, during the development of the Draft EIS.