

8.1.2 E-MAIL COMMENT DOCUMENTS—DRAFT EIS

Individuals who commented on the Draft EIS in e-mail form are listed in table 8.1.2-1 along with their respective commenter ID number. This number can be used to find the e-mail document that was submitted and to locate the corresponding table on which responses to each comment are provided.

E-Mail Comments

Exhibit 8.1.2-1 presents reproductions of the e-mail comment documents that were received in response to the Draft EIS. Comment documents are identified by commenter ID number, and each statement or question that was categorized as addressing a separate environmental issue is designated with a sequential comment number.

Response to E-Mail Comments

Table 8.1.2-2 presents the responses to substantive comments to the Draft EIS that were received in e-mail form. Responses to specific comments can be found by locating the corresponding commenter ID number and sequential comment number identifiers.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 8.1.2-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Email Comments)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Suzanne Canja	P-E-0001
Kathleen Donehower	P-E-0002
Joanna Donehower	P-E-0003
Michael Jones - University of Hawaii	P-E-0004
Miriam Bennett	P-E-0005
Ginger Decker	P-E-0006
Marie-Anne Hudson - McGill University	P-E-0007
Matt DeBenedetti - Legato Systems, Inc.	P-E-0008
Dave Potter	P-E-0009
Michael Callahan	P-E-0010
Dave Beames	P-E-0011
Craig Bender	P-E-0012
Cynthia Dale	P-E-0013
Christina Donehower - McGill University	P-E-0014
Farhana Mia	P-E-0015
Jessica Forrest	P-E-0016
F. Anthony Kurtz	P-E-0017
Jim Anderson	P-E-0018
Dave Potter	P-E-0019
Carolyn Heitman	P-E-0020
Matt DeBenedetti - Legato Systems, Inc.	P-E-0021
Isabel Julian	P-E-0022
Richard Gibson	P-E-0023
Graeme Marsh	P-E-0024
David Skimin	P-E-0025
Amy Winterscheidt and Bruce McCracken	P-E-0026
Frank McCord - Cascade Bank and the Navy Relations Committee	P-E-0027
David Bird - McGill University	P-E-0028
Josee Rousseau - McGill University	P-E-0029
Lari Belisle - Anchorage ARTCC	P-E-0030
Ivona Xiezopolski	P-E-0031
Judith Evered	P-E-0032
Michael Jones - University of Hawaii	P-E-0033
Ben Brisbois	P-E-0034
Mike Milligan	P-E-0035
Karen Button	P-E-0036
Nola Conn	P-E-0037
Graeme Marsh	P-E-0038
Ronald Russell	P-E-0039

Table 8.1.2-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Email Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Miguel Checa	P-E-0040
Paul Miller	P-E-0041
Robin Connors	P-E-0042
Marie Le Boeuf	P-E-0043
Pete Doktor	P-E-0044
Hattie Berg	P-E-0045
Kawika Alfiche	P-E-0046
Ednette Chandler	P-E-0047
Gary Bart	P-E-0048
Marti Paskal	P-E-0049
Deborah Burnham	P-E-0050
Myra Lewin	P-E-0051
Richard Burge	P-E-0052
Kima Douglas	P-E-0053
Dolores Blalock - Communication Design Dept	P-E-0054
Scot Ryder	P-E-0055
Kathy-Lyn Binkowski	P-E-0056
Diana Richardson	P-E-0057
Lauryn Galindo	P-E-0058
John Kesich	P-E-0059
Carole Madsen	P-E-0060
Shawn Dicken	P-E-0061
John Grant	P-E-0062
Michael Douglas	P-E-0063
Nancy Miller	P-E-0064
Cindy Brockway	P-E-0065
James Danoff-Burg	P-E-0066
Douglas Cornett	P-E-0067
Makaala Kaaumoana	P-E-0068
Yvette Crosby	P-E-0069
Kevin Correll	P-E-0070
Maire Susan Sanford	P-E-0071
Kami Altar	P-E-0072
Eli Harris	P-E-0073
Charles Hansen	P-E-0074
Nahe Kahokualohi	P-E-0075
Nancy Crom	P-E-0076
Lori Juiff	P-E-0077
Pulelehuakeanuenue Oshiyama	P-E-0078

Table 8.1.2-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Email Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Tammy Robinson	P-E-0079
Kekama Galioto	P-E-0080
Dane Nance	P-E-0081
Bryan Kuwada	P-E-0082
Rosemary Alles	P-E-0083
Jessica Manthey	P-E-0084
Christine Page	P-E-0085
Shaun Smakal	P-E-0086
Kalyan Meola	P-E-0087
Fredy Morse	P-E-0088
Amy Ono	P-E-0089
Mike Stephens	P-E-0090
Gary Manfredi	P-E-0091
David M.K. Tane Inciong II	P-E-0092
Amanda Rang	P-E-0093
Karen Mavec	P-E-0094
Joy Chambers	P-E-0095
Peter Zadis	P-E-0096
Peter Sandoval	P-E-0097
Robert Culbertson	P-E-0098
Paul Williams	P-E-0099
Kathy Harter	P-E-0100
Mary Lu Kelley	P-E-0101
Christina Borra	P-E-0102
Cathleen Hayes	P-E-0103
Marion Kelly	P-E-0104
L.M. Bubala	P-E-0105
Eleawani Felix	P-E-0106
James Nordlund	P-E-0107
Jeff Frontz	P-E-0108
Terry Bunch	P-E-0109
Deborah Davis	P-E-0110
Charone O'Neil-Naeole	P-E-0111
KatRama Brooks	P-E-0112
DJ Colbert	P-E-0113
Jeffery Courson	P-E-0114
Nathan Boddie	P-E-0115
Virginia Gibson	P-E-0116
Aggelige Spanos	P-E-0117

Table 8.1.2-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Email Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Ravi Grover	P-E-0118
Forest Shomer	P-E-0119
Timothy Johnson	P-E-0120
Donna Melead	P-E-0121
Ana Young	P-E-0122
D. Bowman	P-E-0123
Rudolf Vracko	P-E-0124
Jessica Ma	P-E-0125
Joseph Rodrigues	P-E-0126
Karrina Mount	P-E-0127
Christopher Kubiak	P-E-0128
Faye Kurk	P-E-0129
Toni Ehrlich-Feldman	P-E-0130
Stephen Thompson	P-E-0131
Jeremiah Spense	P-E-0132
Frank Marsh	P-E-0133
Reagan Hooton	P-E-0134
Pat Porter	P-E-0135
Jane Yamashita	P-E-0136
Monica Kaiwi	P-E-0137
Matthew McGuire	P-E-0138
Sanford Higginbotham	P-E-0139
Dick Miller	P-E-0140
Nikki Gentry	P-E-0141
Carlos Altieri	P-E-0142
Tina Horowitz	P-E-0143
Annalia Russell	P-E-0144
Gain Andrea Morresi	P-E-0145
Miguel Godinez	P-E-0146
Perry McCorkle	P-E-0147
Kay Snow-Davis	P-E-0148
Niyati Brown	P-E-0149
Shannon Rudolph	P-E-0150
Lisa Carter	P-E-0151
James Albertini	P-E-0152
Raphael Mazor	P-E-0153
Adam Mick	P-E-0154
Larry Ford	P-E-0155
Jenifer Prince	P-E-0156

Table 8.1.2-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Email Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
B McClintock	P-E-0157
Philip Mohorich	P-E-0158
Mary Krane Derr	P-E-0159
Paul Waller	P-E-0160
Connie Boitano	P-E-0161
Carroll Dana	P-E-0162
Jean Flint	P-E-0163
Jerome Carpenter	P-E-0164
Philip Simon	P-E-0165
Cheryl Rosefeld - University of Missouri	P-E-0166
Emma Kaye	P-E-0167
Robert Blackiston	P-E-0168
Forrest Hurst	P-E-0169
Tod Heintz	P-E-0170
Alison Hartle	P-E-0171
Walter Pomroy	P-E-0172
Robert Lebendiger	P-E-0173
Ricky Wright	P-E-0174
Judy Dalton	P-E-0175
David Dinner	P-E-0176
Tom Jackson	P-E-0177
Robert Kelly	P-E-0178
Scott Jarvis	P-E-0179
Dwayne Tarletz	P-E-0180
Karin Hazelhoff	P-E-0181
Daniel Lovejoy	P-E-0182
Scott McKenzie	P-E-0183
Gary Brady	P-E-0184
Noelani Puniwai	P-E-0185
Katie Johnson	P-E-0186
Bob Tripp	P-E-0187
Maya Moiseyev	P-E-0188
Maliu Neilson	P-E-0189
Michele Chavez-Pardini	P-E-0190
Donovan Watts	P-E-0191
Eliza Linser	P-E-0192
Catherine Rawson	P-E-0193
Berton Harrah	P-E-0194
Bill Lewis	P-E-0195

Table 8.1.2-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Email Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Kiope Raymond	P-E-0196
Suki Ewers	P-E-0197
William Golove	P-E-0198
Gregg Schulze	P-E-0199
Lee Altenberg - University of Hawaii	P-E-0200
Mark Reif	P-E-0201
Richard Powers	P-E-0202
Rhoda Libre	P-E-0203
Raphael Kaliko	P-E-0204
Leslie Minor	P-E-0205
Rick D. Eberharter	P-E-0206
Jane Seymour	P-E-0207
Deborah M Wright	P-E-0208
Margaret Ann Lyman	P-E-0209
Victoria Walker	P-E-0210
Al & Peggy Pierce	P-E-0211
Linda & Dennis Finlayson	P-E-0212
Crispin Wilhelm	P-E-0213
Charles Glaisyer	P-E-0214
Nancy Robert	P-E-0215
Larry Walsh	P-E-0216
Peggy Katica	P-E-0217
Chris and Doretta Runo	P-E-0218
Peggy Kurtz	P-E-0219
Wendy Zieve	P-E-0220
Peggy Toepel - Everett Shorelines Coalition	P-E-0221
Mike Palmer	P-E-0222
Bruce Wasell	P-E-0223
Brian Dale	P-E-0224
Ann Peterson	P-E-0225
Kevin Nasr	P-E-0226
Mary Kate Olson	P-E-0227
Greg Rielly	P-E-0228
Karen Clark	P-E-0229
Julian Dewell	P-E-0230
Walt Blackford	P-E-0231
Michelle Geck	P-E-0232
Kitty and Gordy Adams	P-E-0233
Elspeth Anderson	P-E-0234

Table 8.1.2-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Email Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Gloria Chou	P-E-0235
Mark Nagel	P-E-0236
Karen Stolworthy	P-E-0237
Larry Egge	P-E-0238
Thomas Murphy	P-E-0239
Barbara Birman	P-E-0240
Judy Thomas	P-E-0241
Linda Beeman	P-E-0242
Shannon Walter	P-E-0243
William Rubel	P-E-0244
Dean Enell	P-E-0245
Kimberly Hunter	P-E-0246
Marsha Cogdill	P-E-0247
Marianne Edain - Whidbey Environmental Action Network	P-E-0248
Maxine Kraemer	P-E-0249
Mike Curtis	P-E-0250
Scott Kerst	P-E-0251
Glen Milner	P-E-0252
Valerie Steel	P-E-0253
Anne Robison	P-E-0254
George and Maribeth Newland	P-E-0255
Diane Kendy and Michael Nutt	P-E-0256
Gloria Olson	P-E-0257
Philip Jazwieck	P-E-0258
Michael Martin and Won Chong Kim	P-E-0259
Karen Davies	P-E-0260
Karen Charnell	P-E-0261
Elizabeth Hallgarth	P-E-0262
Sheila Hoopman	P-E-0263
Corry Venema-Weiss	P-E-0264
Robert Setlow	P-E-0265
Won Chong Kim	P-E-0266
Christine Giannini	P-E-0267
David A. Kurtz	P-E-0268
Deane W. Minor	P-E-0269
Donna Witte	P-E-0270
Judy Thomas	P-E-0271
Mark Anderson	P-E-0272
Ray McKinnon	P-E-0273

Table 8.1.2-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Email Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Dale and Laura Temple	P-E-0274
Kelli Trosvig	P-E-0275
Margaret Grospitch	P-E-0276
S. Phillips	P-E-0277
Mary Jane Anderson	P-E-0278
Miji Ryan	P-E-0279
Ivan Eastin	P-E-0280
Glen Miller	P-E-0281
Ken Adams	P-E-0282
Robert Emery - Friends of Maggie Park	P-E-0283
Amy Burton	P-E-0284
J. C. and Mary O'Donnell	P-E-0285
Scott, Kim, Michael, and Kevin Schroeder	P-E-0286
John Doyle	P-E-0287
Lynn Hays	P-E-0288
John Hurd	P-E-0289
Gloria Olson	P-E-0290
Tracey Hoffman and Carol Grout	P-E-0291
Chris Beckmeyer	P-E-0292
Calvin Bouma	P-E-0293
Kim Buckhalter	P-E-0294
Eugene S Dvornick	P-E-0295
Joseph E Eichinger	P-E-0296
Bernie JMW Fleming	P-E-0297
Rose Goulet	P-E-0298
Denis Hayner	P-E-0299
Andrew H	P-E-0300
Jamie and Kathy Hunter	P-E-0301
Christianne Loupelle - Dept of Natural Resources Sciences, McGill University	P-E-0302
Mike Mashock	P-E-0303
John R McCoy	P-E-0304
Patricia Johansen Mitchell	P-E-0305
Bob Mumford	P-E-0306
Michelle Wilson Nordhoff	P-E-0307
Michael Papa	P-E-0308
Lynn Willeford	P-E-0309
Malama Pono, M. Doherty, Chisa Dodge, Mona Kim, Ujenna & Marguerit Johnson, and Garth Forth	P-E-0310
Timothy M Reisenauer	P-E-0311

Table 8.1.2-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Email Comments Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Brent Sampson	P-E-0312
Eileen Simmons	P-E-0313
Phil Sturholm	P-E-0314
Michelle Trautman	P-E-0315
No Name Provided	P-E-0316
Susan Payne and Don Dumm	P-E-0317
Doris and Clair Olivers	P-E-0318
Cha Smith - KAHEA: The Hawaiian-Environmental Alliance	P-E-0319
Katherine Lynch	P-E-0320
Patricia Neel	P-E-0321
Larry Fox	P-E-0322
Mary Lee Griswold	P-E-0323
Anne Hartley	P-E-0324
Betty Taylor	P-E-0325
Patricia Neel	P-E-0326
Toni Marthaller-Andersen	P-E-0327
Patricia Neel	P-E-0328
Kimberli McCabe - Port Gardner Bay Recovery	P-E-0329
Philip Notermann	P-E-0330
Bill Mulliken	P-E-0331
Norma Jean Young	P-E-0332
Frederick Olson	P-E-0333
Laurie Keith - Whidbey Island No Spray Coalition	P-E-0334
Sally Goodwin	P-E-0335
Robert Kenny	P-E-0336
Fred Geisler	P-E-0337
Elisa Miller	P-E-0338
Dale and Laura Temple	P-E-0339
M. Ward Hinds - Snohomish Health District	P-E-0340
Erich Franz	P-E-0341
Melinda Gladstone	P-E-0342
Suzanne A. Fageol	P-E-0343
Dan Warnock	P-E-0344
Eve Riley	P-E-0345
Susan Berta - Orca Network	P-E-0346
Constance Hallgarth	P-E-0347
Laura Hartman	P-E-0348

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: S Canja Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2003 3:39 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Opposition to GMD ETR I am writing to express my deepest concern over the proposed inclusion of Midway Atoll, NWHI in the Ground Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range. Please continue to protect Midways unique biological resources by preserving the atoll as a wildlife refuge. I worked at Midway Atoll from October 1997 September 2000 as a field biologist studying the endangered Hawaiian monk seals. Since the establishment of a Wildlife Refuge with the USFWS in 1996, the birth rate of Midway monk seal population has grown substantially and continues to be delicately stable. The beaches, reefs, and surrounding waters of Midway not only support the monk seals, but also the threatened Green Sea Turtles, Hawaiian Spinner Dolphins and a vast array of rare lagoon, reef, and pelagic fishes. Midway provides important and critical habitat for fifteen species of seabirds totally more than 2 million birds, including albatross, petrels, terns, noddies, tropicbirds, shearwaters, and frigatebirds. Midway has the largest colony of Laysan Albatross in the world, the second largest Black footed Albatross colony and has several endangered Short tailed Albatross. In addition Midway is an important stopover for migrant shorebirds. My concern is this: The proposed activities increase the potential for an oil spill and/or hazardous waste contamination. Midway has already	P-E-0001 1	still experiencing the repercussions of these acts. Because of the sensitivity of an isolated atoll, I strongly oppose risking the balance of the ecosystem any further. Light pollution created from proposed security lights is a serious threat to nocturnal birds like the Bonin Petrel. USFWS has been working on mitigating the existing lights on the island for this reason. Bonin petrels are easily disoriented with lights and often collide into them and/or associated buildings. Because of their fragile body structure, these incidents are often lethal. Similarly, proposed antennas, power lines, fences, and satellites can pose a major hazard to seabirds, particularly albatross. Seabirds are not keyed into having obstructions to deal with and are unexpectedly caught off guard with these types of structures. Unfortunately, these mistakes could cost them their lives. And finally, while facility locations may be inshore, away from beaches where seals haul out, the increased levels of noise pollution created during construction and the addition of regular human presence will impact nesting and resting seabirds. Undoubtedly some seabird nest sites will be displaced by the onset of a new building(s) and a large fenced in area surrounding such building(s). In addition the increased use of motor vehicles during the albatross nesting season could be hazardous to chicks who begin to wander away from their nest. Midway Atoll was created as a National Wildlife Refuge for good reason. Many rare and endangered species have come to know and count on Midway as being a safe home. It is in the wildlifes best interest that I oppose the use of Midway Atoll as a Ground Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Suzanne Canja	2 3

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: KDONEHOWER Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 10:15 PM To: grndetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: GMD ETR EIS Please do not include Midway Atoll in GMD ETR. Over the past few years Midway's unique biological resources have been nurtured and preserved as a National Wildlife Refuge. Part of that care has included removal of lighting and physical structures which impede the growth, habitat, and nesting of many restricted bird populations. The proposed GMD ETR plans would reverse those moves and destroy the refurbished breeding grounds of those birds, as well as several groups of marine mammals. Much hard work, planning, and money has been spent to promote the reintroduction and re colonization of this atoll by endangered species. Please do not destroy the work that has been done there. Consider using offshore monitoring for the GMD ETR. Or perhaps, a previously established military operative base could be used, without the expense of setting up and staffing a new facility or the destruction of the breeding areas of endangered animals. Thank you. Kathleen Donehower Gig Harbor WA	P-E-0002 1	From: Joanna Donehower Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2003 12:47 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: No to Midway Atoll Missile Defense Testing I am writing to express my concern over the proposed inclusion of Midway Atoll, NWHI in the Ground Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR). Please continue to protect Midway's unique biological resources by preserving the atoll as a wildlife refuge. Joanna Donehower	P-E-0003 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Michael Jones Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 6:08 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: additional comments on the GMD ETR draft EIS 21 March 2003 via E mail to: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command ATTENTION: SMDC EN V (Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliott) 106 Wynn Drive Huntsville, AL 35805 Additional Comments on the Ground Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) These comments supplement those that I submitted on 3 March 2003. Please confirm that you have received these comments and those I submitted previously. 1) number of launches at PMRF and KLC The draft EIS does not make clear whether Strategic Target System launches from PMRF and KLC would be part of or in addition to those for the North Pacific Targets Program. I was told at the 6 March meeting in Honolulu that any Strategic Target System launches from these sites for GMD tests would not add to the totals envisioned in the North Pacific Targets Program EA. The final EIS should include tables giving the proposed annual number of launches at PMRF and at KLC for GMD tests and other programs during the expected duration of GMD testing. 2) inconsistent weights The numbers given in the 3rd line on page 2 18 are inconsistent. A weight of 20,000 tons corresponds to 18,144 metric tons, not 20,320 metric tons. 3) launch hazard area for 360 degree azimuth at PMRF I addressed this issue in my scoping comments for this EIS and in the comments I submitted on 3 March. I also noted in one of my	P-E-0004 1 2 3	comments on the North Pacific Targets Program EA that no previous environmental documents have provided details of the launch hazard area for a launch azimuth of 360 degrees. I consider the response to this comment inadequate for any meaningful assessment of the hazard area. I was told at the 6 March meeting in Honolulu that the launch hazard area could be modified (for example by reducing the maximum reaction time before the range safety officer is required to terminate an off course missile) so that the north half of Polihale State Park is excluded. The final EIS should discuss this, explicitly state what modifications are necessary for a launch with a 360 degree azimuth, and show a diagram analogous to that in Fig. 4.1.1.7 2 in the 1998 PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS for a 360 degree launch azimuth. Michael Jones Dept. of Physics & Astronomy Univ. of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii Below is one of my comments on the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the North Pacific Targets Program dated 3 April 2001. This comment addresses a launch azimuth of 360 degrees for a Strategic Target System booster from the Kauai Test Facility (KTF) at PMRF. 9) The discussion of proposed launches from KTF in section 2.1.2.3 on page 2 22 asserts that "appropriate launch safety criteria can be applied to preclude the need for new land use requirements." The only basis given for this assertion is "discussion with the PMRF Range Safety office." More details need to be provided to assess this assertion. This is particularly important for an initial launch azimuth near 360 degrees. One can see from figure 2 10 that a trajectory at an azimuth of 360 degrees comes within 3 kilometers of the northern part of Polihale State Park. Therefore, a warning area of the same size as shown in figure 2 7 (i.e. 4 kilometers on either side of the flight trajectory) would contain all of the park. However, only the southern part of the park is within the current ground hazard area and is thus subject to the restrictive easement for launches from PMRF. If the warning area were to extend 37	4

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

kilometers on either side of the 360 degree trajectory, one can see in figure 1 3 that it would contain Kokee State Park and the towns of Hanalei and Princeville. The response to this comment, dated 1 Oct. 2001, is the following: "The warning area expands out as if from the center of a cone after the flight has left the Kauai coast thus the extended safety zone is over water. No portion of the warning area covers any new area of Polihale State Park. The PMRF Range Safety Office confirmed this during northwest and north launch discussions as part of the PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS. Since the warning area does not cover the northern part of Polihale State Park, it will also not cover Kokee State Park or the North Shore."	COMMENT NUMBER	From: Dagirlz48 Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2003 2:26 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX port Gentlemen, I am writing to add my voice to the other Everett, Washington, residents who have asked that the SBX not be ported here. My primary concern is the proximity of two hospitals within the 13.8 mile Potential Disturbance Area. These hospitals provide care for the residents of two large counties. One is the trauma center and handles more patients than the trauma center in King County where Seattle is located. The other Providence hospital campus provides special care for neonates and pediatric intensive care. The SBX should be located where major medical facilities such as these will be well out of the range of the PDA. Thank you for your consideration, Miriam Bennett, R.N.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0005 1
--	-------------------------------	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Ginger Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2003 1:50 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Proposed Everett location of SBX radar Julia Elliott U.S. Army Missile Defense Command RE: Proposed Everett location of SBX radar Dear Ms. Elliott: I am very concerned about the proposed Everett location of the Sea Based X Band radar. I feel that Everett is not a good choice for this radar. Everett is a clean, quiet residential community that overlooks Port Gardner bay. This beautiful bay is the source of vistas and recreational opportunities. We have worked hard to clean up our shoreline and protect it's natural beauty and well as increase it's economic vitality. Years ago, our shoreline was heavily industrialized and Everett was not considered a desirable place to live. We now have the second largest Marina on the west coast with a wealth of recreational opportunities. We are poised to become one of the most livable cities in America and we have been working to increase tourism here. The Navy is a clean and welcome presence in our bay. It gives our town an 'Annapolis' feel. But this radar is unsightly. It's presence would seriously damage our home values, environmental health, and economy. Please consider more suitable sites that are not as populated or as rich in natural beauty as our beautiful port. Ginger Decker Everett, WA	P-E-0006 1 2	From: Marie Anne Hudson Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 12:25 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge To whom it may concern, I am writing to express my concern over the proposed inclusion of Midway Atoll, NWHI in the Ground Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR). Midway Atoll should be conserved in its current state as a wildlife refuge for many reasons: 1. Fifteen species of seabirds (more than 2 million birds, including albatross, tropicbirds, boobies, shearwaters, petrels, frigatebirds, terns, noddies) nest on the atoll each year. 2. Midway is home to the largest colony of Laysan Albatross (<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>) in the world and the second largest Black footed Albatross (<i>P. nigripes</i>) colony. An endangered Short tailed Albatross (<i>P. albatrus</i>) recovery effort is also underway. 3. It is an important stopover for migrant shorebirds (curlews, plovers, turnstones). 4. The beaches, reef, and surrounding waters support endangered Hawaiian Monk Seals (<i>Monachus schauinslandi</i>), threatened Green Sea Turtles (<i>Chelonia mydas</i>), Hawaiian Spinner Dolphins (<i>Stenella longirostris</i>) and a vast array of rare lagoon, reef, and pelagic fishes. This is but a short list please continue to protect Midway's unique biological resources by preserving the atoll as a wildlife refuge. Thank you, Marie Anne Hudson M.Sc. Candidate McGill University Quebec, Canada	P-E-0007 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Matt DeBenedetti Sent: Sunday, March 16, 2003 4:14 PM To: 'gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil' Subject: Opposed to SBX in Everett Some more information Original Message From: Matt DeBenedetti Sent: Sunday, March 16, 2003 2:12 PM To: 'pwhitely Subject: SBX in Everett Peyton, I just read your article about the proposed SBX at Naval Station Everett, and I also read the Environmental Impact Statement have you read the EIS? The claims they make in that document are worthy of an article unto itself. Here are some of the highlights, which I shared with family and friends... Hey guys, I've learned some new things today... We all know what EPA stands for, but here are some new ones that go along with EPA (and DoD). Do you know what EMR is? How about EED? IEEE, anyone? Well the EIS that I read this morning talks about all of these things, and more! Read on... EIS = Environmental Impact Statement EMR = Electromagnetic Radiation EED = Electroexplosive Device IEEE Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Nice, huh? There goes the neighborhood...	P-E-0008	I am reading the Environmental Impact Statement not much to worry about other than intense radiation discharge, navigational equipment interference, prolonged periods of significant noise generation, etc, etc... oh wait, there is also the aesthetic impact (can you say resale value) oh, wait... the EIS says that we already have a carrier in port, and it's about as tall, so there really won't be any aesthetic impact (other than the fact that the carrier is half submerged by design!). What's to worry about RF radiation, anyway? The EIS actually argues that because the IEEE and the EPA averages radiation level exposure per 6 minute increment, increased exposure (10x) for shorter durations is acceptable. Yeah, so what if there is considerable published concern over the likelihood of EED (Electroexplosive devices) interference causing ejection seats in aircraft to discharge, airbags in cars to deploy, military aircraft weapons to launch and fire extinguishers to activate? It's all part of something called Main Beam Illumination, and because this radar device is designed to go in 360 degrees, everything is affected by it. Neat, huh? The EIS also identifies that AM/FM radio, Harmonic Band Radio frequencies and arial and nautical navigation equipment will be affected, as will (although no LONG TERM affect is anticipated) the ocean creatures like whales, dolphins, etc, who use sonar to navigate and communicate. Oh wait, I just read that television signals will also be adversely affected, and high power transmission lines will further distribute the effects beyond the immediate vicinity. The real bonus to this is that I'll be able to look directly at the platform from my living room window. Wow, my very own converted oil platform X band Radar facility in Port Gardner Bay. Sincerely, Matt DeBenedetti LEGATO SYSTEMS, INC. Pacific NW Area Sales Manager, Xtender Solutions OR, WA, ID, MT, WY, ND, SD, AK and Western Canada (BC, AB, SK, YT)	1 2 3 4

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: kirsten potter Sent: Saturday, March 15, 2003 11:35 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Midway Atoll useage Please send me the info on use of the Midway Atoll Refuge in the DEIS. I want to study it further. My addresses are below. Thanks! I also wish to file the below comments in case I do not receive the DEIS information in time to allow study and more in depth comments by the cut off dates [since I am in travel status soon.] I briefly served as fill in, acting Refuge Manager, US Fish and Wildlife Service, on Midway Atoll in 2001. I can say, from first hand observations, that it is a very unique place both biologically and historically. I also worked with the E.A. that established the Guam NWR and served as fill in Refuge Manager four times from 1993 1998. Regarding the possible military uses on the Midway Atoll NWR, I urge that no construction or other actions be undertaken that would damage habitat in the refuge. My specific biological comments: a) Measures must be taken extremely vigorously to prevent alien species, like rats, brown tree and other snakes, mongoose or house cats, etc., into the Atoll. Every aircraft and ship cargo, crew and passengers must be very thoroughly instructed, inspected and screened to prevent transfer of life forms. Unhappily, I know for a fact, having worked on Guam, that military commanders pushed by military deadlines are not always concerned with introducing exotic species into new habitats! They often don't listen to their staff biologists. Day to day compliance with environmental protection protocols and policies must be clearly	P-E-0009 1 2	required and routinely inspected for of all commands by order of the top military officer him or herself. b) Measures must be taken to extremely vigorously check soil, food items and all other plant materials so that alien plants species ["weeds"] are not further introduced into Midway Atoll. Things as seemingly simple as dirt in the soil of vibram tread boots can bring in seeds or organisms that could further damage this very important habitat. Again, military commanders often ignorant of these avenues must be made very sensitive to these potentially very adverse impacts. c) As a U.S. Coast Guard officer in the 1970's I worked oil spill control. I also received training in oil spill cleanup with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Monk seals, green sea turtles and many, many marine organisms could and would be very greatly damaged by an oil or other fuel spill. Spills on land, especially in the Atoll's porous sand, could be equally damaging and maybe even harder to clean up. [How do you dig up all the contaminated soil and remove it when it is the island?] Thorough training must be implemented to enforce spill prevention procedures. The routine erection of spill control barriers around every fuel storage point must be required. And, first responder spill cleanup procedures must be well instructed. Also, spill clean up materials must be stockpiled on the Atoll. d) Night lighting on hangers, at the oil facility and street lights was causing excessive Petrel losses [collisions as they are drawn to lights just like moths] during my time. The final EIS must stipulate that lighting not in immediate use will be turned off, always. Lighting needed for longer periods must be provided with cones or shields to direct the light downward or only toward the needed location. No general night lighting, please! e) I have seen Laysan Albatross routinely collide with old style power lines in broad daylight. The final EIS should state that except when absolutely impossible communication and electric cables are to be laid out on the ground surface. With the wide spread of Petrel burrows in the soft sand, these lines should be laid parallel to roads and not cross country.	3 4 5 6 7

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
g) When possible, exotic vegetation like Ironwood Trees should be removed. The EIS should require that in no case should non native vegetation be further planted or propagated on the Atoll, except in food garden container areas. No more Ironwoods, no grasses to reinstate the golf course and no uncontrolled personal tree, shrub or vegetable plantings should be allowed. The risk of exotic insects and exotic plant irruptions is too great.	8	From: Callahan, Michael C. Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2003 3:14 PM To: 'gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil' Subject: Comments on EIS for missile defense in Alaska	P-E-0010
h) During my time, waste disposal was being very poorly handled. Existing sewage lines were breaking down, an open pit garbage dump was in use and recyclables, like batteries, were stacking up. The final EIS must stipulate repair of sewage systems including no dumping of sewage within the Atoll or within a proper [1/2 mile?] distance offshore from the Atoll. No open or closed pit garbage dumping should be allowed. All garbage must be transported off island. Maximum recycling must be employed.	9	Dear Sir: I'm hoping that this is the correct venue to enter my EIS public comments on the missile defense system (including the current expansion plan), in Alaska. I have heard a great deal about the possible environmental impacts and/or supposed performance of this system in the last few months. While I agree that there will be some possible environmental impact of this system, I also believe that the environmental impact of a North Korean nuclear device would be much greater. As for the alleged performance difficulties of the system, I also believe that if North Korea believes that the system will work that would be a sufficient deterrent in and of itself. Additionally, I find it pretty amazing that people can determine the efficacy of a highly complex system before it's even installed, much less tested.	1
i) During my time, diesel generators produced electricity. The EIS should require the maximum possible employment of solar and wind powered generators for electricity. This also would reduce the need for power lines since the power could be produced near the use site.	10	I'm using North Korea as an example, since they have missiles that will reach Alaska and if they don't already have it are on the verge of having a nuclear weapons capability. Please note, though, that this is only an example since the same logic would apply to any rogue nation state or terrorist organization. In summary, I ask you to fully implement the missile defense system in Alaska as quickly as possible.	
j) Use of battery powered vehicles of all types should be maximized in the final EIS. All people regardless of age or rank should be required, except where medically or otherwise impossible, to travel the two larger islands on bicycles. It would help people's physical fitness. Also, this would greatly increase the compatibility of motor vehicles with the great concentration of bird life nesting on the Atoll.	11	Michael C. Callahan Eagle River, AK	
Thank you for this chance to comment. We have to have a strong military but Midway Atoll has very significant biological resources that really must be protected to the very best of our abilities.			
I sure fell in love with the place!			
Dave Potter Klamath Falls, OR			

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: DBeames Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2003 1:13 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett Im sure Im one of many on the hillside overlooking Port Gardner Bay who feel we have sacrificed our share to the defense effort by loosing much of our view to the Navy port at Everett and her greyness, the USS Lincoln. The months when she is away making some water viewable seems a fair trade off. Please dont tell us now that we will have to look at some thing three times as high and not near so sleek. My vote is no for a SBX in Everett. In case no one has noticed, most of Puget sound is deep enough for your needs.. Indian Island sounds like a great place. Sincerely Dave Beames Everett, WA	P-E-0011 1	From: Craig726 Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2003 9:30 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Mooring, Naval Station Everett SMDC EN V Ms. Julia Elliott U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command P.O. Box 1500, Huntsville, AL 35807 3801 Re: Naval Station Everett, SBX mooring The SBX environmental impact statement GMD ETR Draft EIS under estimates the impact of selecting Naval Station Everett as an SBX mooring site in the "Ocean Traffic" section 3.8.6.2. The security lighting installed on Pier Bravo has created a hazard to navigation that does impact commercial and recreational vessels. None the navigation markers are visible when approaching from the Bay. This situation will be far worse when the USS Lincoln is in port requiring the SBX platform to be anchored. The report also notes limited commercial freighter operation at the Port of Everett. That is historically correct as the development of Naval Station Everett has interrupted commercial operations. The Port continues to establish new business and the number of scheduled freighters stops is increasing.. This will create harbor navigation problems far greater than implied by the reports "occasional log carrier" reference. Naval Station Everett is not the best site for SBX mooring. Craig Bender recreational boater moored Port of Everett marina	P-E-0012 1 2 3 4

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Cynthia Dale Sent: Monday, March 17, 2003 3:07 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Test X Band Radar Ms. Julia Elliott, I'm writing you today to voice my disapproval of the SBX Radar project proposed for Everett, Washington. Your Sea Based Test X Band Radar will have a profound negative impact on our town and the surrounding community. Everett is home to the second largest Estuary in the State of Wa., the second largest pleasure boat Marina on the West Coast of America, a haven for Marine Wildlife such as Seals, Whales, Crab, Salmon, Eagles and Seagulls, all of which surround our water front Jetty and nearby Island. Everett also has a thriving water front tourist business. We are a home to the second largest multi campus hospital in the state of Wa., and to 5 nearby private and publicly owned Airports. We currently have approximately 20,000 children attending Public and Private Schools in Everett, all of which will be effected in a seriously negative way if this SBX Radar project is located in Everett. The housing market will plummet, individuals will not be able to sell their homes, and small business will vacate down town Everett; This project will devastate Everett's economy. The Department of Defense has no business locating this Sea Based Missile Defense Program in Everett. I plan to fight this project all the way out of Everett. Cynthia Dale Everett, WA.	P-E-0013 1 2 3	From: Cdonehower@aol.com Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 12:28 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Public comment DEIS, Midway Atoll March 21, 2003 To whom it may concern: I am writing to express my concern over the proposed inclusion of Midway Atoll in the Ground Based Missile Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR). I urge you to continue to preserve Midway in its current state as a National Wildlife Refuge. As a research intern for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, I had the pleasure of spending three summers on Midway (1999-2001). I worked directly with 12 species of seabirds and gained invaluable skills and knowledge for my current graduate work in ornithology and a future career in conservation biology. While Midway's role in the GBD ETR will be as a support site, and most environmental impacts will arise from proposed facilities and infrastructure construction, I have outlined some of my specific concerns regarding the DEIS below: 1. Midway's endemic flora and fauna, like many island ecosystems, suffer from decades of competition with aggressive invasive species. As mentioned in the DEIS, over 200 plant species have been introduced to Midway since the arrival of residents in 1902. However, little discussion is provided as to how military personnel will minimize the potential for the spread of existing (and introduction of new) invasive species. What precautions will be taken and how will construction areas be restored following disturbance? Will native plants be planted, or will alien species be allowed to colonize these locations? 2. Light pollution (from security lights) is a serious threat to nocturnal birds like the Bonin Petrel (<i>Pterodroma hypoleuca</i>); petrels can become disoriented, colliding with buildings, etc. with lethal force. Not only should USFWS approved lights be used but efforts should be made to minimize lighting altogether. Similarly, fences, power lines, antennas, satellites, and other infrastructure may impede flight patterns and pose a hazard to seabirds, particularly albatross.	P-E-0014 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
3. Increased use of motor vehicles for construction and transportation purposes may not only degrade air quality but may increase 1) casualties of na++ve albatross chicks wandering the roadways and 2) general disturbance to nesting seabirds.	3	From: Farhana Mia Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 12:00 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Ground Based Midcourse Defense	P-E-0015
4. While construction activities and facilities' locations may be confined to inshore areas away from hauling out locations of seals and turtles, the increased levels of human disturbance will undoubtedly impact other wildlife via noise pollution (e.g. from generator operation) and regular human presence.	4	Good afternoon,	
5. The proposed activities increase the potential for an oil spill and/or hazardous waste activities. The atoll's remote location could make clean up difficult and costly.	5	I am writing to express my concern over the proposed inclusion of Midway Atoll, NWHI in the Ground Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR). Please continue to protect Midway's unique biological resources by preserving the atoll as a wildlife refuge.	1
Why we should preserve Midway in its current state as a wildlife refuge:		Thank you,	
1. Fifteen species of seabirds (more than 2 million birds, including albatross, tropicbirds, boobies, shearwaters, petrels, frigatebirds, terns, noddies) nest on the atoll each year.		Farhana Mia	
2. Midway is home to the largest colony of Laysan Albatross (<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>) in the world and the second largest Black footed Albatross (<i>P. nigripes</i>) colony. An endangered Short tailed Albatross (<i>P. albatrus</i>) recovery effort is also underway.			
3. It is an important stopover for migrant shorebirds (curlews, plovers, turnstones).			
4. The beaches, reef, and surrounding waters support endangered Hawaiian Monk Seals (<i>Monachus schauinslandi</i>), threatened Green Sea Turtles (<i>Chelonia mydas</i>), Hawaiian Spinner Dolphins (<i>Stenella longirostris</i>) and a vast array of rare lagoon, reef, and pelagic fishes.			
Thank you for accepting public comment.			
Sincerely,			
Christina E. Donehower			
Graduate Student			
McGill University, Dept. Natural Resource Sciences			
Ste Anne de Bellevue, QC			
CANADA			

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Jessica Forrest Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 12:15 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: proposed testing on Midway Atoll I was disappointed to learn that Midway Atoll (Northwestern Hawaiian Islands) is to be included in the Ground Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range. I do not believe that this is an appropriate use for a National Wildlife Refuge. It was my understanding that Wildlife Refuges have been created to provide wildlife with relatively undisturbed habitat; this goal is clearly incompatible with military testing. At a more general level, I believe the world would be much better off if more resources were devoted to conservation and less to defense but I suppose that comment needs to be directed elsewhere. Thank you for your attention. Jessica Forrest	P-E-0016 1	From: F. Anthony Kurtz Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2003 7:05 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Ground Based Midcourse Defense Estended Test Range Environmental Impact Statememt To whom it may concern: I am a citizen of the community known as Channel Islands Beach, CA, which is adjacent to Naval Base Ventura County Port Hueneme. I have owned property in this community for nearly 20 years and have lived full time in the community for the last 9 years in retirement. I naturally have concern for those events and activities, which affect the quality of life in the community and therefore have studied the Draft Environmental Impact Statement with much interest. I must admit my analysis of the Statement is that of a layman, as I have no special scientific expertise. But, from my review of the document it would appear that a most careful attempt was made by experts to compile and assess the anticipated impacts of such an important and complex project to all areas to be affected. As a citizen I still have some significant degree of trust that my elected representatives and in turn the career employees of the government who carry out there legislated programs are for the most part concerned in the best interest of the country and its citizens. I pray that they in turn fulfill that trust by having done as represented, a careful analysis as set forth in the above named document to identify potential risks and hazards to the environment. My laymen's assessment tells me that they have done such a careful analysis. It would also seem that it would be an intelligent decision to locate such a facility in this community because of the synergistic benefits relating to existing facilities and the geography of the proposed site. These factors seem to spell particular benefits to taxpayers particularly because it seem to be the least cost option. Furthermore, from my	P-E-0017 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
understanding of the proposal, the Sea Based X Band Radar platform would either be moored at San Nicholas Island or at sea for use in various test programs. While the platform might from time to time be towed within the proximity of Port Hueneme and made visible to the surrounding coastal community it would be only for maintenance and/or repairs and such events would be of limited duration. There is no intent to have the Sea Based X Band Radar platform permanently moored within view of the surrounding coastal community when not being used in the Pacific for tests simulating incoming missile attacks. Therefore, assuming that all of my conclusions set forth above are true, I am in support of this proposed project in general and in specifics as to its impacts upon the community surrounding the Naval Base Ventura County Port Hueneme and the adjacent San Nicholas Island facility. In closing I wish to thank all those responsible for conducting the information hearings in the Ventura County, CA area for there respectful and helpful presentation of the EIS. Sincerely, F. Anthony Kurtz Channel Islands Beach, CA		From: Jim Anderson Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2003 12:48 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: X band dome in Everett This is in regard to the Public Hearing in Everett on February 27, 2003. Why should we have a billion dollar boondoggle cluttering up an already cluttered harbor? This huge white dome will only detract from the existing environment. If it were something that would genuinely keep us safe I would still have doubts about locating it here. But it will do nothing to keep us safe. This whole missile defense idea has been proven ineffective in the few tests they have done (the results of which have been so spun that the meaning of the term "success" has been redefined to be synonymous with "failure"). And even if they could shoot down a missile with a missile it would only work if the missile were unaccompanied by decoys or chaff (which any country that can make warhead shaped mylar balloons, even North Korea, is capable of producing). Even without decoys any more than a single missile firing would not be effectively stopped. This means that countries like Russia, China or even India could easily defeat it by firing a whole bunch of missiles. This enormous billion dollar white dome you want to stick in the bay, the X band radar, has such a short wavelength that it will warn us about raindrops, hailstones, small birds, and any other such common objects commonly occurring in the skies above us and only be able to pick up an object (but not whether it is a warhead or a similarly shaped decoy) in space if such interference is not present. Please don't waste any more of our money on defense industry welfare programs. (Reference: "Shield of Dreams" by Tim Folger Discover magazine Nov. 2001) Jim Anderson resident of Snohomish County WA	P-E-0018 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: kirsten potter Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2003 6:22 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Additional Midway DEIS comments Sir, Thank you for rushing the two volume Draft DEIS which includes military use of Midway Atoll. I read through it but don't claim to be an expert on it, of course! I offer these comments as additions to my earlier e mail. I am writing as a retired US Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Manager who served briefly [a few weeks] in 2001 as temporary, fill in Refuge Manager on Midway as well as serving four tours as fill in Refuge Manager for the Guam National Wildlife Refuge from 1993 1998. I retired with 35 years federal service and 22 years as a Refuge Manager project leader. a) The No Action Alternative includes the statement that Midway Atoll will continue as a National Wildlife Refuge. This statement is not made under Alternatives 1,2, and 3. This should be clarified. Alternatives 1,2 and 3 should state that Midway would continue to serve as a National Wildlife Refuge. Or, if this is not true, the reasons why it will not continue as a National Wildlife Refuge must be discussed thoroughly since that action would have significant impacts in many areas. b) The numbers of people and the duration of their stay during both construction phase and operational phase were not presented, as far as I could find. I see this as a serious omission. Impacts from increasing the number of people living on the Atoll, both short and long term, could be significant. They may be as great or greater than the project's operational impacts on the environment.	P-E-0019 1 2	The project's full impacts on many areas of Midway's environment will vary greatly depending upon numbers and duration of people brought to the Atoll. A thorough discussion needs to be included of the impacts from these added humans, their living arrangements, allowable off duty activities and how their impacts on wildlife and the environment will be monitored, quantified and qualified. Also, how will wildlife protection rules be enforced, seven days per week and 24 hours per day? I know from experience, this will not be an easy task. This needs to be discussed in the final EIS. c) No biological mitigation measures are proposed in this document. I think this is a significant error. Monitoring, coordinating, educating and all other phases of managing the project's on Atoll environmental impacts especially human associated impacts as above will involve significant work loads. Please include in the final EIS that funding will be provided to hire and place a qualified biological observer on Midway Atoll reporting directly to the Refuge Manager. This extra person would be required to insure that coordination, training, orientation and supervisory attention is well and continually conducted toward minimizing adverse environmental impacts. Thank You. Dave Potter	3 4

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
March 23, 2003 U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command ATTENTION: SMDC-EN-V, Mrs. Julia Hudson-Elliott 106 Wynn Drive Huntsville, AL 35805 By E-mail to: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Enclosed are my comments on the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range (ETR) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). 1) The Kodiak Launch Complex (KLC) is the only proposed launch site which will launch a total of 11 different vehicles (launch vehicles, targets and interceptor). The FEIS needs to include the targets and interceptors which will be in violation of the INF Treaty. The STARS is still subject to the INF Treaty (1992 STARS Final EIS, Volume 1, page 3-66), but in spite of that fact the MDA supported a launch of the STARS missile from Kodiak on November 9, 2001, which 'exploded' 6 miles off Kodiak's coastline. MDA has ignored the INF Treaty issue in previous Environmental Assessments and this issue needs to be addressed before, not after GMD expansion. 2) Comments in this DEIS are very contradictory and confusing. Page es- 4, Section ES 1.4, Proposed Action, states there will be a total of approximately 10 launches per year for the entire GMD ETR. Then, Page 2-1 (DOPPA) states approximately 15 launches per year. Clarification is also needed as to how many vehicles are actually being proposed for each launch. For example, if 5 launches are being proposed from the KLC in one year, each one of those 5 launches might include 2 targets, 2 interceptors or one of each. In reality, that would total 1-10 vehicles per year from the KLC, not including other launch sites. It is difficult to believe that 10 launch vehicles	P-E-0020 1 2	a year would not have a cumulative effect on Kodiak's air quality, commercial fisheries and natural resources. 3) The Transportable System Radar Electromagnetic Radiation hazard zones, Page es-29, Table ES-4, refers to the Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation's (AADC) 'safety procedures relative to radar operations.' The FEIS should include the radar's EMR hazards range, and the hazardous waste which will be generated by its use, since this radar was not included in the 1996 KLC EA nor the Army or Air Force's EAs. Also, what authority does the AADC have outside of Alaska in relationship to the PMRF (Table ES-4)?! The Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation is a State of Alaska entity. Please explain in FEIS. 4) Page 2-3, Section 2.1.1. Ground-Based Interceptor Systems. In reference to liquid propellants, it states: "These liquid propellants would consist of a form of monomethyl hydrazine and nitrogen tetroxide, respectively. The liquid fuel and liquid oxidizer tanks would arrive at the site fully fueled." There is no discussion of how these highly volatile, toxic materials will be transported to the KLC. Transportation on Kodiak's main public road system is unacceptable. The potential of an accident happening is too great a risk. Paving the dirt road to the Narrow Cape/KLC site (which is going to continue this summer) is not going to lessen the hazards of an accident happening. In fact, the road will become even more hazardous during the fall and winter because the paved roads around the city of Kodiak become 'very slick' with freezing temperatures. As the SMDC and MDA is already aware, the road to Narrow Cape consists of many S- turns and steep hills, and the defense agencies may need reminding--- the majority of the road is adjacent to cliff edges. Page 4-54 states: "The primary hazard related to the transportation of missile components would be the	3 4

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
potential for an accident involving the transport vehicle and a resulting explosion/fire of solid fuel motors and/or small explosive actuation devices (used in missile control and FTS)."		The FEIS should include the ESDQ for proposed ETR Targets and 'Interceptors', along with the 'Warning Zone' in nautical miles.	7
5) Page 2-4, Section 2.1.1.1. states there are presently no plans to store liquid propellants on-site for the Ground-Based Interceptor other than the preloaded fuel and oxidizer tanks that would be installed on the EKV. However, this statement is contradictory in regards to the KLC, which will have a 'Hypergolic Fuel Storage Facility' for the storage of liquid fuel (Page 2-51, Table 2.3.1-1). The KLC is already 'plumbed' for liquid fuels, according to information released by the AADC over a year ago. For the past two years the Kodiak public has been outright lied to by the Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation, the Army SMDC and the MDA, when these agencies denied liquid fueled vehicles would be launched from the KLC. The liquid missile fuels must pose a great 'explosive' hazard, considering the agencies have gone through a great deal of deception to keep the public from knowing the fuel would be used, or tested.	5	6) Page 2-7, Figure 2.1.2-1. The only proposed launch vehicle listed for the PMRF is the STARS. Please explain why no other missiles are being proposed for launch from that location for the ETR. Also, the KLC is the only site being considered for launching the AIT and QRLV vehicles (both which have previously been launched from the KLC). If the reason is 'safety risk' related in regards to launching from other locations, then the KLC should also be eliminated from consideration for further launches.	8 9
Liquid fuel at the KLC will prevent public access to Narrow Cape/Fossil Beach, since there is no way the public can get to Fossil Beach without driving within the radius of the ESQD, and the probability is very good that the public will be denied access to Narrow Cape area by security guards when liquid fuel is stored at the KLC site.	6	7) Page 2-8, paragraph 4- Ground Launched Target, states: "Land launches of target missiles would be accomplished from a fixed launch pad or silos." Launching targets from silos at the KLC would be in violation of the INF Treaty MOU, since silos are not 'above ground'. Likewise, interceptor launches from the KLC would violate the INF Treaty (long-range).	10
Regarding 'Ground-Based Interceptor Security'-- "It is estimated that security related activities would occur for approximately 5 weeks for each campaign." (Page 2-5, Section 2.1.1.3). Also, Page 2-63 states: "The Beach could also be closed if a GBI missile is at the site during times of heightened security."		8) Page 2-9 states: "All potential ranges would be able to accommodate air delivery of a target missile with the existing support facilities and infrastructure. Therefore, no construction or additional major equipment would be required." This statement is untrue in regards to the Kodiak Launch Complex. Page 2-50, Proposed Facilities, says new GBI silos or launch pad would be required at KLC. The Narrow Cape/KLC site has no 'FAA approved' licensed runway for air delivery of missiles, boosters, etc. There is no documentation in the DEIS which gives reference to the fact that a runway will be constructed at Narrow Cape to off-load boosters and hazardous materials. If this idea is being proposed, please state in the FEIS. Hazardous fuels (hydrazines, nitrogen tetroxides e.g) had to be shipped to the PMRF only by aircraft or cargo vessel--	11 12 13

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
NOT BY LAND (1992 STARS DEIS, page 2-31). However, the MDA proposes to transport the same hazardous fuels in addition to the more hazardous 'Hypergolic Missile Fuels' and 'Oxidizers' on Kodiak Island's main public road system to the KLC site. If this situation was a public safety issue for the PMRF, it is also unacceptable to transport fuel-filled missile boosters and volatile missile related materials on Kodiak's main public highway.		locations (sea/air based) as part of the GMD ETR ? If so, include it in the FEIS.	
The FEIS should include discussion of how target missiles and interceptors would be delivered from Ft. Greeley to the KLC (public transportation hazard on the ONLY highway to Anchorage, e.g.) Since Ft. Greeley is considered the Deployment location, it should be included in the FEIS as such.	14	9) Page 2-42, Figure 2.1.8-2- The map shows Targets or Interceptors launched in a SW launch trajectory down the east side of Kodiak Island will pose a potential hazard from falling missile debris, which could land anywhere within the 70 nm 'Warning Zone' (populated land areas e.g.), for the STARS missile. No calculations are given in the DEIS for the other proposed SW launch trajectories of target/interceptor missiles from the KLC, which shows the velocity and 'Warning Zone' for each proposed missile launch. Page C-9, Debris Impact Areas- states: "Debris consists of missile fragments that may land upon structures or populated areas. Fragments may include burning propellants which could explode or burn thus posing additional hazards (explosion or fire)."	18
Transporting missiles /interceptors to Kodiak from Ft. Greeley, will make Ft. Greeley a 'major player' in the GMD ETR and it should be included in the FEIS. Also, if Kodiak is going to be considered a 'Deployment' location, that information should also be included. According to a August 5, 2002 'Wall Street Journal' article, the Sea-Based X-Band Radar "will be linked to at least 10 ground-based interceptors in Alaska." 6-10 missile interceptor silos in Alaska are presently being built at Ft. Greeley. The Wall Street Journal article also stated the SBX-Band Radar will be used to "guide test interceptors located on Kodiak Island." It is evident that Ft. Greeley is a major component in the GMD ETR, even though it was not discussed in the DEIS. Ft. Greeley's participation in the GMD ETR program needs to be included in the FEIS; Otherwise, the MDA is attempting to deceive the public once again.	15	As I have stated in previous written comments, all proposed SW launch trajectories down the east side of Kodiak Island should be ENTIRELY ELIMINATED from consideration in the FEIS, because of populated villages. Some Kodiak Island villagers may be supportive of the MDA's proposed activity (as one MDA comment states in the DEIS), however, that does not mean that native village people are in support of potentially hazardous missile debris falling on their property. The recent 'Space Shuttle' tragedy is a perfect example of how far debris can scatter in the air from an accident. The MDA is ignoring public safety issues by refusing to eliminate this particular launch trajectory. WHY?? Are 'minorities' more expendable? The MDA can not assume a launch accident will not happen. The November 9, 2001 KLC STARS missile is another example. What if that same missile had exploded in 'mid-air' during a SW launch trajectory, and debris fell over/near Old Harbor?	19
The FEIS should include the type of Ground-Based Interceptors being proposed for the GMD ETR. According to a BMDO news release on March 07, 2003, the Missile Defense Agency has put out a contractor's bid for the 'Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) program. Will this particular interceptor be tested at the KLC and other launch	16		20
	17		

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
10)Page 4-35, Cumulative Impacts states: "there will be no cumulative impacts anticipated at the KLC from launches proposed for the GMD ETR program, since combined activities would be performed at different times and locations." There is no basis for this statement, considering that there has not been any 'dual launches' from the KLC. Page 4-169 states: "In the event of dual GBI launches, the exhaust products are conservatively estimated to be twice the level of a single launch." Common sense dictates that exhaust from dual launches up to 5 times a year at the KLC would potentially pollute the land and fishing waters in the Narrow Cape area, especially in the vicinity of the popular Pasagshak River State Park if the wind blows in that direction during a launch. 11)Page 4-55 (last sentence) states: "The same ESQD would be established and enforced while the missile components are at the KLC." Considering the fact that 5 launches per year from the KLC is being proposed, and the fact that there will be 1-10 vehicles /missiles launched per year, depending on whether the launches are 'dual' in nature, it seems reasonable to assume that the Narrow Cape/Fossil Beach area is going to be closed to the public for a good portion of the year, especially since the GBI (booster stages and EKV) would be assembled at the KLC (and other test sites), as stated on Page 2-3 (Ground-Based Interceptor Systems). If this is the case, the FEIS needs to clarify and state the fact if the public will lose access for most of the months of each year. The Narrow Cape/ Fossil Beach area is State of Alaska 'public' property-----NOT 'Federal' property. As such, the public has the right to access the area and beaches without federal restrictions. The MDA is taking over one of the most highly public- use areas on Kodiak's road system, especially in the summer when people use the Narrow Cape area and beaches for camping, hiking and fishing. A city-wide population of approximately 14,000 people (not including village people), are confined to 50 miles of road system,	21	which ends either at Narrow Cape or Chiniak. Imagine..... one main road-- 50 miles long, for 14,000 people! Even then, because of rocky cliffs, forest growth etc., much of the land on the main road system is not accessible to the public. Two thirds (2/3) of Kodiak Island is already Federally owned (Wildlife Refuge). The remaining land on the road system is either Borough, Coast Guard or privately owned property, so public recreational property is very limited to Kodiak residents. So limited in fact, that it is becoming a problem in more ways than one. The majority of people in Kodiak do not own boats in order to escape to nearby islands for recreational purposes, so they are dependent on the recreational areas on the main road system, which have been available to them for the last 50 years. Narrow Cape is one of those areas, and now-because of future KLC security issues, the Defense Department is going to deprive the public from enjoying State of Alaska entitlement. NOTE: Constitution of Alaska. Article. VIII, Section 1. Statement of Policy. "The natural resources of Alaska "belong" to Alaska and to Alaskans in a way that, in the federal system, Alaska's society and economy in general do not." Article VIII, Section 2. General Authority. "The legislature shall provide for the utilization, development, and conservation of all natural resources belonging to the State, including land and waters, for the maximum benefit of its people."	
	22		
	23	The development of a missile launch site at Narrow Cape is not 'beneficial' to the public when 'federal' security actions will be inforced on 'public' roads and property. The public will lose access to the land and beaches at Narrow Cape when Interceptors, liquid fuels, and boosters are on the KLC site, and when the 'TPS -X' radar is being tested.	24

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
10)Page 4-35, Cumulative Impacts states: "there will be no cumulative impacts anticipated at the KLC from launches proposed for the GMD ETR program, since combined activities would be performed at different times and locations." There is no basis for this statement, considering that there has not been any 'dual launches' from the KLC. Page 4-169 states: "In the event of dual GBI launches, the exhaust products are conservatively estimated to be twice the level of a single launch." Common sense dictates that exhaust from dual launches up to 5 times a year at the KLC would potentially pollute the land and fishing waters in the Narrow Cape area, especially in the vicinity of the popular Pasagshak River State Park if the wind blows in that direction during a launch. 11)Page 4-55 (last sentence) states: "The same ESQD would be established and enforced while the missile components are at the KLC." Considering the fact that 5 launches per year from the KLC is being proposed, and the fact that there will be 1-10 vehicles /missiles launched per year, depending on whether the launches are 'dual' in nature, it seems reasonable to assume that the Narrow Cape/Fossil Beach area is going to be closed to the public for a good portion of the year, especially since the GBI (booster stages and EKV) would be assembled at the KLC (and other test sites), as stated on Page 2-3 (Ground-Based Interceptor Systems). If this is the case, the FEIS needs to clarify and state the fact if the public will lose access for most of the months of each year. The Narrow Cape/ Fossil Beach area is State of Alaska 'public' property-----NOT 'Federal' property. As such, the public has the right to access the area and beaches without federal restrictions. The MDA is taking over one of the most highly public- use areas on Kodiak's road system, especially in the summer when people use the Narrow Cape area and beaches for camping, hiking and fishing. A city-wide population of approximately 14,000 people (not including village people), are confined to 50 miles of road system,		The MDA's actions are 'deplorable', especially when there are other GMD ETR options (sea and air launches and continued launches from 'Federal' launch locations), rather than taking over public property. The MDA does not absolutely have to have a missile launch site in Kodiak, it 'prefers' the location in order to test some of its newly developed weapon and fuel systems along with 'classified' research, which poses too great of a risk to test in large populated areas. 12)The DEIS does not list the KLC contamination control procedures, nor the management of hazardous material use, storage and disposal of liquid waste. The DEIS refers to an 'off-site' location for some of the hazardous KLC waste, but the off-site location is not named. Will some hazardous waste be taken to a Soil Remediation Facility on Kodiak Island? If so, what facility and what type of waste (liquid, soil, e.g)? Will hazardous waste go to the Kodiak Borough landfill outside city limits? If so, what kind of waste? The landfill is already near capacity. 13)How will the location of the Transportable System -X Radar (TPS-X) at Narrow Cape/KLC affect public access of the area? Page 2-61. TPS-X Radar, states the TPS-X radar is a wide band, phased array radar system, and "EMR hazard exclusion areas would be established around the TPS-X radar antenna." If the radar system emits an electromagnetic radiation "due to potential sidelobe exposure", within 1,312 feet, how will the public access Fossil Beach and stay out of the radar's hazardous zone? Page 2-61. Launch Complex Security states: " It is assumed that testing would be on a campaign basis and the security for these tests would be on a similar basis. It is estimated that the security activities would occur for approximately 5 weeks for each campaign." Now, it sounds as though the public is going to be further restricted to Narrow Cape by the radar's testing phases. More clarification is needed in the FEIS.	25 26

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
14)A wide band, phased array, sidelobe radar system already exists on the Kodiak road system (Chiniak), and is located only a few miles across from the Kodiak Launch Complex. It emits an 'electromagnetic wave beam'. Another similar radar system is in King Salmon, Alaska on federal property (old Air Force Base). The transmission of these radar systems would pose an immense hazard to a missile's electronics during a launch, possibly by causing a missile's electronics to heat up and potentially causing the missile to 'explode'. How could the MDA ignore such a 'powerful' radar system (1.9 MW transmission) which is very close to the Kodiak Launch Complex, and fail to include it in the DEIS when other GMD ETR radars and sensors are listed? Is it possible that this radar system will be used to test the Air Force's 'Directed Energy' defense program? The radar's purpose needs to be included in the FEIS, along with the radar's public health hazards. The FEIS needs to include more detailed information on how all of the radar systems will correlate with one another and the EMR hazards if all of them are transmitting at once. If all of these radar systems will be correlated at the same time as part of the GMD ETR program, then include information in the FEIS. The Chiniak electromagnetic wave radar has the capability alone to emit EMR far into the atmosphere AND the ionosphere, and its EMR range would be very beneficial in monitoring or possibly 'intercepting' any 'reentry' vehicles. Assuming all radar systems will be turned on at the same time as part of the GMD ETR (the 'KLC TPS-X Radar', the Chiniak and King Salmon electromagnetic wave radars, AND the 'Sea-Based X-Band radar'-- a tremendous amount of EMR will be focused in the airspace at once. It would be an environmental hazard to aircraft and birds which were not able to escape the high level of electromagnetic transmission. It is now beginning to make sense why the Department of Defense is asking for an 'exemption' from the 'Migratory	27	Bird Act.' If bird populations begin to decrease because of all the EMR transmission as part of DOD testing (Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar e.g.) then the department would not be held accountable for its actions. If the radar systems did not pose a hazard, the DEIS would not have made references to birds.	
		15)Regarding the Sea-Based Test-X Band (I note the wording 'test'). How can the MDA know what all of the potential hazards will be from the radar during its various test mode locations along its route to the Pacific Ocean and to Alaska? The radar system is going to pose great hazards to commercial airlines and small aircraft along its 7 months route. During the radar's 'testing' calculations, how will the MDA 'calculate' how many species and numbers of birds will be killed or 'fried' when they fly through the X-Band transmission? Include that information in the FEIS.	29
		The DEIS EIS does not name the 'remote' areas the SBX will operate. Include these locations in the FEIS.	30
		Since the MDA already knows the SBX is going to be tested, why was the 'DD Form 1494' not filed with the Military Communications Electronic Board ahead of time and the results included in this DEIS? The public would then know what EMR risks will be involved in the radar's transmission. Please include the DD 1494 Form and the Military Communications Electronic Board's comments and recommendations in the FEIS. Once the FEIS is distributed and the SBX is in operation, the public will not know what comments were made by the Military Communications Electronic Board concerning the radar's operation.	31
	28		32

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
16)Page 4-55 states: "The same ESQD would be established and enforced while the missile components are at the KLC." If a minimum of 5 single/dual launches per year (potentially 9 or more in the future) will take place from the Kodiak Launch Complex (KLC) and launch personnel will be at the KLC site for up to 2 1/2 months before and 2 weeks after launches, it is reasonable to assume the public is going to lose access to Narrow Cape/Fossil Beach for the majority of each year, including having to evacuate the 'extremely popular' Pasagshak River fishing area in the summertime (ESQD) if barges are off-loaded at Barge Landing #3.	33	18)Page 3-14. Affected Environment. The MDA has been given expert opinions regarding the Geological and Soil Status at Narrow Cape/KLC. The expert opinions alone should justify why a missile site should not be located on Kodiak Island. Page 3-15, "The Narrow Cape fault also poses a surface rupture potential at KLC. The U.S. Geological Survey concluded that the fault was active." Page 3-18 states there is a landslide approximately 1,400 feet long near the Pasagshak Point Road, and "the landslide feature itself may actually extend to within the project site boundaries." The same page then states "no detailed fault studies have been performed for the entire KLC site". WHY not?	37
The FEIS needs to include descriptive diagrams which show the ESQD for 'Interceptor' launches, along with the 'Warning Zone' for potential interceptor debris should an accident occur.	34	Page D-1. Appendix D--- Engineering Field Analysis of Seismic Design Building Standards for Existing Facilities at Kodiak Launch Complex states: "the shaking hazard at Kodiak is significantly greater than was previously recognized and exceeds standards such as the Uniform Building Code that have traditionally been used as a basis for design and construction in the Kodiak area."	38
17)Page 4-137states: "Targets launched from KLC, Vandenberg AFB, air and/or ocean platforms, if not destroyed by intercept, would impact in the BOA or possibly on uninhabited islands within the precalculated debris hazard/impact zone." Page 4-138 (Figure 4.3.5-1) shows launch protection circles for launches from Reagan Test Center, but no other locations. The Alaska coast has many uninhabited islands, but many of the islands are haulout areas for Stellar Sea Lions. A few of the locations are: 'Dangerous Cape' (haulout), 'Cape Barnavous' (a 'major, official, designated haulout'), 'Two-Headed Island' (major haulout), 'Cape Kagulyak', 'Sitkinak Island' (a 'major rookery and haulout' on the east side of Kodiak island). Why were these locations not included in the DEIS? Stellar Sea Lions are an endangered species as the MDA is well aware. Include all Stellar Sea Lion haulouts and rookeries in the FEIS which would be potential impact areas for missile debris and/or booster drop zones.	35	Seismic hazard analysis of Narrow Cape has been ongoing for the last couple of years and the study should be almost completed, but the DEIS fails to include any of the analysis completed to date. Page D-1 states this analysis is currently not available for use in the Draft EIS, but the information will be evaluated and taken into consideration upon the completion of the study. The MDA should already have enough evidence on hand to concur that the land at Narrow Cape should be excluded as a launch site. A seismic hazard analysis should have been done in 1995 before the AADC started construction of the KLC.	39
	36	Page D-2 The MDA's "valid assumption" that the present KLC facilities comply with the 1994 edition of the 'Uniform Building Code' is not good enough to continue further construction at Narrow Cape/KLC. How can the	40

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
MDA 'verify' the design of the KLC structures when it was not able to obtain a copy of the calculations to verify the design? This is unbelievable! The Code may now require less load capacity than it did when the KLC buildings were designed--however, the earthquake magnitude rating has also changed since the KLC was constructed. An earthquake rating of 7.0 magnitude in 1995, would now be a 10.0 magnitude. The FEIS needs to include the present earthquake magnitude measurements in reference to the KLC/Narrow Cape location. 19)The STARS missile is still subject to the 'INF Treaty' and should be eliminated from further launches from the KLC. The Final EIS will not be released until August 2003, which ironically is the same month the White Sands Missile Range with MDA support, is already proposing to launch another strategic long-range target from Kodiak, Alaska (Army Magazine-December 2002). There should be no further long-range target or future interceptor launches from Kodiak, nor expansion of the GMD program until treaty issues are confronted and dealt with. 20)The DEIS did not include public hearing, public comments transcripts, etc. (Section 8.0) Why were these excluded? The FEIS should include ALL public comments in full by each individual and agencies (written and oral), and the comments should not be 'summarized' as they are in this Draft EIS. Comments by individuals and state and federal agencies have always been included in full in previous Final EIS's. Please do not take 'short-cuts' by summarizing, as it is not beneficial or respectful to the public when people have taken their time to make oral and written comments (especially written comments). CarolynHeitman Kodiak, Alaska	41	From: Matt DeBenedetti Sent: Sunday, March 16, 2003 2:04 PM To: 'gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil' Subject: Everett, WA SBX Ms. Elliott, I am writing this letter to express my opposition and concern regarding the SBX proposal in Everett, WA. Not only does this equipment pose a serious health hazard to the residents of the community, but also it detracts from the natural beauty of Port Gardner Bay in the Puget Sound. I would like to receive details regarding this proposal. The info about the Sea Based Radar is as follows It is called the SBX and looks like an oil rig topped by a huge sphere that will sit 250 feet above the water and measures 390 feet in length. None of the links they provided for more information work how convenient! But there is a name and e mail address for someone to contact with the program is: SMDC EN V, Julia Elliott U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command P.O. Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807 gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil <mailto:gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil> All comments have to be submitted by March 24th to the person listed above. Sincerely, Matt DeBenedetti LEGATO SYSTEMS, INC. Pacific NW Area Sales Manager, Xtender Solutions OR, WA, ID, MT, WY, ND, SD, AK and Western Canada (BC, AB, SK, YT)	P-E-0021 1
	42		

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Isabel Julian Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 9:47 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Midway Atoll To whom it may concern, I am writing to you in regards of the plans to use Midway Atoll as a missile testing facility. I am wildlife biology student from McGill University in Montreal, Quebec, Canada and there are several concerns that I would like to bring up concerning this project. 1. Midway's endemic flora and fauna, like many island ecosystems, has suffered from decades of competition with aggressive invasive species. As mentioned in your EIS, over 200 plant species have been introduced to Midway since the arrival of residents in 1902. However, little discussion is provided as to how military personnel will minimize the potential for the spread of existing (and introduction of new) invasive species. What precautions will be taken and how will construction areas be restored following disturbance? Will native plants be planted, or will alien species be allowed to colonize these locations? 2. Light pollution (from security lights) is a serious threat to the nocturnal birds like the Bonin Petrel (<i>Pterodroma hypoleuca</i>); petrels can become disoriented, colliding with buildings, etc. with lethal force. Not only should USFWS approved lights be used but efforts should be made to minimize lighting altogether. Similarly, fences, power lines, antennas, satellites, and other infrastructure may impede flight patterns and pose a hazard to seabirds, particularly albatross. 3. Increased use of motor vehicles for construction and transportation	P-E-0022 1 2 3	4. While construction activities and facilities' locations may be confined to inshore areas away from hauling out locations of seals and turtles, the increased levels of human disturbance will undoubtedly impact other wildlife via noise pollution (e.g. from generator operation) and regular human presence. 5. The proposed activities increase the potential for an oil spill and/or hazardous waste contamination. The remote location of the atoll could make clean up very difficult and costly. The Atoll is a unique environment and should be left as undisturbed as possible. There is potential for much damage that would be irreversible and devastating. Please reconsider your plan of using this unique biological area as a testing site, and continue to preserve it as a natural refuge. Thank you Isabel Julian Montreal, Quebec, Canada	4 5 6 7

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: rmgibson Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2003 11:23 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: VAFB Range Expansion As a 24 year Air Force veteran, I take exception to the nonfactual statements of Ms Baker (as reported in the Lompoc Record, Lompoc, CA dated February 26, 2003). Obviously she is not aware of the fact that had it not been for the missile/nuclear stand off with the USSR during the cold war she would be either speaking Russian or learning how to today. She is of the opinion that if we had dumped all our missiles, warheads, munitions and sent the Navy to the ocean bottom, all would have been peace and light with the Russians. I stood the ramparts during the Korean, Cuban crisis and the cold war and when I hear the uninformed, simplistic mewings of people like Ms Baker, I can only say that they should have walked in my shoes for those 24 years. Mr. Ruhge hit the nail on the head when he stated that there is no factual evedence of harm to either people or the environment during the years of missile testing at Vandenberg AFB. The current missile launch schedule is only a small fraction of what it was 20 years ago. With the known ability of North Korea to hit the west coast with a missile, it would seem logical to have all the protection that we can have. With any degree of accuracy, San Luis Obispo would be well within the circular area of probability for a missile armed with a nuclear warhead aimed at Vandenberg. If you are looking for inputs, I am solidly in favor of this program. Richard Gibson Lompoc, CA	P-E-0023 1	From: Graeme Marsh Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 6:24 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Protest & Complaint about inadequate information and debate process re: proposed new US Military activities on Kauai Importance: High URGENT March 24th, 2003 To Whom It May Concern, The US Military, re: Proposed new US Military activities on Kauai, Hawaii. Dear Sir(s) / Madam(s), It has come to my attention as a tax paying resident of Kauai, a county in the State of Hawaii, that the US military proposes to increase it operations on Kauai, with an emphasis towards the proposed "Star Wars" initiatives. There has been no public hearings here on Kauai to allow the general public, especially Kauai residents, to be made fully aware of: 1: The precise nature of such proposed increases in US military activities, and operations on our island home. 2: Disclosure and public debate related to necessary Environmental Impact study results of the proposed increased levels of military operations here on island. 3: The impact on access to, and use of traditional Hawaiian sites and locations that are critical to the ongoing practice of the ancient rites and ceremonies by the Hawaiian Peoples.	P-E-0024 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
To this end I demand that there be public hearings held here on this island, that full disclosure of all enviromental impact studies be made, and that all rights of the indigenous Hawaiian population be upheld, and preserved. If no such environmental impact studies have been made, then I further demand that such detailed studies be undertaken, and the results made available to the public, and that a full debate of such issues take place before the US Military proceeds any further. Regards, Graeme Marsh. Graeme Marsh Kapaa HI		From: Sallyskims Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 12:38 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: klc draft eis below is a list of questions regarding the draft EIS for the Kodiak launch proposals 1. EIS states information from the faa on the weather facts that KLC has a wind direction average of "NW". FAA gets this info from the Kodiak airport which is set between two mountain ranges. Kodiak airport wind is from a funnel between the two ranges, concluding that variations of winds from WNW to ENE feeds this valley in the direction of NW or SE. In the EIS, it is also stated that KLC has a "Marine" environment different from the "Inland" climate. Maybe the weather facts and information should have been taken from the off shore data buoys that depict a more accurate wind and weather averages. National Data Buoy Center(NDBC) shows not the average but duration of wind directions. Most winds blow NE or SE/SW. Both of these winds pose a hazard to Old Harbor and Kodiak City if there were an in flight catastrophic failure with great amount of fallout. 2. With the great proposed expansions of the KLC, you need to have a second look at the current fire fighting equipment and personnel. Currently they have a flat bed truck with a water tank on it as their "fire engine". The "specially trained" fire fighters are actually off duty city and Federal fire fighters that have little training in responding to rocket mishaps. Do you think that the current fire fighting equipment is adequate for even a small fire? Please address the true needs of a fire department.	P-E-0025 1 2 3

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
3. (4.1.3.2.1) page 4 26 states information on debris of solid fuel's aluminum oxide and the solubility of the fuel. The EIS used the U. S. Air Force (Lang, et al, 2000) study on the measurement of prechlorate in dilution. This study was done at water temps at 84 degrees F. I do not think that the study accurately represents the waters of the KLC. At F 84, the prechlorate was diluted to a "safe" level in 270 days. How long would it take to dilute in water temps of the KLC surrounding waters? If there were an in flight abortion and the fuels, solid or liquid, were to land in Pasagshak bay, using the information given, 270 days of dilution could disturb or kill the salmon runs of four sub species for a year cycle. Using an accurate dilution chart of the prechlorate in water temps associated in the KLC areas, how long would it take and how would the salmon and other wildlife be effected or altered if exposed to these fuels? 4. The EIS addressed the KLC's Environment Monitoring Plan which requires five pre launch and five post launch aerial surveys for endangered species. The fact is that there has been 0 aerial surveys due to weather. What is the point of having the survey and for it to be required if the environment has yet to cooperate. Please review these questions. I would like to have a copy of the EIS when complete David Skimin Kodiak, Ak	4	From: Bruce MacCracken Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 4:18 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Pert Gardner Bay, Everett, WA	P-E-0026
	5	Dear Ms. Julie Elliott,	1
		We are citizens of Everett, WA, and would like to voice our strong opposition to the placement of the SBX in our harbor.	
		There are many issues that concern us in regard to this project and it is difficult for us to speak to these issues intelligently since there has been a dearth of information on the subject. A letter to you, Ms. Elliott, from Walter Seldon of the Port Gardner Neighborhood Association parallels our concerns.	2
	6	However, there is one issue we would like to address: the visual and aesthetic impact. This will have a profound negative impact on Everett's economic development, revitalization of the downtown core and pending development of the waterfront. There has been a tremendous amount of work on the part of citizens and our local government to bring about positive changes in our city. Progress has been slow but steady and our reputation is gradually improving. With the downturn in the economy we are already facing hurdles that hinder our forward progress. Do not provide us with another hurdle which could well be the straw that breaks the camel's back.	3 4
		Our home does not have a view of the harbor but we do have our eyes on Everett's future and, with that in mind, we strongly oppose siting the SBX in the heart of our crown jewel: our beautiful harbor.	5
		Sincerely,	
		Amy Winterscheidt and Bruce MacCracken	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Fmmccord Sent: Friday, February 28, 2003 12:33 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.wil Subject: MDA's GMD at Naval Station Everett We appreciated the presentations made at the Everett Holiday Inn today. I have to admit that some of the technical aspects of this proposal are over our heads. However there is a majority of our community that support this proposal for the following reason: The country understands the impact and changes resulting for September 11. We are fighting a war with terrorists who are dedicated to our destruction by any and all available means. Seattle was reported to be one of the top ten terrorist targets in the country. North Korea has missiles that can reach the West coast. North Korea is now able to make one atomic bomb a month. Unfortunately these conditions will probably get worst not better in the future. The Seattle area is very liberal and has its share of antiwar groups who always show up in meetings such as yours to voice their concerns. The silent majority rarely comes out but I know from past experience that there is great support for defending the country. There is a large population of retired military living in this area who are very supportive if we need them.	P-E-0027 1 2	I am confident that the Everett community will support the GMD proposal as strongly as we support Naval Station Everett and our military forces. Frank McCord Chairman of Cascade Bank and the Navy Relations Committee	3

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: David Bird Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 7:43 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: midway atoll While I have personally not had the pleasure of visiting Midway, a number of fellow scientists and friends of mine, including one of my current graduate students, have spoken very highly of this place as a refuge for wildlife. Is there no place on earth that humans can leave alone, or at least minimize our impact so that birds and other wildlife can thrive? Even when we set up wildlife refuges such as the one in Alaska, there are those who cannot seem keep their fingers off them if there is money involved. While I do understand the need for developing weaponry for fighting the scourge of terrorism, can the U.S. government not find an alternative place, one with less value for wildlife and the scientists who study it, to Midway Atoll? Please reconsider your decision to test bombs in this area. David M. Bird, Ph.D. Professor and Director Avian Science and Conservation Centre McGill University Quebec	P-E-0028 1	From: JosÈe Rousseau Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 3:40 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Protection of Midway Atoll TO: U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command ATTN: SMDC EN V (Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliot) 106 Wynn Drive Huntsville, AL 35805 U.S.A. I am writing to express my concern over the proposed inclusion of Midway Atoll, NWHI in the Ground Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR). Please continue to protect Midway's unique biological resources by preserving the atoll as a wildlife refuge. Why we should preserve Midway in its current state as a wildlife refuge: 1. Fifteen species of seabirds (more than 2 million birds, including albatross, tropicbirds, boobies, shearwaters, petrels, frigatebirds, terns, noddies) nest on the atoll each year. 2. Midway is home to the largest colony of Laysan Albatross (<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>) in the world and the second largest Black footed Albatross (<i>P. nigripes</i>) colony. An endangered Short tailed Albatross (<i>P. albatrus</i>) recovery effort is also underway. 3. It is an important stopover for migrant shorebirds (curlews, plovers, turnstones). 4. The beaches, reef, and surrounding waters support endangered Hawaiian Monk Seals (<i>Monachus schauinslandi</i>), threatened Green Sea Turtles (<i>Chelonia mydas</i>), Hawaiian Spinner Dolphins (<i>Stenella longirostris</i>) and a vast array of rare lagoon, reef, and pelagic fishes.	P-E-0029 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
The inclusion of Midway Atoll, NWHI in the Ground Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR) will have several negative impacts on its fragile equilibrium. Just the fact that the island is home of several endangered species should be enough to remove Midway Atoll as a test range location. Thank you, Josee Rousseau Dept. Natural Resource Sciences McGill University Ste Anne de Bellevue, Quebec Canada		From: Iari.belisle Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2003 2:23 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: EIS GMD Extended Test Range I have just completed a cursory review of the draft EIS for the Ground Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range. I would like to comment on the aspect of commercial air traffic as it is impacted by launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex. I have been directly involved with KLC since its beginning. Through close coordination and refinement of procedural issues as they relate to the integration of missiles from a commercial launch facility into the National Airspace System, we have been able to reduce the impact to commercial aviation but never eliminate it. In paragraph 4.1.2.2, reference is made to the En Route Airways and Jet Routes and is summarized to imply that there is no disruption to air traffic. This is not true. Figure 3.1.2 1 only shows that portion of the airway structures north of KLC. The airway structure that exist south of the KLC is not addressed and is significantly impacted. Everyday, commercial aircraft travel between North America and the Far East. In the Anchorage ARTCC Flight Information Region alone, this number can be between 60 and 80 a day. Additionally, within Oakland ARTCC's Flight Information Region, this number can reach as high as 150 per day. To restrict your scoping to the impact to commercial aviation to those airways north of KLC does not portray an accurate picture of the impacts to commercial aviation. Working in concert with representative of Alaska Aerospace Development Cooperation and the airline industry, we have managed to reduce the impacts to commercial aviation. However, each launch can cost the airline industry hundreds of thousands of dollars in operating expenses. This is due to aircraft having to fly around safety areas on alternate routes and in many cases, a disruption to their schedules to accommodate the restricted flight areas.	P-E-0030 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
There is a typographical error in paragraph 3 1 8 2 Recreation. Pasagshak State Recreation Area is located the northwest of KLC in lieu of northeast. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me. Lari Belisle Airspace and Procedures Specialist Anchorage ARTCC	3	From: Ivona Xiezopolski Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2003 12:43 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Testimony against missile expansion tests Ms.Julia Hudson Elliott, STOP THE EXPANSION OF "STAR WARS" MISSILE TESTS! The U.S. Missile Defense Agency proposes a massive expansion of its missile defense tests Ground based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR) in the North Pacific to include: -+ additional missile launches between Nohili, Kwajelelin, Kodiak, and Vandenberg; -+ High frequency X Band Radar platforms in the sea off of Kalaeloa (Barber's Point) and on Midway. In addition, the Navy is conducting sea based missile defense tests, and the Army is expanding its Theater High Altitude Area Defense missile launches. Missile defense: A+ violates the Anti Ballistic Missile Treaty; B+ will create greater global insecurity and escalate the nuclear arms race; C+ desecrates Hawaiian sacred places; D+ poses a threat of accidents, electromagnetic radiation, and damage to endangered species and cultural sites Ivona Xiezopolski Kaneohe, HI	P-E-0031 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Judy Evered Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2003 9:47 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Missile Defense G.B.M.D.S. To Julia Elliott U.S. Army Space and Missile Defence Command. Dear Ms Julia Elliott, I am opposed to the establishment of the various Ground based Midcourse Defence Extended Test Range for the following reasons: 1. The past tests have been largely unsuccessful. Three out of eight trials is not sufficient to continue in this line of research. 2. Ocean life is not being properly protected. 3. Budget projections, performance objectives and development deadlines must have public, academic and specialists oversight. 4. This oversight must be an open process, with all diverse/intelligent, rational considerations must be consulted for our future. 5. War on the U.S. is too immanent to depend on this research. We need our resources here and now, not planned with huge debts which would bankrupt our economy further. Examples are cargo containers not all inspected in Long Beach and Los Angeles harbors. 6. Dollars are better spent in proper, proven protection ie. on the Coast Guard and local radar over our vulnerable site eg, VAF Base,	P-E-0032 1 2 3 4 5	Diablo Nuclear Power Plant, etc. Also in training and equipping Emergency workers Indefinite future benefits do not warrant costs. I crossed the Pacific by freighter in December 2001. We observed very few ships, but one the crew pointed out was illegally fishing. Sincerely, Judith B. EVERED	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Michael Jones Sent: Monday, March 03, 2003 12:26 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: comments on the GMD ETR draft EIS 3 March 2003 via E mail to: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command ATTENTION: SMDC EN V (Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliott) Huntsville, AL 35805 Comments on the Ground Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) The comments below are based on my review of the draft EIS document dated January 2003. The most serious deficiencies in the draft are inadequate information on hazard areas for GBIs and target missiles (comments 6 9), inadequate analysis of cumulative impacts of all missile tests (comments 14 17, 22), no details about locations of tests of the SBX radar in the Gulf of Mexico and in transit to the Pacific Ocean (comment 18), incomplete safety analyses of SBX operation near Honolulu International Airport (comments 18 19), no mention of treaty restrictions on air launched and sea launched targets (comments 12 13), and inadequate analysis of hazards to aircraft from debris from collisions between targets and interceptors (comment 27). In addition, there are several errors (comments 20, 23 25) and inconsistencies (comments 2, 26, 29) to be resolved. Furthermore, improvement is needed in distribution of the EIS (comment 1) and providing access to comments made during the scoping process (comment 31). Detailed comments follow.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0033	1) distribution of the draft EIS The distribution list in section 11.0 indicates that the document was sent to 11 federal and state agencies in Hawaii plus the Hawaii Office of Environmental Quality Control and the Univ. of Hawaii Environmental Center. This is an improvement from last fall, when notices about the scoping meeting in Honolulu were not sent to either of the latter two organizations. It is also useful that the document is available via the Internet. However, the distribution list does not include any agencies on Kauai, any Hawaii state libraries, or any of Hawaii's members of Congress. The notice in the 7 Feb. Federal Register does indicate that the document was sent to the Hawaii State Library and the Univ. of Hawaii Library. Because the GMD ETR program could include additional launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) on Kauai and use of the TPS X radar at PMRF, the document should be sent to state libraries on Kauai and to PMRF. Similarly, there should be much wider distribution of the draft EIS in the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI); the distribution list includes only two RMI officials. Finally, only one person in Florida is on the list even though the Sea Based X Band Radar (SBX) will be tested in the Gulf of Mexico. 2) annual number of launches Page es 4 contains a statement there would be "a total of approximately 10 launches per year for the entire GMD ETR." Nearly identical statements on pages 1 5 and 2 1 claim a total of 15 launches per year. The latter number seems to be based upon 5 launches per year from three sites Kodiak Launch Complex (KLC), Vandenberg AFB, and the Reagan Test Site (RTS) in Kwajalein. However, this number seems to exclude target launches from PMRF, air launched, and sea launched targets. This should be clarified in the final EIS. 3) radar safety at PMRF The Health and Safety section of Table ES 5 on page es 29 mentions adherence to Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation safety procedures. Why do these apply outside of Alaska? 4) related environmental documents The list of related documents and Internet link to them in Appendix A are useful. The 2002 THAAD Pacific Test Flights Environmental Assessment should be added to Table A 1. Also, page A 1 twice refers the current document as the ... Extended Test Range EIS.	COMMENT NUMBER 1 2 3 4 5 6
---	---	--	---

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
5) propellant in GBI Page 2 3 gives an assumed GBI propellant mass of 20,500 kg but the total masses for the two GBI configurations in Table 4.1.1 9 are 19,767 kg and 12,572 kg respectively. Is there a third configuration with propellant mass of 20,500 kg?	7	9) LHA for Strategic Target System launches at PMRF The discussion in section 4.4.4 contains no quantitative information or diagrams showing the LHA for Strategic Target System launches at PMRF. It is stated on page 4 159 that launches from PMRF to RTS have used an initial launch azimuth of 280 degrees. It is also asserted that the North Pacific Targets Program EA analyzed launches with initial azimuths between 310 and 360 degrees. My interpretation of previous environmental analyses (1992 STARS EIS, 1998 PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS, and 2001 North Pacific Targets Program EA) is that there has been no detailed analysis of the safety aspects of Strategic Target System launches at azimuths other than 280 degrees. The 1998 PMRF EIS examined other launch azimuths only for smaller rockets. The North Pacific Targets Program EA envisioned Strategic Target System launches with azimuths between 310 and 360 degrees but did not have diagrams showing the LHA and did not contain a detailed safety analysis of such launches. This is especially important because a launch with an azimuth of 360 degrees and the same LHA used for a launch at 280 degrees appears to bring all of Polihale State Park within the hazard area. I raised this issue both in my written scoping comments and at the 18 Sept. 2002 meeting. The final EIS should contain a diagram similar to that in Fig. 4.1.1.7 2 in the 1998 PMRF EIS for a launch azimuth of 360 degrees.	
6) ESQDs for GBIs It is stated on page 2 4 that explosive safety quantity distances (ESQDs) would be established around GBIs but no quantitative information is given. Fig. 4.1.7 1 on page 4 56 shows ESQD circles of radii 399 meters and 239 meters at the Kodiak Airport. It is stated on page 4 55 that an inhabited building ESQD with radius of 434 meters would be established assuming the GBI contains 20,410 kg of division 1.1 explosive. If the propellant were division 1.3 explosive, it is claimed that the inhabited building ESQD radius would be 74.7 meters. The only diagrams showing these ESQD areas at KLC seem to be Figs. 2.3.1 2 and 2.3.1 3 on pages 2 54 and 2 55. The final EIS should clarify what ESQDs will be applied for GBIs.	8		
7) ESQDs for target missiles It is stated on page 2 8 that ESQDs would be established around target missiles but no quantitative information is provided. This information is especially important for Minuteman II, MX, and Trident I target missiles because these missiles have much more propellant than that assumed for the GBI. The final EIS should clarify what ESQDs will be applied for each target missile.	9	10) missile reliabilities There is no discussion of missile reliabilities in the draft EIS. This is understandable for the GBI because it is still under development. However, the final EIS should discuss reliabilities of the target missiles. An analysis of Minuteman test launches found a rate of severe failures of 15%. The Strategic Target System has had one failure (9 Nov. 2001 launch at KLC) in five launches.	10
8) LHAs for GBIs and target missiles No information about launch hazard areas (LHAs) for GBIs is given in section 2.1.1. Section 2.1.2.2 on page 2 8 indicates only that LHAs would be established for target missiles. The final EIS should include quantitative information and diagrams indicating the size of the LHAs at various launch azimuths at each launch site. The diagram of "representative exclusion and warning areas" (Fig. 4.1.7 2 on page 4 59) for KLC is nearly identical to Fig. 2 7 in the North Pacific Targets Program EA, which was intended for a Strategic Target System launch at an azimuth of 135 degrees. It is unclear whether the LHA and exclusion and warning areas in this diagram are intended to apply for GBIs or any other target missiles.		11) past launch failures The discussion of launch safety in Appendix C is useful. Three guidance and control failures which led to a decision to destroy the missile are noted on pages C 6 to C 7. It would be helpful to examine some specific examples and compare debris dispersal with the LHAs. Relevant examples are the 15 June 1993 Minuteman failure at Vandenberg AFB and the 9 Nov. 2001 Strategic Target System failure at KLC. It should also be noted that notices to mariners are not always sufficient to insure ships avoid hazard areas. In Dec. 1988, a commercial ship near Kauai was hit by a missile launched from an	11

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
aircraft and one of the ship's crew was killed.			
12) treaty restrictions on air launched targets The discussion of air launched targets on pages 2 9 to 2 10 does not mention treaty restrictions. I noted in my written scoping comments and at the scoping meeting that the INF Treaty seems to prohibit air launched or sea launched missile targets if the target range is between 500 and 5,500 kilometers. Statements noting this restriction were made in the Jan. 1994 Theater Missile Defense Extended Test Range EIS. The 2002 LRALT EA does not discuss treaty restrictions. A reply to my comment on the LRALT EA asserted that the INF Treaty did not apply to such launches but no compliance review was cited to justify this interpretation. The final EIS should address treaty restrictions and provide references to any relevant compliance reviews.	12	15) cumulative impacts of all missile launches at PMRF On page 3 68 it is asserted that, "Land use at PMRF and surrounding areas would not change." This needs further discussion in the final EIS because the total number of launches at PMRF could approach the maximum of 30 in the current restrictive easement. The following launches at PMRF have been proposed or seem possible: Strategic Target System 4 per year for GMD 4 per year for the North Pacific Targets Program THAAD interceptor 14 per year for THAAD Pacific Test Flights Vandal 15 were launched in 1994 Aries 3 launched in 2002 for Aegis/LEAP tests Aries? ? per year for Navy Sea Based Midcourse tests Hera? ? per year for Navy Sea Based Midcourse tests All of these would require exercise of the restrictive easement. Hera and THAAD launches appear to require a new easement because the LHAs for these missiles are larger than that for the Strategic Target System. Without more detailed information about the number of possible launches from these other programs, there is no basis to conclude that land use cumulative impacts are insignificant.	14
13) treaty restrictions on sea launched targets The discussion on pages 2 10 to 2 11 does not mention treaty restrictions even though previous environmental analyses (1994 Theater Missile Defense Extended Test Range EIS and the 1998 TMD Extended Test Range Draft Supplemental EIS) discuss restrictions from the START and INF Treaties. The 1998 TMD ETR DSEIS states that the START Treaty prohibits launches from sea based platforms and that launches from ships are restricted to ranges less than 600 kilometers. The 1994 TMD ETR EIS notes that the INF Treaty restricts launches from mobile and fixed sea launch platforms to ranges less than 500 kilometers. The final EIS should address what treaty restrictions apply to launches from sea platforms.	13	16) cumulative impacts of all missile launches at KLC It is noted on page 4 64 that the KLC EA indicated no significant impacts from nine annual launches. It is also asserted that it is "not likely" that the proposed action plus other planned launches at KLC "would exceed this level of activity." However, the proposed five annual GMD launches plus four annual launches for the North Pacific Targets Program add to the limit analyzed in the KLC EA. This appears to be a serious impact if any NASA or commercial launches are planned at KLC.	15
14) cumulative impacts of all missile defense tests near Hawaii I noted in my written scoping comments that no previous environmental analyses of missile defense tests near Hawaii have analyzed impacts of tests of the Navy Sea Based Midcourse Defense (formerly the Theater Wide system) or intercept tests of any system against targets launched more than 1,200 kilometers from the Pacific Missile Range Facility. The final EIS needs to assess the impacts of such tests (including THAAD tests) as cumulative impacts along with GMD tests.		17) cumulative impacts of all missile launches at Vandenberg AFB It is noted on page 4 171 that launches at Vandenberg are limited to 30 annually (10 military + 20 space launches) and that the proposed addition of five annual GMD launches could exceed the limit in fiscal year 2004. On page 4 207, it is also noted that the limit could be exceeded but does not mention a specific year. The final EIS should provide a table showing the number of planned launches during the 10 years of the GMD program.	16

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
18) SBX safety analyses On pages 4 212 and 4 220 are statements that an "EMR/EMI survey and analysis would be conducted" and that potential interference with ground , air , and ship based electronics will be evaluated "during the detailed EMR/EMI survey that is underway." How can one evaluate the impacts of the SBX operations near Oahu until this survey and analysis are completed? Similarly, it is stated on page 4 275 that the location of SBX testing in the Gulf of Mexico "has not been determined" and a "full EMR/EMI survey and analysis would be conducted." Nearly identical statements are made about SBX testing between the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean on page 4 276. The final EIS should cite the results of the EMR/EMI surveys and specify testing areas.	17	22) cumulative impacts of the TPS X radar at PMRF Section 4.4.4.3 on page 4 161 does not address potential cumulative impacts of the TPS X radar and the THAAD X band radar. There is no analysis of simultaneous operation of both radars or of effects of the TPS X radar on THAAD interceptors, whose potential launch site is about 400 meters from the potential TPS X site on the PMRF main base.	21
19) SBX hazards to aircraft near Oahu It is noted on page 4 212 that unrestricted operation of the SBX moored off Barbers Point "would have the potential to adversely affect air operations." Coordination with agencies and airspace users and use of the EMR/EMI survey results to define SBX operating times and areas are intended to "minimize adverse effects." It is questionable whether these procedures are adequate to reduce EMR hazards to aircraft using Honolulu International Airport and Kalaeloa Airport. It is noted on page 4 213 (and shown in Fig. 3.6.2 1) that several low altitude airways cross the area of potential SBX interference. These seem to be compelling reasons to avoid operating the SBX near a major airport. As the EIS understates on pages 4 211 to 4 212, "A location outside the approach/departure area for Honolulu International Airport would probably reduce the potential restrictions on SBX operations and simplify the coordination process."	18	23) incorrect reference The reference to the North Pacific Targets Program EA on the 4th line of page 3 2 should indicate 2001b, not 2000.	22
20) error in last line of Table 4.6.2 1 The distances in the Fully Populated columns should be 150 meters and 483 feet respectively.	19	24) 1999 MOA for ground disturbing activities at PMRF On page 3 68, it is implied that the 1999 Memorandum of Agreement among the Navy, PMRF, and the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer is shown in the 1998 PMRF EIS. In fact, this EIS, dated December 1998, contains only a draft MOA dated November 1998. The final EIS should contain the final MOA or a reference to it.	23
21) rank order of SBX support bases The preliminary rank order is given on page 2 89 but no details are given about the criteria used to determine the ranking. The final EIS should discuss these criteria and indicate how the decision about the support base will be made.	20	25) missile of the ROI? The next to last line on page 3 117 states that airway V4 "crosses through the missile of the ROI." Fig. 3.6.2 1 on page 3 118 shows V4 passing through the middle of the SBX interference area.	24
		26) inconsistent tables The propellant masses for the Orion 50SXLG and BV/BV+ GBI configurations given in Table 4.1.1 9 total 19,767 kg and 12,572 kg respectively; the corresponding total masses of the exhaust products in Table 4.1.1 10 are 22,670 kg and 23,830 kg respectively. The final EIS should correct these numbers or explain the inconsistency.	25
		27) hazards of debris from intercepts It is acknowledged on page 4 277 that debris from collision of a GBI from Vandenberg AFB and a target from KLC "may have moderate impacts to airspace." Fig. 4.11.1 1 shows that the area in which the probability of such debris causing a fatality for a 737 aircraft exceeds one in a million has a diameter of 22 kilometers. Comparing the diagram of high altitude jet routes in Fig. 3.11.1 6 with the intercept scenario in Fig. 2.1.8 3 seems to	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
indicate that both target and interceptor debris would cross several jet routes between Hawaii and the West Coast. The interceptor debris for the scenario in Fig. 2.1.8 4 also appears to cross some jet routes. The final EIS should show the jet routes on the intercept scenario diagrams. The measures proposed to avoid debris hazards to aircraft are coordination with the FAA, NOTAMs, and surveillance of the affected airspace. In order to judge whether these measures are adequate, it would be useful to know how often aircraft have flown into warning areas during previous missile tests. 28) sea launched target sites No specific sea launched target sites are discussed on pages 4 279 and 4 280, but it is stated that the sea launch platform would be positioned to avoid jet routes. The only scenario illustrated for a sea launched target is in Fig. 2.1.8 6. The final EIS should include jet routes near the Aleutian Islands on this figure so one can judge how close they are to the trajectory of the sea launched target. Similar figures for any other scenarios involving sea launched targets that are being considered should be included in the final EIS. 29) cumulative launches over the Pacific In section 4.11.3.4 on page 4 289, it is stated that the proposed action would result in five launches per year. This seems inconsistent with the quoted number of 15 per year on pages 1 5 and 2 1. 30) discreet events? The 3rd line on page 4 290 describes each flight test and SBX test as a "discreet short term event." The people involved with the tests may be discreet but the tests themselves are discrete. 31) scoping comments Sections 8.0 and 9.0 seem to be intended to contain public comments and responses and consultation comments and responses but they contain only the phrase "to be provided in the final EIS" in the draft. Perhaps these sections are intended for comments on the draft. Section 7.0 contains only summaries of comments submitted during the scoping process. It summarizes meetings with federal and state agencies but does not provide any	26 27 28 29	detailed comments from these agencies. Previous draft EIS documents (for example, the draft PMRF Enhanced Capability EIS) have provided detailed agency comments as well as public comments during the scoping process. Such detailed comments can be useful and important. For example, it would be useful to know what questions the FAA representatives in Honolulu asked about operation of the SBX radar near Honolulu International Airport. The only indication on page 7 3 is that the FAA questions concerned "operation of the radar and the effects of radiological hazards and interference with air traffic." (Presumably the FAA actually asked about EMR hazards, not hazards from ionizing radiation.) Without access to such detailed comments, it is very difficult for the general public to assess possible impacts. 32) fact sheets and schedules The "Fact Sheets" available at the Sept. 2002 meeting are not available on the Missile Defense Agency web site http://www.acq.osd.mil/bmdo/bmdolink/html/factsheet.html It would be helpful to set up a web site at which meeting schedules and other EIS related documents are available. Michael Jones Dept. of Physics & Astronomy Univ. of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii	30 31

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Ben Brisbois To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: ATTN: SMDC EN V (Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliot) Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 21:22:18 0000 Dear Mrs. Hudson Elliot, It has recently been brought to my attention that the U.S. armed forces intends to include Midway Atoll in the Ground Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range. I would like to express my concern over this action, as Midway's unique biological resources make it a valuable but vulnerable wildlife refuge. Please continue to protect Midway's diverse ecosystems. Sincerely, Ben Brisbois	P-E-0034 1	From: Mike Milligan To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: DEIS Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 20:07:59 0000 Mike Milligan Kodiak, Alaska I have three main concerns with the DEIS: 1) There is not enough concrete statements guaranteeing the exclusive use of solid fuel, (as opposed to liquid fuel) rocket motors in both the testing and deployment phase. 2) There is no description of test target rockets after existing inventories of existing assets (ie minuteman) are exhausted. There should also be a commitment by GMD to use the testing matrix as a method of disposing of existing weaponry as new treaties (such as START) mandate weapon delivery system removal. 3) There must be concrete statements at the beginning and throughout the document that this proposal is about hit to kill technology and that any pursuit of other technologies (such as used by Israel in the ARROW system) will require a new DEIS. Sincerely, Mike Milligan Kodiak, Alaska	P-E-0035 1 2 3

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: moonmagick@wildmail.com To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: DEIS comments to Midcourse Missile System Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 18:21:52 0000 U.S. Army Space & Missile Defense Command Attn: SMDC EN V, Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliott 106 Wynn Drive Huntsville, AL 35805 Sent via email to: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Comments to the "GROUND BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE EXTENDED TEST RANGE (ETR) DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)". Any further building in Fort Greeley or elsewhere should be immediately halted for three reasons. First, the EIS process is not complete. Moving forward on this project without such in place belies the NEPA process, which is the only tool the public has for oversight. Second, the project is on a fast track without even knowing if it will work. The Pentagon, in their yearly report on weapons, released last month, stated the NMD has failed to demonstrate the capabilities for which it is being built. It has failed in every test except those in which a decoy was in place. These do not reflect realistic circumstances. Third, around \$73 billion has been spent thus far on a program that has not proven itself to work. In a time when the economy is failing, unemployment has skyrocketed, education, health care, and other basic needs services go unfounded, this country simply cannot afford this program. The Missile Defense program ought to be scrapped, for the following reasons. ° First, it is in violation of an international treaty that was in effect until the current Administration. We see the effects backing out of this treaty already with the reactions by North Korea. (Recall they were one of the "axis of evil" this Administration so diplomatically named, and one of the reasons cited for going forward with NMD.)	P-E-0036 1 2 3 4	° The program destabilizes the Pacific Rim region politically. This program puts this country in more jeopardy, not less. The build up of arms only signifies to other countries they must do the same, in order for their country to "be safe". That is why international treaties are negotiated in the first place; the arms race is a dead end, security wise. ° It will be environmentally devastating. Already, Alaska lives with the legacy of some 700 contaminated military sites. Our communities are dying of cancer and other illnesses as a result. I have read through the records of all military Superfund sites in Alaska, seeing first hand how the military has failed to cleanup their toxic pollution even within the guise of such. They can't even keep their records straight; on Adak they simply "lost" thousands of pounds of chemical warfare agent. And another example, when the Army was being held accountable for their pollution at Eagle River Flats (which has killed hundreds of waterfowl) through a citizen suit, they simply went to the Alaska State Legislature seeking exemption from current state regulations. When the Army cited "nation security" as the reason, the Legislature, wanting to show their sense of patriotism, immediately complied. Given the Department of Defense's dismal environmental record and their continuing push for immunity from environmental law, we have no reason to believe contamination from NMD would be treated any differently. Alaskans want answers, not rhetoric. This system should not be exempted from current law, which mandates it must prove itself to work before being employed. Comments from public hearings were not part of the DEIS, and should be in order for the public to better understand the concerns of affected communities. Unanswered broad view questions remain, such as, what are the potential impacts to Kodak fisheries? What are the impacts to communities surrounding Fort Greeley? Should the system be pursued without the knowledge it will work? Does the American public want the system? There are many specifics, as well. For these, I defer to the careful interpretation of Carolyn Heitman from Kodiak Island. I support her comments. Sincerely, Karen L. Button Anchorage, AK	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0037 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Nola Conn of Anahola, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0037	The text of comment P-E-0045 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Hattie Berg of Kilauea, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0045
The text of comment P-E-0038 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Graeme Marsh of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0038	The text of comment P-E-0046 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kawika Alfiche of Hilo, Hawaii.	P-E-0046
The text of comment P-E-0039 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Ronald Russell of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0039	The text of comment P-E-0047 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Ednette Chandler of Las Vegas, Nevada.	P-E-0047
The text of comment P-E-0040 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Miguel Checa of DeKalb, Illinois.	P-E-0040	The text of comment P-E-0048 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Gary Bart of Beverly Hills, California.	P-E-0048
The text of comment P-E-0041 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Paul Miller of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0041	The text of comment P-E-0049 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Marti Paskal of Hanalei, Hawaii.	P-E-0049
The text of comment P-E-0042 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Robin Connors of Aptos, California.	P-E-0042	The text of comment P-E-0050 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Deborah Burnham of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0050
The text of comment P-E-0043 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Marie Le Boeuf of Kihei, Hawaii.	P-E-0043	The text of comment P-E-0051 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Myra Lewin of Kula, Hawaii.	P-E-0051
The text of comment P-E-0044 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Pete Doktor of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0044	The text of comment P-E-0052 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Richard Burge of Kilauea, Hawaii.	P-E-0052

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0053 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kima Douglas of Princeville, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0053	The text of comment P-E-0061 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Shawn Dicken of Beaverton, Michigan.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0061
The text of comment P-E-0054 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Dolores Blalock of Chico, California.	P-E-0054	The text of comment P-E-0062 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by John Grant of Seattle, Washington.	P-E-0062
The text of comment P-E-0055 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Scot Ryder of Silver Spring, Maryland.	P-E-0055	The text of comment P-E-0063 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Michael Douglas of Princeville, Hawaii.	P-E-0063
The text of comment P-E-0056 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kathy-Lyn Binkowski of DeKalb, Illinois.	P-E-0056	The text of comment P-E-0064 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Nancy Miller of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0064
The text of comment P-E-0057 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Diana Richardson of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0057	The text of comment P-E-0065 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Cindy Brockway of Miami, Florida.	P-E-0065
The text of comment P-E-0058 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Lauryn Galindo of Hanalei, Hawaii.	P-E-0058	The text of comment P-E-0066 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by James Danoff-Burg of New York, New York.	P-E-0066
The text of comment P-E-0059 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by John Kesich of Millerton, Pennsylvania.	P-E-0059	The text of comment P-E-0067 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Douglas Cornett of Marquette, Michigan.	P-E-0067
The text of comment P-E-0060 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Carole Madsen of Kilauea, Hawaii.	P-E-0060	The text of comment P-E-0068 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Makaala Kaaumoana of Kilauea, Hawaii.	P-E-0068

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0069 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Yvette Crosby of Kilauea, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0069	The text of comment P-E-0077 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Lori Juiff of Lebanon, Oregon.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0077
The text of comment P-E-0070 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kevin Correll of Wernersville, Pennsylvania.	P-E-0070	The text of comment P-E-0078 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Pulelehuakeanuenuenue Oshiyama of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0078
The text of comment P-E-0071 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Maire Susan Sanford of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0071	The text of comment P-E-0079 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Tammy Robinson of Asheboro, North Carolina.	P-E-0079
The text of comment P-E-0072 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kami Altar of La Crescenta, California.	P-E-0072	The text of comment P-E-0080 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kekama Galioto of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0080
The text of comment P-E-0073 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Eli Harris of Carrboro, North Carolina.	P-E-0073	The text of comment P-E-0081 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Dane Nance of Asheboro, North Carolina.	P-E-0081
The text of comment P-E-0074 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Charles Hansen of Greensboro, North Carolina.	P-E-0074	The text of comment P-E-0082 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Bryan Kuwada of Ewa Beach, Hawaii.	P-E-0082
The text of comment P-E-0075 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Nahe Kahokualohi of Hilo, Hawaii.	P-E-0075	The text of comment P-E-0083 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Rosemary Alles of Kamuela, Hawaii.	P-E-0083
The text of comment P-E-0076 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Nancy Crom of Albany, New York.	P-E-0076	The text of comment P-E-0084 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Jessica Manthey of Indio, California.	P-E-0084

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0085 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Christine Page of Iahaina, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0085	The text of comment P-E-0093 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Amanda Rang of Stanford, California.	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0093
The text of comment P-E-0086 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Shaun Smakal of Byron, Michigan.	P-E-0086		The text of comment P-E-0094 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Karen Mavec of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0094	
The text of comment P-E-0087 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kalyan Meola of Paho, Hawaii.	P-E-0087		The text of comment P-E-0095 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Joy Chambers of Milford, Massachusetts.	P-E-0095	
The text of comment P-E-0088 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Fredy Morse of Paho, Hawaii.	P-E-0088		The text of comment P-E-0096 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Peter Zadis of Jamaica, New York.	P-E-0096	
The text of comment P-E-0089 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Amy Ono of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0089		The text of comment P-E-0097 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Peter Sandoval of Brooklyn, New York.	P-E-0097	
The text of comment P-E-0090 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Mike Stephens of St. Joe, Alaska.	P-E-0090		The text of comment P-E-0098 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Robert Culbertson of Hanamaulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0098	
The text of comment P-E-0091 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Gary Mafredi of Los Angeles, California.	P-E-0091		The text of comment P-E-0099 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Paul Williams of Atlantic City, New Jersey.	P-E-0099	
The text of comment P-E-0092 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by David M. K. Tane Inciong III of Pearl City, Hawaii.	P-E-0092		The text of comment P-E-0100 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kathy Harter of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0100	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0101 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Mary Lu Kelley of Kalaheo, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0101	The text of comment P-E-0109 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Terry Bunch of San Diego, California.	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0109
The text of comment P-E-0102 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Christina Borra of St. Augustine, Florida.	P-E-0102		The text of comment P-E-0110 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Deborah Davis of Kileuea, Hawaii.	P-E-0110	
The text of comment P-E-0103 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Cathleen Hayes of Kilauea, Hawaii.	P-E-0103		The text of comment P-E-0111 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Charone O'Neil-Naeole of Hilo, Hawaii.	P-E-0111	
The text of comment P-E-0104 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Marion Kelly of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0104		The text of comment P-E-0112 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by KatRama Brooks of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0112	
The text of comment P-E-0105 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by L. M. Bubala of Central Point, Oregon.	P-E-0105		The text of comment P-E-0113 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by D. J. Colbert of Kilauea, Hawaii.	P-E-0113	
The text of comment P-E-0106 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Eleawani Felix of Kilauea, Hawaii.	P-E-0106		The text of comment P-E-0114 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Jeffery Courson of Lawai, Hawaii.	P-E-0114	
The text of comment P-E-0107 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by James Nordlund of Stockton, Kansas.	P-E-0107		The text of comment P-E-0115 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Nathan Boddie of LaGrange, Georgia.	P-E-0115	
The text of comment P-E-0108 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Jeff Frontz of Columbus, Ohio.	P-E-0108		The text of comment P-E-0116 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Virginia Gibson of Key Largo, Florida.	P-E-0116	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0117 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Aggelige Spanos of Kailua-Kona, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0117	The text of comment P-E-0125 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Jessica Ma of Princeton, New Jersey.	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0125
The text of comment P-E-0118 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Ravi Grover of Chicago, Illinois.	P-E-0118		The text of comment P-E-0126 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Joseph Rodrigues of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0126	
The text of comment P-E-0119 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Forest Shomer of Port Townsend, Washington.	P-E-0119		The text of comment P-E-0127 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Karrina Mount of Hilo, Hawaii.	P-E-0127	
The text of comment P-E-0120 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Timothy Johnson of Marina, California.	P-E-0120		The text of comment P-E-0128 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Christopher Kubiak of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0128	
The text of comment P-E-0121 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Donna Melead of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0121		The text of comment P-E-0129 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Faye Kurk of Princeville, Hawaii.	P-E-0129	
The text of comment P-E-0122 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Ana Young of El Paso, Texas.	P-E-0122		The text of comment P-E-0130 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Toni Ehrlich-Feldman of El Cerrito, California.	P-E-0130	
The text of comment P-E-0123 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by D. Bowman of Athens, Georgia.	P-E-0123		The text of comment P-E-0131 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Stephen Thompson of Kalaheo, Hawaii.	P-E-0131	
The text of comment P-E-0124 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Dr. Rudolf Vracko of Kailua-Kona, Hawaii.	P-E-0124		The text of comment P-E-0132 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Jeremiah Spense of Austin, Texas.	P-E-0132	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0133 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Frank Marsh of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0133	The text of comment P-E-0141 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Nikki Gentry of Shreveport, Louisiana.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0141
The text of comment P-E-0134 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Reagan Hooton of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0134	The text of comment P-E-0142 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Carlos Altieri of San Juan, Puerto Rico.	P-E-0142
The text of comment P-E-0135 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Pat Porter of Yardley, Pennsylvania.	P-E-0135	The text of comment P-E-0143 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Tina Horowitz of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.	P-E-0143
The text of comment P-E-0136 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Jane Yamashita of Los Gatos, California.	P-E-0136	The text of comment P-E-0144 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Annalia Russell of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0144
The text of comment P-E-0137 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Monica Kaiwi of Kaneohe, Hawaii.	P-E-0137	The text of comment P-E-0145 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Gain Andrea Morresi of Fairfield, Connecticut.	P-E-0145
The text of comment P-E-0138 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Matthew McGuire of Cheshire, Connecticut.	P-E-0138	The text of comment P-E-0146 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Miguel Godinez of Hanalei, Hawaii.	P-E-0146
The text of comment P-E-0139 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Sanford Higginbotham of Princeville, Hawaii.	P-E-0139	The text of comment P-E-0147 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Perry McCorkle of Washington, D.C.	P-E-0147
The text of comment P-E-0140 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Dick Miller of Hanalei, Hawaii.	P-E-0140	The text of comment P-E-0148 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kay Snow-Davis of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0148

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0149 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Niyati Brown of Pa'auilo, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0149	The text of comment P-E-0157 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by B. McClintock of Honolulu, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0157
The text of comment P-E-0150 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Shannon Rudolph of Holualoa, Hawaii.	P-E-0150	The text of comment P-E-0158 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Philip Mohorich of Lakewood, Ohio.	P-E-0158
The text of comment P-E-0151 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Lisa Carter of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0151	The text of comment P-E-0159 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Mary Krane Derr of Chicago, Illinois.	P-E-0159
The text of comment P-E-0152 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by James Albertini of Kurtistown, Hawaii.	P-E-0152	The text of comment P-E-0160 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Paul Waller of Woodland Hills, California.	P-E-0160
The text of comment P-E-0153 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Raphael Mazor of Berkeley, California.	P-E-0153	The text of comment P-E-0161 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Connie Boitano of Seattle, Washington.	P-E-0161
The text of comment P-E-0154 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Adam Mick of Kailua, Hawaii.	P-E-0154	The text of comment P-E-0162 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Carroll Dana of Kalaheo, Hawaii.	P-E-0162
The text of comment P-E-0155 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Larry Ford of Captain Cook, Hawaii.	P-E-0155	The text of comment P-E-0163 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Jean Flint of Kaneohe, Hawaii.	P-E-0163
The text of comment P-E-0156 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Jenifer Prince of Princeville, Hawaii.	P-E-0156	The text of comment P-E-0164 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Jerome Carpenter of Asheville, North Carolina.	P-E-0164

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0165 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Philip Simon of San Rafael, California.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0165	The text of comment P-E-0173 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Robert Lebendiger of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0173
The text of comment P-E-0166 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Cheryl Rosefeld of Columbia, Missouri.	P-E-0166	The text of comment P-E-0174 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Ricky Wright of St. Simons Island, Georgia.	P-E-0174
The text of comment P-E-0167 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Emma Kaye of Mantua, New Jersey.	P-E-0167	The text of comment P-E-0175 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Judy Dalton of Lihue, Hawaii.	P-E-0175
The text of comment P-E-0168 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Robert Blakiston of Sewell, New Jersey.	P-E-0168	The text of comment P-E-0176 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by David Dinner of Kilauea, Hawaii.	P-E-0176
The text of comment P-E-0169 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Forrest Hurst of Westfield, Indiana.	P-E-0169	The text of comment P-E-0177 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Tom Jackson of Denver, Colorado.	P-E-0177
The text of comment P-E-0170 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Tod Heintz of Minneapolis, Minnesota.	P-E-0170	The text of comment P-E-0178 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Robert Kelly of Calgary, Canada.	P-E-0178
The text of comment P-E-0171 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Alison Hartle of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0171	The text of comment P-E-0179 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Scott Jarvis of Hanalei, Hawaii.	P-E-0179
The text of comment P-E-0172 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Walter Pomroy of Anahola, Hawaii.	P-E-0172	The text of comment P-E-0180 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Dwayne Tarletz of Pahoia, Hawaii.	P-E-0180

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0181 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Karin Hazelhoff of Kamuela, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0181	The text of comment P-E-0189 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Maliu Neilson of Waimanalo, Hawaii.	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0189
The text of comment P-E-0182 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Daniel Lovejoy of Kealahou, Hawaii.	P-E-0182		The text of comment P-E-0190 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Michele Chavez-Pardini of Kamuela, Hawaii.	P-E-0190	
The text of comment P-E-0183 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Scott McKenzie of Asheville, North Carolina.	P-E-0183		The text of comment P-E-0191 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Donovan Watts of Berkeley, California.	P-E-0191	
The text of comment P-E-0184 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Gary Brady of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0184		The text of comment P-E-0192 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Eliza Linser of Kapa'a, Hawaii.	P-E-0192	
The text of comment P-E-0185 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Noelani Puniwai of Vancouver, Washington.	P-E-0185		The text of comment P-E-0193 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Catherine Rawson of Colorado Springs, Colorado.	P-E-0193	
The text of comment P-E-0186 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Katie Johnson of Reston, Virginia.	P-E-0186		The text of comment P-E-0194 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Berton Harrah of Columbus, Ohio.	P-E-0194	
The text of comment P-E-0187 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Bob Tripp of Kekaha, Hawaii.	P-E-0187		The text of comment P-E-0195 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Bill Lewis of Hawaii National Park, Hawaii.	P-E-0195	
The text of comment P-E-0188 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Maya Moiseyev of Palo Alto, California.	P-E-0188		The text of comment P-E-0196 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Kiope Raymond of Kula, Hawaii.	P-E-0196	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0197 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Suki Ewers of Los Angeles, California.	COMMENT NUMBER	THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK	COMMENT NUMBER
The text of comment P-E-0198 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by William Golove of Berkeley, California.	P-E-0197		
The text of comment P-E-0199 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Gregg Schulze of San Francisco, California.	P-E-0198		
The text of comment P-E-0200 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Dr. Lee Altenberg of Kihei, Hawaii.	P-E-0199		
The text of comment P-E-0201 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Mark Reif of Winchester, Virginia.	P-E-0200		
The text of comment P-E-0202 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Richard Powers of Kailua-Kona, Hawaii.	P-E-0201		
The text of comment P-E-0203 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Rhoda Libre of Kaumakani, Hawaii.	P-E-0202		
The text of comment P-E-0204 was the same as that of P-E-0319. This comment was submitted by Raphael Kaliko of Honolulu, Hawaii.	P-E-0203		
	P-E-0204		

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: BonnieMinor Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2003 10:19 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Everett, Washington Dear Ms. Julia Elliott, We live in Everett, Washington and we are deeply opposed to having a SBX X Band Radar platform in our bay. This thing needs to be located AWAY from people, not near the 100,000 plus citizens of Snohomish and Island counties. The environmental concerns of diesel spills and radar emissions would still exist away from a population zone, but health concerns, such as cancer, and economic concerns, such as the devaluation of our home and the economic development of Everett, would not come into play if this thing were set away from a populated area. Thank you for listening to the concerned citizens of Everett. Leslie Minor Everett, Washington	P-E-0205 1	From: "RICHARD D.EBERHARTER" To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX at NS Everett Public comments Date: Sat, 5 Apr 2003 06:01:09 0000 I am a dedicated Everett resident homeowner etc... I support in full the deployment and stationing of the SBX module in Port Gardner Bay. My guess is the opposition will come from a minority of very localized residents who feel the SBX will upset their view of the bay . One more large floating military object in uor bay won't screw up anyone's view . The USS ABRAHAM LINCOLN and her attachments don't seem to be bothering them so I say Yeah! thumbs up for the SBX . Remember, this is a mlitary town now and I believe in the stated mission of the SBX . Sincerely, RICK D. EBERHARTER EVERETT WA.	P-E-0206 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Jane Seymour To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX BAD IDEA Date: Sat, 5 Apr 2003 17:18:44 0000 The SBX is a very bad, stupid idea, beginning with tremendous health risks that far outweigh any possible benefit. I don't want it and everyone I know objects to the SBX on many, many grounds, too numerous to mention. Jane Seymour	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0207 1	To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Sun, 6 Apr 2003 03:07:48 0000 Deborah M. Wright Everett, WA SMDC EN V, Ms. Julia Elliott US Army Space Missile Defense Command PO Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807 3801 April 5, 2003 Dear Ms. Elliott, I am writing to express my concern and objection for the site selection of the Sea Based Test X Band Radar (SBX). It is my understanding that Everett Washington has been selected as the site most favored among all the others. We are a very heavy populated area and the site located in inland waters is a bay, surrounded by residence, hospitals, airports, and the Snohomish County Emergency System all of which will be impacted environmentally, visually and there are serious safety considerations. Also, the time for citizens to respond is so short that many questions are unanswered. The first I heard of this project was the second week in February. When were our County and City officials told about the SBX? We were told by the Department of Defense that in February that there had been a meeting in Seattle in October. The meeting was not even in our county. Who was told about this meeting? I understand that no one from Everett was there which indicates to me that no one was told. If there was a note in the paper it was not significant enough a project of this magnitude. In the meeting in February there was an opportunity to express our views but no dialog and not enough time for the average citizen to get information to investigate the project in order to ask questions. I got the impression from City officials that there was	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0208 1
--	--	---	--

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
not much anyone could do about the decisions that were made by Defense Department.		Also, please send me a copy of the Draft Environmental Statement.	
Now that I have had a little time to study some of the material, I have more concerns.		Sincerely,	
1. Environment: How noisy is the SBX. I understand that it runs 24 hours per day 7 days per week and burns 14,500 gallons of diesel fuel each day. How does the diesel fuel impact our air quality? How does the Electromagnetic Interference Area affect operations like our hospitals, airports and our Emergency Communication Systems using similar systems on the same frequencies? How does the activity around the SBX like the use of helicopters for ferrying personnel impact the environment?	2	Deborah M. Wright	
	3	Thank you,	
	4	Deborah M. Wright, MA, CEAP, PHR Mediations and Workplace Solutions	
2. Safety: Health and safety concerns include the powerful radar equipment placed in a highly populated area. What studies have been done to demonstrate no harm can come to the people, animals and plant life in this area? What is the increase in hazardous materials and the impact on our community? What fail safe controls are planned to ensure our health and safety?	5		
	6		
	7		
3. Fair Notification: The citizens of this community have not been fairly notified. We have not had time to digest the information to even ask pertinent questions. On April 5, 2003 at the Listening Forum held in Everett at the Snohomish County PUD, I made a Public Information Request for all notification documents relating to the SBX; both received and sent from July 2002 to present.	8		
While I am not apposed to the Navy in Everett, they have been good neighbors and contributing citizens. This project has been rushed. Information has not been easily available. It was way below our "radar screen". It is potentially very dangerous to our community as well as impacting the economics of our area by posing a huge unsightly floating piece of equipment that is visually distasteful, has potential health and safety hazards and impacts our environment. The SBX belongs in an area where populations are not affected. There are such sites listed.			

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Annie Lyman To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX radar Everett Date: Sun, 6 Apr 2003 16:58:18 0000 SMDC EN V Ms. Julia Elliott US Army Space and Missile Defense Command PO Box 1500 Huntsville, AL. 35807 3801 Dear Ms. Elliott, This letter is written in opposition to home porting the SBX missile defense system in Port Gardner Bay, Everett , Washington. After reading through the Draft EIS, I have come to the conclusion that there are too many red flags in locating such a project in a densely populated area such as Everett alongside neighboring communities of Marysville, Mukilteo, Edmonds and Whidbey Island. The red flags that I see would impact economic development of non governmental businesses on the waterfront and impede regular waterway traffic of commercial and recreational natures not only when the SBX is home ported but also as it makes its way to and from the Pacific Ocean test grounds several times a year. My understanding of the written EIS is that the presence of the SBX's electromagnetic field would also impact air space around it. We have the Boeing Company air strip and Paine Field airport within 5 miles of the port. I see no written mitigation about dealing with this potential problem. However, economics aside, the areas of biggest concerns for me are those of potential environmental and safety hazards in the whole of Puget Sound. This project would create water -- air-- noise pollution.	P-E-0209 1 2 3	The public has a responsibility to be watchdogs and protect our environment as best as we can. To allow the placement of this project in our already fragile ecological system of Puget Sound from Port Gardner Bay out to the Straits of Juan De Fuca would be a travesty. Again I see no written mitigation on how to deal with potential damage while in port and during transport. I think a proper homeland defense is essential for the safety of America and its citizens. I am in favor of locating this project out in the Pacific Ocean closer to its test grounds and away from populated areas. Just the economic factor of using less fuel/ travel time between home port and testing range area (a difference of 15 18 hours) is considerable. Is it true that the SBX will be making this trip as many as 6 times a year? The savings to taxpayers would be beneficial in having a mid Pacific home base (Marshall Island) over the distant Puget Sound Everett Region. Thank you for reading my concerns and consider them as valid. I would like to ask it to become part of the updated EIS record. Sincerely, Margaret Ann Lyman Everett WA	4 5

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Victoria Walker To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Sun, 6 Apr 2003 19:19:16 0000 To Whom It May Concern: I am against the SBX being in Port Gardner Bay in Everett WA. I have invested money into my property and "paid" for a view. The view I have since enjoyed has been of the Lincoln, and other Navy vessels. I realize that billions of dollars of wasted defense money can't compete with the paltry investment of my home, but it is the largest one us common folk can afford to make. So please, take your SBX somewhere where we don't have to look at it, our environment doesn'tt have to compete with it, and I don't have to worry about what health issues will arise five, ten or twenty years from now. As always, the exact effects of this type of equipment isn't "known" and frankly I don't want to find out that I can't sue the government for literally killing me. Everett is an old mill town that is struggling for identity. I do not support the Navy being part of it. Go to Bremerton, where the damage has already been done and let Everett's waterfront blossom into something that is aesthetic and welcoming. I realize these ideas of esthetics are foreign to the government but just imagine the White House with a view of the SBX as it's main focus when you look out the windows. I guess you get my point. Victoria Walker	P-E-0210 1	From: SHELBYRD To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX ! Date: Sun, 6 Apr 2003 20:01:46 0000 WE THINK THE SBX IN EVERETT, WASHINGTON IS A VERY GOOD IDEA. WE LOOK FOR PROTECTION AND WE FEEL IT WILL PRAVIDE IT. THANK YOU, AL & PEGGY PIERCE	P-E-0211 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: lin To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Mon, 7 Apr 2003 00:24:40 0000 We are residents of Everett, WA, and want to voice our disapproval of anchoring the SBX off the Naval Station here. We have several concerns, one of which is Everett's economic development efforts. There have been huge revitalization to our downtown core with the construction of waterfront view condos. Needless to say, that housing market will suffer when the view is the SBX for 9 months of the year. Another HUGE concern is that not enough is known about the long term effects of electro magnetic radiation exposure. We strongly oppose your consideration of Everett and encourage you to base it in a less populated area. Thank you for taking our concerns seriously. Sincerely Linda & Dennis Finlayson Everett, WA email: linfin	P-E-0212 1 2	From: Crispin Wilhelm To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Huge mistake Date: Fri, 4 Apr 2003 18:36:18 0000 To whom it may concern. I am a physician in Everett, WA. I cannot come to the public hearing this Saturday, but I and my family are strongly opposed to this project coming to Everett. The Navy has done a good job of partnering with civilian concerns. All of that goodwill would be severely eroded. Don't make a huge mistake. Listen to our concerns. Sincerely yours, Crispin Wilhelm, M.D.	P-E-0213 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: res06o3w To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: comment on Everett homeport base for SBX Date: Mon, 7 Apr 2003 01:10:37 0000 To Whom it may concern: Thank you for providing an e mail address for allowing citizen comments on the SBX radar homeport issue for Everett, Washington. Like a lot of my friends and neighbors, I don't have time to go to some of the local meetings that have been held. But, I was surprised to learn that some people did go to voice a negative opinion. I would like to voice a strong FAVORABLE opinion for my wife, children, retired parents, and all the neighbors and co workers I have talked to about this. In fact I have yet to talk to someone who opposes it. I have a boat in the marina next to the Everett Navy Base and I can visualize the radar there with no problems. The security and support is already here. I'm an electrical engineer and am familiar with your technology. I'm aware of and have seen pictures of Cobra Dane, Cobra Ball, Cobra Jane, and other military installations around the world that dosimilar functions. I strongly support this effort and would welcome the decision to make Everett the SBX homeport. Thank you, charles.glaisyer	P-E-0214 1	From: Nancy Robert To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: No to SBX in Everett Date: Sat, 5 Apr 2003 17:47:40 0000 I am voicing my opposition for plans to have Everett as the home port for the huge SBX structure. My concern is the impact it will have to those of us who live within range of the structure. Its size is overwhelming for the harbor. I don't think there is enough information to indicate that EMR transmission is innocuous to living beings. Everett is more than a Navy base. Please do not place things that have the potential for harm in our community. Sincerely, Nancy Robert Langley, Wa.	P-E-0215 1 2 3

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Larry R Walsh To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX at Everett WA Date: Mon, 7 Apr 2003 16:19:29 0000 Hi Just wanted to weigh in with my opinion concerning positioning an SBX at the Everett Washington waterfront. Welcome! The simulated photo of it in Everett looks pretty cool. Looks a lot better than the paper mills, etc in the same area. Kind of dresses the place up. But, if I were you, I'd consider the Pearl Harbor option perhaps a better place to be stationed. Good Luck! Larry.Walsh	P-E-0216 1	From: OVPEG To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: re: sbx/Port Gardiner Bay Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 16:57:28 0000 To whom it may concern: i am writing to let you know i am against your proposal. i think it should be located in non populated areas. Thank you, Peggy Katica Mill Creek, WA	P-E-0217 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Chris Runo To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Everett, WA Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 20:06:12 0000 We have a home directly south of the Everett Port. We love watching the naval ships arrive and depart. However, about every third time the Lincoln comes in, we cannot open our garage door with the remote control in the car. After much calling and convincing the powers that be, they shut off some equipment and life returns to normal. We do not want the SBX located in Everett. It would lower our property values and obstruct our view. That is not our main concern. Our main concern is radiation that it might emit. Since there are five other locations, we ask that you consider one of those that is not in a heavy populated area, such as Everett. Sincerely, Chris and Doretta Runo, Everett, WA. E mail cdrun53 Thank you for your time.	P-E-0218 1	From: Peggy Kurtz Sent: Monday, April 14, 2003 3:06 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett The possibility of having the SBX in the port of Everett is very worrisome to me. First, I am particularly concerned about possible effects of radiation scatter. No matter how safe you say it is, there have been instances of this type of scatter affecting people's health, and I do not want to take that risk. Second, I have been living in north Everett for 20 years, and have seen the waterfront change from an industrial eyesore to a pleasant place for people to spend time. Even the navy complex is at least pleasant to look at. Having an SBX in our port would ruin what we citizens have spent 20 years trying to improve. Everett is not a large city with tall buildings. Your platform would be more than twice as tall as any building currently in our city. Third, we already experience electrical difficulties from equipment at the hospital, and do not welcome any more from defense systems. Finally, the economic impact on our city and property values would be negative. My family has saved money for many years to be able to afford a house looking at the bay, and do not want that savings to be in vain. KEEP SBX OUT OF EVERETT!!! Peggy B. Kurtz	P-E-0219 1 2 3 4

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Wendy Zieve Sent: Monday, April 14, 2003 2:47 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: No to the SBX Plans in Washington To: Julia Elliott Huntsville, Alabama US Army Space Missile Defense Command I am extremely upset to learn about the SBX plans for Everett. I understand that the City of Everett has passed a resolution that the SBX does not belong in a densely populated area. I understand that it has a X band radar capable of sizzling anything within 13.8 miles which is proposed to putter around the Sound while "testing" the capacity of its sizzling system. You have failed to give proper notice to the "affected communities" and must schedule a series of very public Scoping meetings. Then you're going to have to go back and re write the EIS to reflect what they hear at the Scoping meetings. I sometimes work in the radius and often visit friends there. Although I don't live there, I find this so totally abusive of our rights as citizens. Wendy Zieve Shoreline, Washington	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0220 1 2	From: Peggy Toepel To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: DEIS Comment, SBX S Band Radar Platform Siting Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 19:28:28 0000 TO: US Army Space Missile Defense Command FROM: Everett Shorelines Coalition SUBJECT: Comment, DEIS for SBX S Band Radar Platform Siting at Naval Station Everett The City of Everett, the Port of Everett, and citizens (including our members), plus local, regional and state environmental organizations and Washington State Departments of Ecology, Community Trade and Economic Development, and Fish & Wildlife have invested over 5 years of study and effort in planning for management of appropriate and sustainable use of Everett vicinity shorelines and their function, as intended under the US Coastal Zone Management Act. Intermittent SBX Platform moorage in Everett does not qualify as a reasonable and appropriate use of Everett's waterfront. The DEIS conclusions of no significant adverse impacts are unfounded; they appear to be based upon incomplete information, over optimistic assumptions, and inadequate analysis of the factors addressed. The Everett Shoreline Coalition requests removal of Everett from consideration as an eligible site. One of the key considerations in careful and detailed local planning has been the concern that all of the possible human activities at our shoreline create impacts that are compounded and cumulative. If a proposed action is evaluated in isolation, such as the SBX platform siting proposal, it allows far more adverse consequences than would be predictable for a) that use alone and b) that immediate vicinity. The DEIS for proposed moorage and maintenance of the SBX platform at Naval Station Everett is negligent, in confining its brief attention to the immediate vicinity of the Naval Station. Literally, a river runs through it, and daily tides send the harbor waters far upstream into the sensitive Snohomish River estuary.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0221 1
--	---	---	--

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
The DEIS statements, pages 4-238--4-246 * fail to address effects of SBX platform transport, refueling, cleaning and other maintenance upon 9 separate stocks of Snohomish watershed salmonids that migrate through these waters at different times throughout each year, with regional consequences; * fail to include substantive evaluation of prospective test transmission impacts upon well documented large concentrations of migratory birds using the tidelands near the Naval Station; (This conspicuous omission undermines confidence in the ASMD Command's broad assumptions regarding potential impacts upon resident humans, and electro sensitive equipment and facilities, as well as wildlife.) * the statements that acknowledge potential susceptibility of other military systems to disturbance, within the range of SBX transmission, disregard potential susceptibility of civilian systems, relying upon: * unproven design features for interference suppression, still to be defined and developed * "coordination" of SBX operational timing with numerous external agencies and other civilian entities * area avoidance designation, depending upon other entities to recognize and remain outside of invisible boundaries of a mapped High Energy Radiation Area! Each of these assumptions remains highly questionable. Superficial DEIS consideration of standard environmental factors is clearly inadequate for evaluation of siting impacts upon an increasingly dense urban population with a broad array of transportation, communication, and Health & Safety services dependent upon functions vulnerable to interference from not yet studied SBX transmission.	2 3 4	Thank you for considering our comments. Everett Shorelines Coalition Everett, WA Peggy Toepel, Co Chair Everett, WA	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Pmpalmer To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Everett SBX Comments Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 19:22:47 0000 To whom It may concern, I want to register my opposition to the homeporting of the SBX radar in Everett, WA at Naval Everertt. It is the most densely populated of the consdiered sites and the socioeconomic impacts should have been considered, as well as the effects of the biological impacts and electromagnetic impacts have not been answered adequately. Thank You, Mike Palmer Everett, WA	P-E-0222 1	From: Bruce Wasell To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 18:36:25 0000 Importance: high I would like to comment on the proposed SBX. I am in favor of the SBX, because we must realize that to survive in this highly technical, electronic age, we must use scientific sophisticated equipment to stay a notch ahead of our potential enemies. A great example is the war in Iraq. After all, we are within range of North Korea's missile capability. That should cause enough concern that we would want to be as prepared as possible. Any technical problems with this kind of equipment can be solved. By the way, I live on South Whidbey Island and I don't think our view of Everett will be harmed by the SBX. Thank you for this opportunity! Bruce Wasell	P-E-0223 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Brian Dale <briandale@dmdd.com> To: Gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX X Band Radar siting Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 18:31:40 0000 This letter opposes siting of the SBX X Band Radar at the Naval Station Everett in Everett, Washington. Please include this letter in the public comment record on the SBX system. The DEIS incorrectly concludes that no adverse impacts are anticipated for air quality, noise, hazardous materials, visual and aesthetic resources. In fact, all of these adverse impacts will occur with this proposed siting in Everett and the alternative sites are better suited for this installation. The Naval Station Everett is located on Port Gardner Bay, an urban harbor surrounded by a city of 100,000 residents. The SBX platform will operate diesel generators causing air and noise pollution to the nearby homes and businesses. The SBX platform is a visual nuisance that will deteriorate the quality of views and aesthetics enjoyed by the residential neighborhoods that surround the harbor. The existing piers at Naval Station Everett with naval vessels are consistent with the historic use of the harbor, but the SBX platform dwarfs these in size and visual impact. A major commercial and general aviation airport, Paine Field, operated by Snohomish County, lies within the electromagnetic interference and radiation area of the SBX and siting the SBX here would interfere with the operation of this airport. The proposed location for the SBX is at the mouth of the Snohomish River at Port Gardner Bay, a commercial and recreational marine channel. Locating the SBX at Everett would interfere with existing commercial and recreational marine traffic, requiring an exclusion security zone significantly larger than the current Naval Station Everett security zone. Alternate sites for the SBX identified in the DEIS do not have these significant impacts because they are not urban areas. The military mission of the SBX can be accomplished without these significant adverse impacts by siting the facility in one of the other proposed sites. Brian Dale Everett, WA	P-E-0224 1 2 3 4	From: Ann Peterson To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Department Of Defense Proposal to locate the SMX in Everett Washi ngton Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 17:12:19 0000 I oppose the proposal to locate the SMX in Everett Washington for a number of reasons. These are: The possible negative impacts to Human Health and Safety caused by receiving Long Term, Low Level EM Radiation have not been fully studied. The DoD indicates that Radiation "Scatter" will be an issue. Despite its attempts to target the array "So as to not Irradiate" people. The DoD has not fully assessed the chances of interference to Airborne Navigation & Commercial Systems, Sensitive Electronics and Hospitals (we have two large county hospitals very close to our waterfront) and clinic based Medical diagnostic equipment. Especially unknown is what effects will be caused by running tests of the energy beam at FULL POWER five to six times a week while stationed in this populated urban port. I am very concerned about these possible negative impacts for my family and our community. Please place the SBX in an area that isn't so populated. Sincerely, Ann Peterson Everett, WA	P-E-0225 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Kevin Nasr To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 15:45:53 0000 To whom it may concern I live in Everett Washington and am a supporter of the SBX system. However, I am very concerned about the location of the SBX system being placed so near a residential neighborhoods, Hospitals and Airports. Please consider alternate sites. Thank you Kevin Nasr Everett WA	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0226 1	From: JOHN OLSON To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX X Band Radar opposition Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 20:28:03 0000 My name is Mary Kate Olson, I am a resident of Everett, Washington. I am writing to you to tell you that I am opposed to the SBX X Band Radar being home ported in Everett, Wa. I have three young children and I am a school teacher. My primary concern is the amount of radiation levels that the residents of Snohomish County will receive, especially my own children who go to school within a mile or two of the Everett Navy Base. As I understand, tests have been inconclusive. I believe it needs to be in an area that is less populated. I also have lived in Everett for 7 years. I have watched this city revitalize the downtown and the waterfront. The SBX X Radar will hamper those efforts and impact negatively on the economic development of our beloved city. Thank you for extending the period to take public comment Respectfully, Mary Kate Olson Everett, Wa	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0227 1
---	--	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: DEVERY RIELLY Sent: Monday, April 14, 2003 10:37 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Rielly re: Do not locate SBX System in Everett, WA. To: Army Space & Missile Defense Command Fr: Greg Rielly, Everett, WA Re: SBX Radar Platform I will keep this correspondence brief. Please be advised that as a residence of Everett, WA. that I do not know of a single resident that is in favor of the SBX system being located in Everett. The reasons are varied but very legitimate, as was demonstrated at a large community meeting of which I (and hundreds of others) attended at the Everett PUD building. I could go into many such reasons, but I will not at this time. Many of the reasons you could learn of by reviewing the video of the PUD meeting hosted by the Everett City Council and DOD. For that matter, our City Council is 7 0 against locating the SBX in Everett. The City Council, in this instance, have listened to the people who elected them. Just please know that I and many other (common citizens raising their families) are in absolute opposition to being the host city of such a project. Please locate the SBX elsewhere.	P-E-0228 1	From: Karen Clark To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett Harbor Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 06:12:51 0000 Dear Staff I would like to voice my strong opposition to placing the SBX Radar in Everett Harbor. As a member of the business community, I believe this would be extremely detrimental to the economic and civic development of the City of Everett. I know I will relocate my business to another city if this SBX Radar is built here. As a citizen, I would also like to know if a thorough study has been done of this radar system on the surrounding marine ecosystem. Sincerely, Karen Clark	P-E-0229 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Julian Dewell To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: GMD Everett Washington DEIS comments Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 20:56:34 0000 These are my additional comments and/or questions on the above matter: 1. What set back and/or protection procedures are provided for in connection with seacraft going close to the GMD? 2. Is there is any tie to NASA radar network? 3. We understand from your presentation that this unit could be land based, as opposed to water based. What effort has been made to determine a land site? 4. What type of anchorage is used and what size? Could it have an adverse effect on fish and shell fish in Pt. Gardner Bay? 5. What interference with the GMD have on local radio, television, cell phone reception and since the flight path of Paine Field is located over where the GMD will be located, during use, what effect will this have? You mentioned that Pearl Harbor would not be a suitable site, as it is close to Honolulu International Airport why not the same unsuitability, where Paine Field is involved? 6. How much shore power/energy is required? We understand that diesel fuel is used when the unit is not dockside - what emission tests and limitations have been made to control hot house and toxic gasses? 7. What effect will emissions from Kimberly Clark have on the GMD unit and what is the cumulative emissions, when considered together with Kimberly Clark. Finally, we understand that this is merely the DEIS for the test period. Your representatives admitted at the Everett meeting that a new DEIS would be prepared if the test is made at Everett and you decide that Everett or its vicinity is the place for the permanent installation. Thank You, Julian and Alice Dewell, Everett, Wa. 98201. Julian Dewell	P-E-0230 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	From: Walt Blackford To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: STOP SBX in Everett Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 23:55:14 0000 11 April 2003 SMDC EN V Julia Elliott US Army Space and Missile Defense Command P.O. Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807 Dear Ms. Elliott, I am writing to record my strong and unconditional opposition to the proposed SBX radar platform being considered for Port Gardner Bay and Everett, Washington. By its size and its potential for risk to human life and wildlife from electro magnetic transmissions, a facility of this kind is totally inappropriate for a highly populated area. Moreover, given the questionable effectiveness of the missile defense strategy ("star wars") it very likely is a tremendous misuse of public funds when so many urgent educational, environmental, social, and healthcare issues are seriously under-funded. In addition to recording my personal objection to the SBX proposal, I also want to point out that the scoping process for the EIS was flawed by lack of public notice and involvement; therefore, the process should be restarted, beginning with proper notice to all affected communities. The EIS should then re-written to include public comment received from this new process. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully, Walt Blackford ===== Walt Blackford Langley, WA	P-E-0231 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: GeckGirls To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Proposed SBX placement in Everett, WA Date: Sat, 12 Apr 2003 16:22:29 0000 I am writing as a concerned citizen who resides in the North end of Everett. I am also a parent and therein lies my greatest concern. From the information I have gathered at area information meetings, I feel there are to many questions regarding safety and the future ramifications of having this system near our homes. The impact on air quality, biological resources, hazardous materials and wastes, and the overall effects of radiation have not been sufficiently addressed. We need answers. Many people complain of the aesthetic problems; my concern is in the areas I mentioned and how they could affect our children who are our future. Would you honestly want your children or grandchildren to live close to this system and have to deal with the ramifications in their adult years? I'm sure you would not choose to put your family in harms way. Please understand we do not want our families in harms way. The choice of the majority in our community is "NO, DO NOT PLACE THIS LIFE CHANGING SYSTEM IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD." Sincerely, Michelle Geck Community member, parent, preschool teacher. Everett, Wa	<table><tr><th>COMMENT NUMBER</th></tr><tr><td>P-E-0232</td></tr><tr><td>1</td></tr></table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0232	1	From: kittygordy adams To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett Date: Sat, 12 Apr 2003 20:39:04 0000 4 12 03 Dear US Army Space Missile Defense Command, We live on Whidbey Island and would be greatly impacted if the SBX is stationed in Everett, yet our community was not given notice or given a public meeting in which to voice our concerns or ask questions. There remain many unanswered questions following last week's meeting in Everett, and potentially very negative consequences to the health and safety to those of us living in this region, including in the skies and seas, that have not been addressed. Therefore we respectfully ask you to STOP, GIVE PROPER NOTICE TO ALL AFFECTED COMMUNITIES, AND SCHEDULE A SERIES OF VERY PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS. Sincerely, kitty and Gordy Adams Clinton, WA	<table><tr><th>COMMENT NUMBER</th></tr><tr><td>P-E-0233</td></tr><tr><td>1</td></tr></table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0233	1
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-E-0232									
1									
COMMENT NUMBER									
P-E-0233									
1									

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: elly anderson To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX proposed home port Date: Sat, 12 Apr 2003 21:05:52 0000 We have visited the Everett, Puget Sound area for over ten years and will probably end up locating there because of family ties. When informed by our daughter of the Army's plan to home port the SBX Radar platform at the Naval Station Everett, I was appalled especially when there are other, less populated areas on the list of possibilities. It is clear that there are many serious health and safety questions either not addressed or entirely ignored in the DEI statement, air quality, biologic resources, hazardous materials and hazardous wastes, transportation and more. I simply cannot imagine that the Army does not have the brainpower and the resources to devise a better plan for the SBX one that will provide for real defense needs without harming real people in the process. Elspeth M. Anderson Tucson AZ	P-E-0234 1	From: gloria f c To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Scrap SBX Date: Sat, 12 Apr 2003 22:33:03 0000 To the Department of Defense Director: I am horrified at the proposal to build a giant radar in Everett, Washington. In addition to the health hazards for humans, it is harmful to other forms of life. I believe that it is a waste of our tax dollars. My State of Washington has to cut many health benefits and much needed human services. I would willingly pay my taxes for these needs, but not for "defense" measures that are not needed. Now that the war in Iraq is almost over. Please delete this project from your proposed plans. Sincerely, Gloria Chou Clinton, Washington	P-E-0235 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

COMMENT NUMBER			COMMENT NUMBER
P-E-0236	From: Mark Nagel <mdnagel@hotmail.com> To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Public comment on SBX: No to home porting at Naval Station Everett Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 00:30:03 0000 To: SMDC EN V, Ms. Julia Elliot US Army Space and Missile Defense Command PO Box 1500 Huntsville, AL. 35807 3801 From: Mark Nagel Everett, WA. Date: April 12, 2003 Subject: Proposed home porting of Sea Based X Band radar at Naval Station Everett Dear Ms. Elliot, My Executive Summary is thus: NO to home porting the Sea Based X Band radar at Naval Station Everett. As a living, breathing citizen of Everett, I hereby cast my vote in OPPOSITION to the siting of the SBX here in Everett! If I could afford it, I'd send a 250' by 230' postcard (approximate two dimensional measurement of the SBX) stating so. The SBX is massive. It's a prototype, a "test" system. What will its evolution bring? What will SBX II be? How about SBX III, or SBX IV? What follows in the wake of SBX I? Future configurations aren't likely to be open to public scrutiny.	NO, the SBX doesn't need to be in Everett. The missile defense system doesn't require that the SBX reside here in Everett. According to the DEIS there are no mitigating factors for Naval Station Everett should the SBX NOT be home ported there. Why the SBX here? What are the benefits? What could they possibly be? * It won't beautify Everett. * It won't bring any substantial new businesses or jobs to the community. * It won't make the community's water or air cleaner. * It won't attract tourism (other than perhaps from terrorists) to Everett. * It won't improve our community's education. * It won't improve our traffic congestion. * IT WON'T IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN OUR COMMUNITY.	2
1			

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
What are the losses/negative impacts? * Future development of Everett the All American City (less tax base, meaning my property taxes will continue to balloon in the face of excessive government spending): The DEIS blindly stated that there are no socioeconomic issues! * Continued restrictions on air traffic (temporary flight restrictions put in place post 9/11/2001 are likely to be made permanent): We can expect nothing but increased restrictions in the future. * Prominent citizens leaving the area (due to health/safety concerns). * Health. I strongly urge all government officials to work together to make the SBX materialize elsewhere. Sincerely, Mark Nagel (partial funder of the SBX and all other government projects)	3 4	From: EUCIII To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Sea based Test X band radar platform Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 03:22:46 0000 Reference: SBX April 12, 2003 Karen P. Stolworthy Everett, WA SMDC EN V Julia Elliott U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command P.O. Box 1500 Huntsville AL 35807 3801 or Email: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil To Whom It May Concern: I am OPPOSED to the Sea based Test X band radar platform being based at Port Gardner Bay in Everett, Washington. The SBX could emit potentially harmful levels of electromagnetic radiation. Experts say it is unlikely and other experts say it will. There is no guarantee from anyone that harmful levels of electromagnetic radiation will not be emitted from the SBX. The SBX for this reason should not be based in highly populated areas. Everett is a highly populated area. There is not enough research on the dangers of the radiation exposures from the SBX to make it safe in any populated area, such as Everett, Washington. The population of Everett relies on the fire, police, air, and medical communication systems for security and safety. The SBX's electromagnetic radiation output could cause a potential disruption of these services and therefore risk the lives, safety and security of	P-E-0237 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

the population of Everett, Washington. For this reason, the SBX does not belong based at Port Gardner Bay in Everett, Washington. In a time when we are suppose to be increasing homeland security, the SBX would be risking the safety and security of populated areas that are near it. The SBX belongs in an area with very low population. The Port Gardner Bay area and the waters of Puget Sound are a popular boating area. The SBX would prevent free boating in the area waters because of security restrictions and boundaries. Most important, boaters would be exposed to harmful levels of electromagnetic radiation output from the SBX while navigating the same waters. Many residents, including myself, paid high price for residential property with a beautiful view of the Port Gardner Bay area of Everett, Washington. The SBX would block our beautiful scenic views of Port Gardner Bay and Puget Sound. No one has said they would pay us fair market value compensation for blocking our view with the SBX. The SBX is a real "ugly eyesore" to the beautiful scenic Port Gardner Bay and Puget Sound area. I am outside at my residence much of the time. I am extremely opposed to the SBX being placed near my residence. This would expose me to harmful and dangerous levels of electromagnetic radiation output from the SBX if it is place in the Everett, Washington Port Gardner Bay area. In conclusion, the SBX (Sea based Test X band radar platform) does not belong in the highly populated Port Gardner Bay area of Everett, Washington. Thank you for your most important consideration of NOT basing the SBX at Everett, Washington. Sincerely, Karen P. Stolworthy	COMMENT NUMBER 3	From: egge To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Comments on SBX Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 18:40:34 0000 Dear Sirs: With regard to basing the new Sea based Test X band Radar, or SBX in Everett's Port Gardner Bay is not a good idea. The SBX can perform its strategic function just as well if it's based in a less populated area. The potential harm to Everett is too great to put it here. Long term effects of electromagnetic radiation exposure are not known and would be my main objection for the placement of this platform in Everett waters, and may also be detrimental to Everett's future economic development efforts. Thank you for considering my concerns. Sincerely, Larry Egge	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0238 1
---	--	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Thomas M Murphy To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX & Everett Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 20:55:20 0000 Importance: high Having suffered through the Navy and DOD building the pier in Everett, I have to ask how much more do we have to suffer? We will lose even more of our view than what we have already lost. There is then the risk of the unknown and in the near term the unknowable. What will be the interactions between the radar w/ other ship radar, other planes' radar (general aviation flies in this area), and w/ medical equipment at the nearby hospital. What will be the health effects and will it interact w/ radiation treatments. Will it cause problems w/ pacemakers or cardiac monitors. The list could go on but the real question is why put it in an area so populated and so far from its field of operation. I hope it will not be in my backyard. Thomas M Murphy	P-E-0239 1	From: Barbara Birman To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett, WA Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 23:31:39 0000 I would like to go on record as being extremely opposed to placing the SBX in the harbor near Everett, Washington. The negative impacts are too numerous to list here and the possible effects are too great even for my imagination. I am not one who goes on record as a NIMBY but this is so unacceptable that I will do anything I can to fight it. Please reconsider. There must be many other locations where it would not be so close to human habitation. Barbara Birman	P-E-0240 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Judy Thomas Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 12:36:10 0700 To:<amdetreis@smdc.army.mil> Subject: SBX ATTENTION: Re: SBX Tne Missile Defense Agency has failed to give proper (read: any) notice to the "affected communities" (like us on Whidbey), that their Scoping process was fatally flawed by this lack of notice, and that the only course now is to STOP what they're doing , give proper notice to ALL "affected communities," and schedule a series of very public Scoping meetings. Then they're going to have to go back and re write the EIS to reflect what they hear at the Scoping meetings.	P-E-0241 1	From: linda To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX comment Date: Sat, 12 Apr 2003 15:29:48 0000 To Whom It May Concern: I wish to express my opposition to the plan to locate a Sea Based Test X Band Radar installation in Everett. The public has not been properly consulted about this plan. I understand the only scoping meeting on it was held in Seattle, and that no member of the public attended inasmuch as Everett had not been named as a possible site. Moreover, SBX's environmental impact is highly questionable. The daily and weekly testing of the facility may well create unacceptable levels of electromagnetic exposure and interference. Finally, it is an enormous eyesore to foist upon an otherwise beautiful part of the world. Thank you. Linda Beeman Clinton, WA	P-E-0242 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Shannon Walter To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett, Wa. Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 16:57:46 0000 I oppose the Department of Defense proposal to locate the SBX in Everett Washington for a number of reasons. Mainly because: The negative impacts to Human Health and Safety caused by receiving long term, low level EM Radiation have not been fully studied to insure human/planet safety. The DoD indicated that Radiation "Scatter" will be an issue despite its attempts to target the array "So as to not Irradiate" people. This is an "Issue" I oppose due to undue health degradation. The size of this structure, built on a converted ocean based oil drilling rig, and its design for heavy industry degrades the visual and aesthetic value of our local waters and sea life. Its placement would undermine the City of Everett's current and future efforts to promote economic re development and attract investment in our waterfront and city core. The DoD has not fully assessed the potential interference to airborne navigation and commercial communication systems, sensitive electronic and hospital and clinic based medical diagnostic equipment. Especially unknown is the effect of the "full power" tests of the energy beam that must be run 5 to 6 times per week. In addition I oppose an industry that burns an average of 15,000 gallons of diesel fuel each day. Please count my vote against this project. Sincerely, Shannon Walter 6th Generation United States Citizen	P-E-0243 1 2 3 4	From: Will Osprey To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Date: Thu, 10 Apr 2003 23:20:30 0000 I am writing to say that I am deeply concerned over the intent of the Missile Defense Agency to base the SBX in Everett. The city of Everett has already sent a letter to the Dept of Defense informing them that the City's official position is that SBX does not belong in a densely populated area such as this, and Everett doesn't want it. South Whidbey Island definitely falls within the 13.8 miles range of this 250 ft. tall, stadium sized oil rig, fixed with an X band radar. As part of the 'affected communities,' we should have been informed long in advance, and our input been included in the scoping process. This issue is bound to become widely discussed. If the X band finds its place here, its presence will not go ignored by our community. I personally would consider moving away from a place I dearly love, but not without doing my utmost to create community awareness about the potential health effects of such massively high powered EMF's, especially on pregnant women, infants in the womb, newborns and young children. Marine life would also be severely affected. Thank you for hearing and representing the interest of Whidbey residents, William Rubel	P-E-0244 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Dean Enell To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: That contraption in Everett Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 04:26:37 0000 Who wants this thing -- not me. I live about 10 miles away on Whidbey Island where I will suffer the radiation that this boondoogle emits. Prove to me that this device is safe and more importantly that it is needed. Until so, throw this silly idea into the round can. thanks, Dean Enell Langley, Wash.	P-E-0245 1	From: hunterjkks To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 04:30:43 0000 I am a registered voter and I am against the SBX. I have changed my parents message to show how I feel!!!! Please read the following Original Message From: Kathy Hunter Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 10:08 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX X Band Radar I OPPOSE the Department of Defense proposal to use Naval Station Everett or Port Gardner Bay, Everett, WA., as a Primary Support Base for the SEA BASE TEST X BAND RADAR. My family house over looks Port Gardner Bay, I OPPOSE this location for the SBX in Test Phase or as a permanent Primary Support Base. I feel our home value would decrease considerably with the visual and aesthetice degradation of our view if the SBX was based in Everett, WA. There are unstudied negative impacts of long term exposure to low level electromagnetic radiation on human health and safety, which is an enormous concern to our family. With my parents owning a business in downtown Everett, the loss of future economic opportunities could be devastating if the SBX was located here. The re development impact for the City of Everett would be greatly affected too. PLEASE take Everett, Washington off your list for the location of the SEA BASED TEST X BAND RADAR. After I graduate from college in 2 years, I WILL NOT move back to Everett if the SBX is located in our community. Thank you Kimberly Hunter, Everett, WA.	P-E-0246 1 2 3 4 5

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: "W. Mitchell Cogdill" To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 04:39:10 0000 Dear Ms. Elliott, I oppose the Department of Defense proposal to use Naval Station Everett as either a test site or as a permanent support base for the sea based test X band radar (SBX). Based on the information given at a recent information meeting in Everett, I firmly believe that there are possible negative effects to health and safety from radiation and magnetics as well as other pollutants which can be emitted from this structure. Furthermore, this giant object could pose problems with interference to airborne navigation (Boeing tests aircraft at nearby Paine Field), communication systems, electronics, hospital and medical equipment. Of course, just the magnitude of this 250 feet tall structure would create an eyesore on a waterfront which is being revitalized. I do believe that other less populated sites which are being considered by the DOD would be more sensible. It is my hope as well as my family's hope that you will not select Everett for the SBX. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration. Very Sincerely, Marsha Cogdill Everett, WA.	P-E-0247 1 2 3	From: "Marianne Edain, Whidbey Environmental Action Network" To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: DEIS comments Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 05:34:21 0000 Ms Julia Elliott, On behalf of Whidbey Environmental Action Network, I am submitting these comments on the Ground Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range DEIS, dated January 2003. In particular, I am commenting on the Sea Based Test X Band Radar proposed to be based at Naval Station Everett. Under NEPA, procedure is of the utmost importance. The information provided by David C Hasley, NEPA compliance officer, at a public meeting held in Everett on April 5, 2003 (which was videotaped and recorded by a court reporter) was that MDA had failed in its procedural obligations under NEPA. To quote:"When we began the scoping in March of 2002, this was not a part of the proposal. . . We were in a bit of a hurry, so we averaged between Bremerton and Everett and held the scoping meeting in Seattle. In hindsight, I wish we'd gone to the affected communities. It obviously didn't work." Indeed it did not. Not a single person attended the scoping meeting in Seattle. One suspects that lack of public notice in the affected communities may have played a major role in such poor attendance. Whatever the case, a scoping at which no member of the public is in attendance is not a scoping. The process from that point on was fatally flawed. The DEIS which issued based on the non scoping is of necessity a fatally flawed document. The only cure for this fatal flaw is to set aside the present document, to hold a genuine scoping meeting, with appropriate public notice, in the affected communities as defined by the communities, not by people at the opposite end of the county. We hereby formally request that you set aside the DEIS and perform legally valid scoping in the affected communities. At a minimum, we request an extension of the comment period sufficient to allow experts of our choosing to review the document and to provide us with their responses.	P-E-0248 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
It is patent that no one working on the DEIS had the least bit of familiarity with this region, nor did they do the most basic research. The following statement appears on p. 4 237 "Frequent rains common to the area would minimize dust and PM 10 formation." Even a cursory glance at readily available rainfall data would have shown the author that our rainfall is highly seasonal, and that in fact we have serious drought problems during the summer months. During that time we also have air quality problems of a magnitude to require dust abatement. This points out a larger problem with the DEIS there are no citations given for most of the statements made. They are simply bald faced assertions which we are evidently expected to accept at face value. In the entire DEIS there is precisely one reference to Whidbey Island, and then only as a hindrance to navigation (p. 3 140). Altogether unmentioned is Camano Island, which forms one side of Port Susan Bay, where the SBX is proposed to be based. Whidbey and Camano Islands constitute Island County. Besides being non entities and mere navigational obstructions, these two islands house upwards of 70,000 residents, 3 municipalities, and a Naval Air Station. No notice of this proposal was provided to Island County, the 3 municipalities, nor to any of the 70,000+ residents. We are now inquiring if NAS Whidbey was given notice. This lack of notice to a clearly affected community resulted in a large populace and at least 4 jurisdictions being deprived of their right to help determine the scope of the EIS, and of their right to comment on the resulting fatally flawed document. Again, the only reasonable (and legal) course of action is to return to the scoping process. There are many other flaws in this document, particularly the failure to consider the cumulative effects of multiple repeated short term exposures of humans and wildlife, including plants, to electromagnetic pulses.	3	It appears, based on statements such as the one found on p. 4 238, that there will be adverse effects on aviation. What appears to be at issue in this document is merely the extent of that adverse impact. NEPA is clear that an EIS is premature if the supporting documentation has not yet been produced. Please wait to issue the EIS until the actual data are available for evaluation. On p. 4 244 we find the unsupported assertion "main beam illumination on the ground will not occur." We are not enlightened as to how or why this will not occur. This is insufficient. Either document and substantiate this statement, or delete it and do not rely on it. On p. 4 245 we are informed that a "detailed EMR/EMI survey" is underway and will be completed in Spring of 2003. The EIS is premature until this information is available. Please make it available. In the following paragraph, we are told that "High power effects are non linear and therefore difficult to predict. Additional modeling is underway to determine potential interference distances related to high power effects." Again, until the modeling is finished and the information available, the EIS is premature. Under "Aircraft/Avionics" we are told that "SBX operations would be coordinated with the FAA, Coast Guard and other groups or agencies as appropriate. Therefore no health and safety impact to coastal areas, airspace/aircraft or mariners are anticipated." In response, we are not much reassured by an agency which does not even acknowledge the existence of our county, and can't even manage to hold a legally valid scoping meeting, can, by "coordinating" with other agencies somehow prevent the cumulative impacts of multiple short term exposures to EMR/EMI. Again, an unsupported assertion is made, in this instance "no health and safety impacts to coastal areas, airspace/aircraft or mariners are anticipated."	6
	4		7
	5		8
			9
			10

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
On p. es 13, under Potential impacts, we are informed that "A full electromagnetic radiation/electromagnetic interference survey and analysis would be conducted by the Joint Spectrum Center, in conjunction with the FAA, DOT, and other potentially affected users. The survey is used in preparing a DD Form 1494 that would be required as part of the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process." In other words, MDA has not yet done the basic research necessary to answer our questions about the health and safety, or the potential exposures of civilian residents to EMR/EMI. These analyses need to be done before issuance of an EIS. The lack of this information should have become obvious during the scoping phase. Again, NEPA requires information before conclusions. p. 2 17/18 describes the vessel on which the SBX would be mounted. The description is inconsistent with that given at the public informational meeting of April 5, 2003 in Everett. Which is the actual proposal? p. 3 139 describes the region of influence, and is inconsistent with other descriptions. Please state explicitly, and consistently, what the region of influence is to be, and how this is consistent with the assertion that there will be no health and safety impacts to surrounding civilian populations. There are many more problems, but time is short. The bottom line is that this DEIS is altogether inadequate, and is based on a fatally flawed scoping process. Please go back to the scoping phase, and this time please do it right, complete with information on health effects and citations for all statements. Marianne Edain	11	^ . ^ . ^ . ^ . ^ . ^ . ^ . ^ . ^ . ^ Whidbey Environmental Action Network is a non-profit membership-based organization dedicated to the preservation and restoration of the native biological diversity of Whidbey Island and the Pacific Northwest. If you are not already a member, please consider joining. Dues are \$35 per year. Members receive our newsletter and periodic action alerts. WEAN Langley, WA	
	12		
	13		

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: maxiepax To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Location of SBX Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 06:01:12 0000 Dear Sirs, I oppose the use of Naval Station Everett as a test site or as a permanent primary support base for the Sea Based test x band radar (SBX). I am concerned for several reasons: 1 I live on the bluff above Naval Station Everett, and the size and design of this structure will spoil the visual and aesthetc value of the waterfront, as well as the view from mine and all the many homes around Port Gardner Bay, and from the parks where people come to look at sunsets and sailboats, and our Navy ships when they are in port. 2 I have already experienced being unable to use my car remote at times when the Lincoln is in port, and am concerned that the SBX would have an impact on sensitive electronics in our area, which might even include hospital and clinic based medical diagnostic equipment. Have these possible interference effects been fully assessed? 3 I am also concerned about the effects of possible long term, low level EM radiation, (and radiation "scatter" as indicated by the Dept. of Defense.) 4 Lastly, I believe our City's efforts to promote economic re development and attract investment in our waterfront and the core of our city will be undermined by the presence of the SBX in our harbor. Please do not place the SBX at Naval Station Everett. Thank you. Maxine Kraemer Everett, WA	P-E-0249 1 2 3 4	May 1, 2003 SMDC-EN-V, Ms. Julia Elliott US Army Space and Missile Defense Command PO Box 1500 Huntsville, AL. 35807-3801 Dear Ms. Elliott, From what I have learned about the proposed Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar (SBX) that is intended to be positioned at Naval Station Everett (Port Gardner Bay, Everett WA), I feel this is not in the best interest of the residents of Everett. There appears to be too many 'unanswered' questions regarding this technology and possible health risks associated with exposure to this type of radiation that this type of facility should be located where nobody would be at risk. I am in favor of improving our defense strategy and technology. I suggest that SBX be installed in areas that avoid public exposure to the radiation, minimize the negative visual impact that this structure would have on the surrounding area, and that local economy does not suffer. From what I understand, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not thoroughly address the negative impacts on the local quality of life by implementing SBX in Everett. As a person who operates a business with several employees situated on the Everett waterfront, I would like it to be know that I oppose installing SBX in Everett. Sincerely, Mike Curtis Concerned Citizens Against the SBX Everett, WA 98201	P-E-0250 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: scott kerst To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: sbx Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 09:10:05 0000 X Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) I strongly disagree that the SBX should be located by a population center like Everett Washington. It should be located in a low population or a no population area like the Marshall Islands, or Midway or Wake Island.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0251 1	From: gkaajm To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX EIS comments Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 21:52:05 0000 Glen Milner Seattle, WA April 14, 2003 U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command ATTN: SMDC EN V, Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliot Huntsville, AL 35805 Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliot I am commenting on the SBX or Sea Based Test X Band Radar. I live in north King County, approximately 15 miles from Everett. I believe the program should stop until more information is known about it. I am concerned about the energy that this system produces in operation. High amounts of electromagnetic radiation are known to cause harmful effects to organism. It is also not known what type of effects these electromagnetic waves may have upon people with metal pieces (iron composites) in their bodies. There clearly needs to be more research and public disclosure of this program. I would have attended the public comment meeting in Everett earlier this month but I was unable to attend. Please keep me informed of all developments with this system. Thank you. Glen Milner	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0252 1 2
--	--	--	---

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Valerie Steel To: Julia Elliott <gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil> Subject: SBX in Everett, Washington Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 22:16:56 0000 April 14, 2003 SMDC EN V, Ms Julia Elliott US Army Space and Missile Defense Command PO Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807 3801 RE: SBX in Everett Dear Ms. Elliott, I am writing to document my opposition to the Sea Based Test X Band Radar (SBX) proposed to home port at Naval Station Everett or in Port Gardner Bay, Everett, WA. As a four year cancer survivor, I am incensed that the Department of Defense would consider a highly populated urban area such as Everett as a location for this project. The DEIS does not address the affects of radars of this power over a long period of time, nor can it. These studies do not exist they have not been made. According to the EPA's most current data, Snohomish County ranks among the dirtiest/worst 10% of all counties in the US in terms of the number of people living in areas where cancer risk from hazardous air pollutants exceed 1 in 10,000. More than 590,972 people in Snohomish County face a cancer risk more than 100 times the goal set by the Clean Air Act. You are proposing to put an as yet untested device in a community that already has unacceptable levels of cancer!	P-E-0253 1 2	To place the SBX in a populated area is a cure that would be worse than the ailment it was intended to treat. Place this radar at a site that a community does not call home. Sincerely, Valerie Steel Everett, WA Copy sent via US Postal Service	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Valerie Steel To: 'Julia Elliott' <gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil> Subject: SBX in Everett Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 22:52:57 0000 April 14, 2003 SMDC EN V, Ms. Julia Elliott US Army Space and Missile Defense Command PO Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807 3801 RE: SBX in Everett Dear Ms. Elliott, Since 1990 I have been involved with the arsenic and lead contamination clean up in North Everett. The clean up is the result of practices by a smelter that was in operation briefly at the turn of the last century. At the time, they were employing commonly accepted methods of production. The clean up costs are rapidly approaching \$80 million and may ultimately be more. Now, I am concerned that this SBX radar which is being proposed for Everett may have very serious long term consequences that people in future years will have to deal with. I worry that people may suffer irreparable damage from the radiation. I strongly oppose the placement of this questionable device in such a highly populated area. Sincerely, Anne Robison Everett, WA	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0254 1	From: George Newland To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: sbx platform Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 23:46:27 0000 Dear Selection Committee: Please be advised that we are adamantly opposed to the siting of the proposed SBX platform on Everett's waterfront. Our port facilities are much too small to accomodate a vessel of this size and nature without severe visual, social, environmental and health impacts. For all concerned citizens, please consider a sparsley populated area that can safely harbor this project. To situate this type of operation in an urban setting is ludicrous to say the least. Also, if the decision makers visit the proposed Everett site, they will see that it is not conducive whatsoever to handling an immense cumbersome structure such as the SBX. Sincerely, George and Maribeth Newland Everett, Wa.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0255 1
--	--	---	--

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Diane Kendy To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Proposed SBX in Everett Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 23:57:19 0000 Ms. Julia Elliott, SMDC EN V US Army Space & Missile Defense Command Post Office Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807 3801 We strongly object to this proposal going forward without any notice to the affected communities, including all of Island County, Washington. This installation would have a HUGE impact on the entire Puget Sound area, which makes it mandatory that local residents be given an opportunity to make their comments known in open public forums. SBX does NOT belong in densely populated areas! Diane Kendy & Michael Nutt Langley, WA	P-E-0256 1	From: Gloria Olson To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 00:10:41 0000 Ms. Julia Elliott, I am writing to you with great concern about the SBX potentially coming to Everett Washington. My husband and I have been a citizen here our whole entire life. We have two children that are the most important issue in our lives. They are 13 and 15 with so much to look forward in the future. I can tell you many details as to why I am praying that the SBX does not end up here but I it comes down to simply this: The health concerns of our children! Also, I am a receptionist at a near by office and my husband is an ironworker, out of Snohomish. We have worked very, very hard to provide a decent home for our family. With retirement always a concern, we are afraid that the value of our home will be worthless. Please care about this community! It would be unfair given the fact that we have had little voice, no time, and very little information, and zero choice of this matter. This is not some isolated area without human beings. We are families and citizens who would be effected negatively by this decision. It would crush our hopes, dreams and ideas for a prosperous Everett waterfront! Please, I plead with whomever it may concern. This will benefit no one here. This, the SBX, DOES NOT BELONG IN A RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY! It would simply be cruel and completely wrong. MORALLY WRONG!	P-E-0257 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
Also, I ask that this process start over from the beginning! I, as a neighbor of this harbor did not have a fair chance at all! Please, our future is in your hands. Do what you would want done for your loved ones. Put yourself in our place; The fear, the vulnerability, the chance that everything you've worked for you may have to walk away from! I pray, I plead, I hope. Sincerely, Gloria Olson Everett, Wa. Gloria Olson Friendly Distributors, Inc. Everett, WAshington	2	From: Philip Jazwieck To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett WA Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 00:56:12 0000 To: SMDC EN V I went to the meeting that was held at the PUD Auditorium in Everett WA on April 5, 2003. I did not get a chance to speak so I am writing this. I am in support of the military and what it needs to do the job that the country ask of it. I was disappointed in the citizens who did get up to speak, not one was for it they just complained about how it would affect them (noise,view,radar interference) our money that they thought could be better spent on there kids or other social problems, also the environment which I don't see any thing different about that rig versus any other sea going vessel. To me it just makes sense to put it where it has the easiest access to all of what ever type of support that it mite need be it people, supplies or repair. Which out of all the different locations, Washington or California would be at the top of the list. For Washington the electricity is a little better rate wise I think. Plus I think it would look good in the marina. Hope you put it here. Thank You Philip Jazwieck Everett WA	P-E-0258 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: michael martin To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: NO TO SBX IN EVERETT Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 01:05:10 0000 We, like all residents of Everett, are very supportive of the men and women of the Navy base here. We appreciate them and welcome them as a part of our community. However, we feel it is vitally important that we express our deep concerns to the proposed SBX system in the Everett community. We simply would like to be on the record for our VERY STRONG OPPOSITION to the SBX system being located in the Port of Everett. To us, and the countless other residents we have spoken to, the very idea of the SBX system locating to this area is unthinkable and completely unacceptable. Make no mistake about it, the economic and social ramifications of this would be severe to the citizens of this community. In addition, we feel strongly it likely would impact this city's relationship with the navy base. We do not want this to happen. I urge you to strongly consider another site for the SBX system. Thank you. Michael Martin and Won Chong Kim Everett, WA	P-E-0259 1	From: Richard and Karen Davies To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Sea Based Test X Band Radar Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 02:22:49 0000 To whom it may concern: I oppose the Sea Based Test X Band Radar (SBX) that is proposed to home port at Naval Station Everett or in Port Gardner Bay, Everett, WA. I am worried that the effects of radars of this power to nearby residents in the surrounding community may be unsafe. According to the SBX information sheet, safe operating areas and angles are not established at this time. Living in a Radiation Hazard Zone with questionable operating areas and angles is not what Everett citizens want for their families in this recently-named All-American City. I am concerned that the affect on air quality along the waterfront and in nearby Everett, when 14,500 gallons of diesel fuel are consumed per day for nine months of the year, will be unsafe levels of contaminants and diesel odors in downtown Everett. The project is too big and out of scale with the rest of the city, and it will discourage other commercial non industrial development on the waterfront at a time when Everett is planning attractive and compatible access to the waterfront by both citizens and commercial developers. It took seventy-five years for Everett to clear the waterfront of the smokestacks and debris of a number of mills that resulted in the "City of Smokestacks" name. The city must now take care to preserve the natural beauty, property values, and economic potential that have been regained. The SBX project will eliminate the vision and future waterfront potential of Everett. Surely a better military site for the SBX project can be found. It does not belong in the center of a community population. Were it your community in question, I'm sure you would agree. Sincerely, Karen Davies	P-E-0260 1 2 3

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Karen Charnell To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Location Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 02:28:32 0000 I am writing to oppose the location of the SBX Radar System in Port Gardner Bay in Everett, WA. My concerns are the low level radiation exposure, potential interference with cardio and radiation therapy equipment at the two hospitals located very near the waterfront, and the visual blight to this up and coming community situated on Puget Sound waterfront. Please take Everett Washington off the short list of potential locations. It is too close to residential and medical areas.	P-E-0261 1 2	April 14, 2003 Dear US Army Space Missile Defense Command: I am writing to express my opposition to the placement of the SBX X-Band Radar in the Port of Everett, WA. The very short time that Everett, Mukilteo, Marysville and the Island Communities have had to respond to this proposal is unacceptable. What information we have been able to garner revolves around the following: 1. Unknown health risks due to radiation emissions. 2. Anticipated significant decline in property values based on unknown health risks, coupled with loss of esthetically pleasing views of Port Gardner Bay. 3. Anticipated decline of Everett's economy based on new business choosing to not establish in the same area as the SBX. 4. Disruption of air traffic. 5. Knowledge that if the SBX was ever called upon to fulfill its function, that it would have a seventy-five percent chance of being in port when called upon to do so. 6. Placement in Everett would be for the convenience of 54 crew members who would be staffing the SBX, including the use of city power and water. Consideration for the aforementioned risks to the community appear to not have priority status over ease and convenience for the Department of Defense. I sincerely hope that you will remove Everett from the list of potential candidates for the SBX and place it in a non-populated area where there will be no risk to life or livelihood. Yours truly, Elizabeth Hallgarth Everett, WA	P-E-0262 1 2 3 4 5

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Sheila To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: X Band Radar (SBX) in Everett, WA Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 04:06:29 0000 I am writing to express my opposition to the use of the X Band Radar (SBX) in the Puget Sound area of Washington state. There has been a critical lack of notification to affected communities. Please, stop the current process and start over. The public needs to know that this is being considered and given ample opportunity to comment. I am deeply concerned at the impact this much radiation will have in such a densely populated area. Sincerely, Sheila Hoopman Edmonds, WA	P-E-0263 1	From: William Chandler To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Sea Based Test X Band Radar (SBX) Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 04:07:13 0000 I am furious. I am writing to voice my opposition to the Sea Based Test X Band Radar (SBX) proposed to home port at Naval station Everett or in Port Gardner Bay, Everett, WA. I oppose this radar being placed in a large, urban such as my community of Everett. Such technologies should be placed where they will not effect any people or the potential safe functioning of their community or the beauty of their environment. The negative impact on our waterfront is huge and is inadequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I cannot believe that you would force any community to accomodate such a potentially dangerous system and the manner in which you have tried to force this project on our community is despicable. The hearings for any project that would have such a huge impact on the community should have been widely publicized and yet most people even in Everett proper are unaware that such a dangerous eyesore is proposed for our waterfront. Corry Venema-Weiss Everett, WA	P-E-0264 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: rsetlow To: <gmdetreis@smdc.arm.mil> Subject: SBX Near Whidbey Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 22:13:53 0700 I am a new resident on Whidbey Island and just learned about the SBX = project in the local paper. It appears to be a project similar to one I was familiar with in Norway, the so called, Vard Radar, as I worked in the US Embassy in Oslo during the discussion/installation controversy phase of this USAF/SPACOM project. This space surveillance radar is also known as, Globus, in Norway and received much attention in the Norwegian press/media. Though key issues are different, some overlap and SMDC probably could use the same approaches the USAF and Norway used to gain approval and safe operation near the town of Vard. If you not familiar with the Norway X band radar and related issues, I suggest SMDC track down the folks involved in HQ USAF, SPACOM, DIA, Raytheon, etc. If you need a supporter and/or more help in this local, generally liberal/anti military environment, I'm willing to learn more about SBX program to help DOD, SMDC make the case to locate SBX in this region if agreement is not already in hand. Regards, Robert Setlow, USAF Lt. Col. (retired)	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0265 1	From: WonChong Kim To: "gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil" <gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil> Subject: SBX opposition Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 17:17:10 0000 Hello. I am a resident of Everett, WA. I am writing to notify you that I oppose the proposed site of the Port Gardner Bay area for the SBX construction/location. We currently have a good relationship with the naval post located there, but should the SBX location be set in the Everett waterfront, it would definitely damage that relationship. The impact to the community would be very harmful economically and emotionally, as the town is trying to get a better profile in the public eye, and has recently made great costly steps toward improvements. Also, the area is completely populated, and the possible physical and emotional damage from such irradiation to the area, while unknown, could prove to be very costly and most likely negative in effect. Thank You. Won Chong Kim Everett, WA	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0266 1 2
---	--	---	---

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Christine To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Radar Everett Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 13:40:02 0000 Dear Sir/Madam: I am an Everett homeowner who would like to remain one. I am opposed to the SBX being located here in the waters off a town of 95,000 people, most of whom live here because of the natural beauty of Puget Sound as well as the wildlife it attracts. All of this would be seriously threatened by the presence of the SBX. We have pods of orcas who swim in these waters and are already suffering enough from PCB water pollution and heavy metal in their prime food, salmon, which in any case is in short supply in recent years. These animal family groups cannot suffer any further losses and sustain a population large enough to maintain a healthy genetic diversity. No information has been provided that environmental studies have been done on the impact of SBX on orcas and other wildlife, especially the effects of a fuel spill or of the EMR emitted by SBX. Not only is this an immediate threat in Gardner Bay and surrounding city of Everett, but to all that live in the waters through which the SBX would travel going to and from testing areas. Having a generator running 24 hours a day for 9 months a year will have a profound impact on the ability of orcas to communicate in the area, and this will directly affect their survival as they have to communicate to conduct their hunts. The impact of this noise on the hearing of orcas as well as on the ability of young to learn to differentiate calls has not been studied, but would surely be negatively impacted.	P-E-0267 1	We also have a resident population of nesting ospreys in Port Gardner Bay very near the site planned for the SBX. This is critical habitat for these majestic birds who nest on the pilings in the bay then hunt along the Snohomish River. The area is also major habitat for migrating birds who are already under threat from West Nile virus. The air pollution alone generated by burning 14,500 gallons of diesel per day while in port makes the SBX a health nightmare not only for nearby osprey and other birds, but for the entire area which, on cold, clear winter days, often suffers inversions for several days at a time when woodburning is not allowed. Diesel is a carcinogen which should be retired as a fuel ASAP. It certainly should not be burned in these amounts in the middle of a city. Unfortunately, I cannot take time to go into the many other issues raised by the SBX. Suffice it to say that for the above and myriad other reasons, I am strongly opposed to the SBX being located in Everett or anywhere in Puget Sound. I hope that decisionmakers will realize that both the government and residents of Everett are equally strongly opposed to this monstrosity, and will remain so. Sincerely, Christine Giannini Everett, WA	2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Dave Kurtz To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 14:49:17 0000 Let me add my voice to the thousands who are opposed to the SBX project in Everett. Everett has been a great supporter of the military, and the Navy has benefited from the positive relationship with the community here. That atmosphere of good will and cooperation is greatly endangered by this project. It will be an eyesore and a constant irritant to the community. For the good of Everett AND the military, please keep the SBX out of here! Thank you. Sincerely, David A. Kurtz	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0268 1	From: "Deane W. Minor" To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX on West Coast Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 15:54:32 0000 4.15.03 To whom it may concern: I am a resident of Everett, Snohomish County, Washington. I am writing to OBJECT strenuously to the placemenet of teh SBX in our small harbor. While the health concerns from radiation may be overblown -- I hope -- there are significant other negative impacts from placing this huge device in our harbor: (1) it will be UGLY -- and detract from our beatiful setting. (2) it will negatively impact our city's efforts to improve itself economically; who would want to relocate a business in an area with this monstrosity in place? (3) the impact on other electronic devices is well documented. PLEASE SELECT A LOCATION THAT WILL NOT IMPACT THE CITIZENS OF EVERETT - OR THE CITIZENS OF ANY OTHER METROPOLITAN AREA; we all know that there are such sites available Thank you, Deane W. Minor Everett, WA	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0269 1 2
--	--	--	---

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Ivy35Wood To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Location Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 15:56:11 0000 I strongly OPPOSE the Department of Defense Proposal to locate the SBX in Everett, Washington. Donna Witte, Everett	P-E-0270 1	From: Judy Thomas Date: Sun, 13 Apr 2003 12:36:10 0700 To:<amdetreis@smdc.army.mil> Subject: SBX ATTENTION: Re: SBX The Missile Defense Agency has failed to give proper (read: any) notice to the "affected communities" (like us on Whidbey), that their Scoping process was fatally flawed by this lack of notice, and that the only course now is to STOP what they're doing , give proper notice to ALL "affected communities," and schedule a series of very public Scoping meetings. Then they're going to have to go back and re write the EIS to reflect what they hear at the Scoping meetings.	P-E-0271 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Makhanchor108 To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: I oppose SBX in Everett Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 19:46:23 0000 I write to voice my opposition to the Sea Based Test X Band Radar (SBX) proposed to home port at Naval Station Everett or in Port Gardner Bay, Everett WA. If this type of installation is appropriate for a densely populated area why has there been no public discourse on the issue? I oppose it being put in Everett. Sincerely, Mark Anderson Bothell, WA.	P-E-0272 1	From: Ray McKinnon Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2003 9:57 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Test Platform To whom it May Concern: Concerning the SBX platform being based on the Everett waterfront. We in the city of Everett have invested considerable time and money on research into developing our city's waterfront. The Army's test platform will have a considerable negative impact on those plans. Please give your decision serious thought; this platform would probably be better located someplace like Indian Island. Sincerely, Ray McKinnon	P-E-0273 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Dale Temple Subject: SBX Feedback Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 19:45:59 0000 Below is a copy of the e mail we sent to the US Army Space Missile Defense Command, regarding the proposed SBX radar system being home ported in Everett. I would like to receive a response from each elected official that receives this e mail as to what your position is. A simple "For" or "Against" would suffice. Thank you. Sincerely, Dale Temple To Whom it May Concern: We are writing to express our opposition to having the SBX radar system home ported in Everett, WA. While we are ardent supporters of the navy base, there are just too many unanswered questions about the affects of this system to our health, environment and our community's economic development. We also do not believe that the notification to the people of our city was either proper or adequate. Sincerely, Dale & Laura Temple Everett, WA	P-E-0274	From: kelli.trosvig To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Cc: kelli.trosvig Subject: Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 05:33:09 0000 I am writing to express my concern over the draft EIS and proposed siting of the SBX home port at Everett Washington. My concerns are as follows: Air Quality: What is the impact to air quality for the proposed SBX Test X band generators? In a maximum use scenario, how long would the generators run each day and what would be the emissions? What is the current air quality for the area and how will this additional point source add to air emissions from existing and future development plans for both the marina and the railroad switching yard located in close proximity to the site. I would recommend at the very minimum the exclusive use of low sulfur (less than 15ppm sulfur) diesel amended with at least 20% biodiesel alternative. The generators should be equipped with the latest and best technology for both noise and clean air emissions including catalyzed diesel particulate filters for carbon monoxide, hydro carbon and fine particulate control. In addition measures should detailed how fueling will be performed to minimize spills and vapors. Endangered Species: The Port Gardner Bay represents a unique and biodiverse system for the migration and return of spawning wild salmon, various whales and occasionally orcas. Adequate measures will need to be put in place to monitor and ensure no adverse in impacts to these species from air, water and non ionizing radiation emissions. Your draft EIS did not address this concern.	P-E-0275
	1		1
	2		2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
Electromagnetic Emissions: Please provide population dosimetry estimates for the expected and potential use of this radar system, including peak and six minute averages and a contour map showing potential exposures. What form of monitoring will be performed and what mechanisms will be in place to inform the general public of potential exposures? During the 20 minute testing each day what will be the frequency and wave form of the non ionizing radiation (maximum pulse energies, etc.). How will side beams radiation estimates be calculated? How will potential adverse effects be studied and assessed prior to testing at the Everett Home port? At the very least I would recommend that an independent consultant be hired to assess exposures and risk for the general population including the potential for non thermal effects documented in the literature (sleep disorders, behavior and memory problems) including an analysis of existing military radar facilities impacts on the population. This analysis should be available to both the military and citizens prior to the siting decision. In conclusion, I would like to ask that the final EIS takes into consideration that the SBX as proposed will be sited in Everett for 9 months a year. It should be considered a fixed point source and follow the most stringent guidelines of safety for environmental and public health protection. Kelli Trosvig Everett, WA	3	From: Bikncatmom To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett WA Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 04:43:03 0000 I am writing to voice my opposition to the Sea Based Test X Band Radar (SBX) proposed to home port at Naval Station Everett in Port Gardner Bay, Everett WA. I oppose this radar being placed in a large urban populated area such as Everett and its surrounding communities. The SBX should be placed in a site that will not affect any population base. It may interfere with our local hospital and medical equipment and emergency response communication systems. Our citizens are not safer within this hazard area. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) does not thoroughly address the negative impacts the SBX will have on our most valuable resource, our recreational and commercial waterway, Port Gardener Bay. The DEIS does not adequately address the loss of future economic vision and redevelopment of our public waterfront properties. The impact of this enormous structure on our waterfront will have a huge negative effect on the visual attraction of the bay. The SBX must not become the visual landmark of our town. I oppose the SBX Radar project being forced upon Everett, Washington and its people. Place this radar at one of the military sites that does not involve a community. Sincerely, Margaret Grospitch Everett WA	P-E-0276 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Tagsjp To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Concerning the SBX decision Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 04:26:06 0000 To the Decision makers for the location of the SBX: I applaud your move to create a system for our country to respond in a proactive manner when it comes to protecting our country. This decision of defense is one made to protect our way of life, the American way of life, a life with a high standard of living and quality. Although the SBX system is designed to protects us from opposing countries, if located in Everett, Washington it will dramatically impact our standard of living in a negative way. Locating the SBX in Everett is a total mismatch. If you really knew our city and our goals, this would be most apparent. Our city is rebounding from the down scaling of a major employer, Boeing, and its early roots as a mill town. It is a city in transition, one that is redefining itself. To do so we are drawing on our most valuable asset, our natural environment. We want the world to see Everett as a city in which they can relate to the natural environment and participate in recreation and cultural events. A city with soaring vital signs. It has taken money, tough decisions, foresight, and hard work to change our town's image. And yet, in one ill thought out, short sighted decision you have the power to stop us in our tracks and destroy the progress our town has made. It would be a decision made by people who do not have to live with the long term consequences of any possible health risks, loss of property value, and a city with a diminished and uncertain future. If the SBX is placed in Everett, it won't be in our "backyard", it'll be in our "frontyard", only a few blocks from our downtown main streets. The SBX is an operation that should not be located in Everett or any other high density population. Please take Everett off the list of possible SBX locations. S. Phillips	P-E-0277 1	From: MJ Anderson To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Comment SBX in Everett WA Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 04:21:23 0000 SMDC EN V Ms. Julia Elliott US Army Space & Missile Defense Command I am opposed to the SBX being homeported in Everett, Washington. The following issues are but a small sample of the numerous reasons for my opposition, which I gathered from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. 1. Inadequate research/studies on the effects of the radar's electromagnetic interference on flight, marine and hospital equipment (area has 5 airports, 2 hospitals, and hundreds of commercial and recreational vessels in the immediate range of the SBX). 2. Inadequate research/studies on the radar's electromagnetic radiation effects on humans and wildlife. There is no reference to the several sensitive wildlife areas here, or to the Shoreline Management Act, which must be adhered to by prospective new development interests. I do not think the military should be exempt from obeying this Act. 3. Inadequate safety mitigation for potential failures, ranging from fuel spills to "misfire" of the radar itself. 4. Inadequate assessment of the radar's impact on Everett's economic vitality. For several years, Everett has worked to change its image from dirty mill town to a revitalized, family oriented area with a variety of businesses, including high tech. Homeporting the SBX here will impact our property values, our ability to bring in desperately needed new businesses, and possibly render unusable our newly designed multi use waterfront development plan. The waterfront development plan's success will hinge on the sales of approximately 400 water view condominium units. If these units don't sell because potential	P-E-0278 1 2 3 4

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
residents don't want to look at the SBX every day, or are in fear of its health effects, our years of effort on this plan are a waste. 5. The stated practice of towing the radar and platform out to sea several times a year for testing defies all logic, when the radar could be homeported in an area much more accessible to the testing site. Wending this huge football stadium sized object through our highly sensitive ecological areas 10 12 times a year cannot possibly be more cost effective because the Army is saving money due to "easier access" for personnel and materials. I request a cost trade off study from the Army, which must have been performed, comparing the money saved by homeporting the SBX in Everett for resource purposes, to the cost of towing the SBX out and back to sea up to 12 times a year. 6. Inadequate notification process to Everett and the surrounding areas of its candidacy for SBX homeporting. The Army's excuse for a shortened public comment period was the the SBX was a late addition to the program. If it was a late addition, the entire process should have been started again from the point at which Everett became a candidate for homeporting. I request that the entire notification process be restarted from the beginning, with adequate scoping meetings held at appropriate locations, and with an appropriate public comment period. 7. The Army has stated that it wants to be a "good neighbor" to its chosen homeport for the SBX. It is clear to me that forcing the SBX on a community that has risen up in singular opposition to this project would make the Army less than a good neighbor. In less than two months' time, the residents and government of Everett have given a massive voice to our dissent to the SBX. The Mayor of Everett and City Council have unanimously passed a resolution opposing the	5	SBX. If the Army truly wants to be a "good neighbor", it will take its SBX to an unpopulated site, which is the appropriate place for this untested project. Mary Jane Anderson Everett, WA	
	6		

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

COMMENT NUMBER	COMMENT NUMBER
From: Miji Ryan To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: EIS SBX Everett, WA Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 03:17:30 0000 After careful study of the material provided for the Environmental Impact Study for the proposed placement of the SBX in the Naval Station of Everett, WA I would like to register my extreme concern that the placement would severely impact the area and request that one of the other proposed locations should be chosen. The materials on possible health considerations of the required in port tests do not address current scientific knowledge sufficiently to provide assurance to the citizens that there could not be serious consequences to them. The city has worked diligently to make the best economic use possible of the waterfront and upgrade the area to provide a more secure financial base for the local economy. There is no doubt that the presence of the enormous SBX would completely negate these plans for relocation of industry and the location of upper scale waterfront usage. While we have been a willing host to the Naval Station, and 52 more personnel would be welcomed, we can not feel the same way about the insertion of a structure the size of a 25 story building. I ask you sincerely to consider another location. Miji Ryan Everett, WA	From: kelli ivan To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Platform in Everett Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 02:35:40 0000 Even as our troops work to bring democracy in Iraq, I would hope that you allow democracy to work in the siting decision for the SBX platform. The residents of Everett have made it very clear that the vast majority do not wish to have the SBX radar platform sited in our community. This platform threatens our endangered salmon and siting the platform in Everett probably violates the Endangered Species Act. Further, since there are other acceptable locations where the local citizens actually would welcome the radar platform, I would hope that you would respond to the expressed wishes of our community and consider siting the SBX platform in one of the alternative locations. This is the only issue that I have ever seen that brought the citizens of Everett together in such a united front. Thank you for taking the time to listen. I hope that we have made our wishes very clear to you. Please take the SBX platform to another community where it will be welcomed. Dr. Ivan Eastin

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Glen Miller To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: NO SBX PLEEEEEEESE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 02:19:57 0000 Dear Sirs, Please do not pick Everett as a place to locate the SBX defense system! I have carefully reviewed all aspects and information I have received on SBX. I understand a need, but Everett does not want it. We are very very concerned about all aspects of SBX radar and platform which has been discussed again and again and again!! I need not say more! Health and view and our lifestyles are priorities! OUR COMMUNITY HAS already given a lot to the navy and military support and feel we have done our PART! NO SBX HERE!! PLEASE NO Sincerely, Glen W. Miller Everett, WA.	P-E-0281 1	From: Ken Adams To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 00:56:04 0000 Please do not locate the SBX radar platform at Everett, WA. That area is too beautiful and populated to have something that large in the middle of everyone's view. I'm sure there are other places to put it that are not as scenic to so many people. Thank you. Ken Adams Everett, WA	P-E-0282 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Robert Emery To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Everett SBX Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 00:37:35 0000 Dear sir: I am voicing my opposition to the proposal to locate the SBX in Everett for the reasons that follow: - negative and unknown impact on the local salmon migratory patterns in Puget Sound, - negative impacts on the human population from the low level EM radiation, that is known to cause or increase incidence of cancer, - possible disruption and negative effect upon the annual migration of the Orca and Gray Whales and other sea life in Port Gardener Bay, - negative visual impact and economic impact to the Everett waterfront redevelopment, - unknown effects of the "full power" tests of the energy beam on local sensitive electronic equipment and life. Please relocate this experiment to a less populated area. SINCERELY, Robert S. Emery Please respond to: Friends of Maggie Park C/oRobertS.Emery President Everett,WA	P-E-0283 1 2 3 4 5	From: Amy Burton To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Placement of SBX Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 20:07:56 0000 I am writing to you as a citizen who lives within the radius of the area that has potential of impact from the proposed SBX. While I am very supportive of the Naval Base we house, I am vehemently opposed to placing in a populated area the potential for unknown harmful effects from radiation. The Port of Everett and the City of Everett are NOT the appropriate location to place such an unknown. Amy Burton, Everett, Washington	P-E-0284 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: J C O'DONNELL To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 23:04:55 0000 Please no SBX in Everett. J.C. and Mary O'Donnell, Everett	P-E-0285 1	From: Scott Schroeder To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX X Band Radar Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 21:12:26 0000 Thank you for allowing us to voice our concerns over the DOD's proposed plan to possibly site the SBX Radar Platform at Naval Station Everett. My family lives VERY close to the Everett Navy Base. We are concerned not only with the impact such a huge structure will have on our views and property values, but also the unknown risks associated with being located so close to such a strong source of electro magnetic radiation. Locating this facility directly below a long established neighborhood of families should be re considered. Since the facility IS a sea going platform, serious consideration should be given to doing just that putting it to sea, rather than locating it in the midst of a heavily populated community. If the issue for selecting Everett as a prime choice is one of providing the facility a secure location, I'd have to think that locating it near the Navy's Indian Island facility would be an even better choice, and it would have a less adverse impact on a far smaller group of people. For the record, we were all in favor of the Navy locating here when the base was first proposed. We are not however, in favor of becoming test animals for the Dept. of Defense. Please reconsider your proposal to site this facility in my neighborhood and choose a location more fitting for experimentation. Sincerely, Scott, Kim, Michael, and Kevin Schroeder.	P-E-0286 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: "Doyle, John F." To: "'gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil'" <gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil> Subject: SBX Everett .. we want it here in Everett Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 20:43:04 0000 gmdetreis : I think Everett needs the SBX project .. don't listen to people that are trying to kill the project because they think they live in a fancy yachtsman community. Everett is a WORKING community My home,. Everett, has a great view of the area from the Navy base to Hat Island and the south end of Whidbey Island... I like to see the Lincoln come in and out of the port and also like to see the sail boats in the sound. The SBX would be great .. keeping Everett a vital part of the defense of the nation. The view of the sound would be enhanced by the presence of the SBX .. Let's be creative and welcome new technology ... Everett is a WORKING community .. it needs jobs. There is talk about building a new/improved dock to help attract Boeing shipping and the new Boeing projects... Thank you looking forward to seeing the SBX in our area .. John Doyle	P-E-0287 1	From: lynn To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 19:18:12 0000 ms julia elliott please know my family is totally opposed to having the SBX siting in Everett. I live on Whidbey Island within view of Everett. Everett doesn't want it. Whidbey doesn't want it. please listen & do what you can to keep this from happening. thank you for listening Lynn Hays & family	P-E-0288 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: John Hurd To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: We want hearings on SBX!!!! Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 15:38:08 0000 SMDC EN V, Ms. Julia Elliott US Army Space and Missile Defense Command PO Box 1500 Huntsville, AL. 35807 3801 Dear Ms. Elliott, I write to voice my opposition to the Sea Based Test X Band Radar (SBX) proposed to home port at Naval Station Everett or in Port Gardner Bay, Everett WA. I oppose this radar being placed in a large, urban populated are such as Everett and its surrounding communities. The SBX radar should be place in a site that will not affect any population base. The 22.5 km (13.8 miles) Radiation Hazard Area and Electromagnetic Interference Area covers a population base estimated at 400,000 people. It interferes with airplane navigation and communication controls. It may interfere with our local hospital and medical equipment and emergency response communication systems. Our citizens are not safer within this hazard area. Current scientific studies have not analyzed radars of this power, or the effects of low EMR "scatter" over a long exposure period on Human Health and Safety. Current IEEE guidelines are based on outdated science and do not protect our health. Our children should not be raised within a Radiation Hazard Area regardless of the assurances that radiation levels are within "safe" limitations.	P-E-0289 1 2 3	The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) does not thoroughly address the negative impacts of the SBX and the security area that will surround it, on the loss of our most valuable resource, our recreational and commercial waterway, Port Gardner Bay. The DEIS does not adequately address the loss of future economic vision and re development of our public waterfront properties. Home porting the SBX will forever tie the City of Everett to an industrial, military and restricted access waterfront. There is not even a socio economic section included in the DEIS. The impact of this enormous structure on our waterfront will have a huge, negative affect on the visual attraction of the bay as well as destroy the views from surrounding homes and businesses. The loss of view, loss of desirability and loss of property values are not taken into account in this proposal. The SBX must not become the visual landmark of our town. I oppose the SBX Radar project being forced upon Whidbey Island, WA. and its people. Place this radar at one of the military sites that does not involve a community. Sincerely, John Hurd Clinton, Wa	4 5 6

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
	From: Gloria Olson Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 2:57 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX IN EVERETT WASHINGTON To whom it may concern, I, Gloria Olson, and others in our community, are working very hard to inform our citizens of the possibility of having the SBX housed in our harbor. It has been a very emotional issue for many of us and we are racing to even have a chance of being heard. This process was done unfairly and unjust! I request that this process of decision making start over, or better yet, just stop completely! Let's have some sense in the matter. This does not belong where my children play and we reside! PLEASE PUT THIS IN A NON RESIDENTIAL AREA! It is a horrible feeling to know that something of this size and capacity can go into your FRONT yard, and we do not have a choice! Could you imagine that happening to you and yours? Please, we must be able to trust our own government that they would not just drop this on us! Sincerely, Gloria Olson and Family	P-E-0290 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Tracy Hoffman To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Radar in Everett Date: Wed, 9 Apr 2003 14:47:21 0000 We are against installing the SBX radar in Everett, WA. While we don't live in Everett we do keep a boat in the Port of Everett. There must be a better location to place such a high power radar installation away from population. Tracy Hoffman Carol Grout Bothell, WA	P-E-0291 1	From: "Beckmeyer, Chris" To: "gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil" <gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil> Subject: SBX In Everett Date: Wed, 2 Apr 2003 20:23:54 0000 To Whom It May Concern This letter is to beg you drop Everett as a site for the SBX platform. We're a small community without much clout and struggling to maintain a toe hold in these tough economic times. We've already lost our timber industry and are losing more of more of our commercial airplane industry everyday. About all we have left to pursue is tourism and our beautiful waterfront is major part of that. Please realize that the SBX platform will destroy that as well. I understand the necessity of the SBX . Of the six potential sites, it seems to me that Adak or Pearl Harbor would suffer the fewest detrimental effects. Adak being remote and inaccessible to the public (one of my brothers was career Navy and stationed there for years), Pearl Harbor being a huge military installation already. Thank you very much for your consideration in extending the comment time. Regards Chris Beckmeyer Everett WA chris.beckmeyer	P-E-0292 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Cal_Bouma Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2003 11:09 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Proposed SBX platform in Everett, WA Dear Sir or Madam: I realize the open date for comments has closed but I was away on business and missed the deadline. I would still like to submit comments on the placement of this project in Everett. I am a steadfast supporter of our military. I am also a firm believer that technology is a necessary part of defense. However, as a local homeowner and involved citizen I am opposed to the placement of the SBX platform in Everett. The city and residents of Everett have worked diligently in an attempt to move past being an industrial center. In order to secure a sound future in these uncertain times, Everett has planned economic development to attract people and families who will make Everett a long term home. Placement of the SBX platform in Everett will harm our plan to attract long term residents to the residential appeal of Everett. Everett has many fine parks including the Jetty Island Bird Sanctuary. The 14th Street Boat Launch has become one of the busiest in the area for sport boaters. The up and coming waterfront with its Farmer's Market, Micro Brewery, Fish Market and Restaurants has attracted a growing number of visitors. Soon the Sounder Commuter Train will provide a link for attracting more residents who wish to live in Snohomish County but work in King County. Development of the waterfront and cleanup of industrial areas. All of these attractions will be negatively affected by the placement of SBX which will undoubtedly put a pall over local outdoor activities with its gargantuan size and brooding presence.	P-E-0293 1	The City and people of Everett have strongly supported our Navy base and are proud of the men and women stationed there. Personally, I have attended many functions on the Navy base and appreciate the work on both sides to make the relationship a good one. Yet I must say the placement of the Navy Base has come with its own cost to the citizens. The construction of the base itself was a large negative visual impact. The fear of being the "target" of a terrorist or other attack due to proximity to the base is one which rests in the mind of every parent residing here in Everett. But these negatives were accepted graciously by the community as part of the price we pay for freedom. This being said, we feel we have paid our price. To add the SBX to our local price is too much. We are a community struggling with our own economic viability and future. The SBX will hamper most of our plans and change the nature of our coexistence with the Navy. I speak for myself as well as many residents I have discussed this matter with when I ask you to locate the SBX elsewhere. Indian Island seems a much better fit when considering the size of our community here in Everett and the fact that development here will affect so many. Sincerely, Calvin Bouma	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Kim Buckhalter Sent: Wednesday, April 09, 2003 5:43 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Opposition The SBX emits Electromagnetic Radiation (EMR) and creates Electromagnetic Interference (EMI). The potential disturbance area from EMR/EMI extends from the center of the SBX 13.8 miles in all directions with a fully populated array. The EMI creates a radio frequency radiation area, aircraft navigation interference area, electronic communication interference area and electro explosive device interference areas. Safe operating areas and angles are not established at this time. Within the potential disturbance areas are 5 airports, 2 low altitude air routes, 2 hospitals, City Emergency Response Communication Systems and commercial communication systems (partial list). X band operates in a frequency range of 8 12 GHz and could potentially degrade the overall performance of other airborne systems such as fire control, weather radar, bomb/navigation in military aircraft that also operate in the X band. Issues of Noise, Socioeconomics, Water Resources, Cultural Resources, Land Use or Environmental Justice are not addressed in the DEIS. Health and Safety and Airspace impacts and mitigation rely on a Joint Spectrum Analysis Survey and completion of DoD Form 1494 which has not yet been conducted. As a resident of Island County I am in direct contact with the environmental impact created by this project. Therefore I strongly oppose it. Kim Buckhalter	P-E-0294 1 2	From: Dvores To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Basing Date: Mon, 7 Apr 2003 23:29:11 0000 Although this is not a voting process I would, never the less, cast my vote for Everett, WA as the new homeport for the SBX platform. The natural geographic advantages and the existing infrastructure make this decision a "slam dunk." No other areas under consideration provide the natural deep water and the existing pier "A" with a 55' minimum draft. Everett provides a military facility with the necessary security and an existing infrastructure for periodic repair and maintenance. Unless I am mistaken Everett is closely associated with the lead contractor for the project. Not only is Everett a logical choice and a common sense choice, it is also a cost effective choice. Eugene S. Dvornick Everett, WA	P-E-0295 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Joe Eichinger To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Everett, Washington Date: Mon, 7 Apr 2003 21:36:48 0000 Dear U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, This email is to voice my objection for the proposed placement of the SBX radar installation at the Port of Everett, Washington. My objections are based on the following: 1. There is no definitive study or body of evidence indicating that the proposed radiation levels over time will not create a health hazard. 2. The proposed structure will reduce property values in the nearby Everett neighborhoods. My recommendation is that you consider placing this structure in a less populated area. Thank you, Joseph E. Eichinger Everett, WA jeichinger	P-E-0296 1 2 3	From: "Bernie J.M.W. Fleming" To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Everett Wash. basing of SBX Date: Wed, 2 Apr 2003 20:48:16 0000 I am in favor of this project. For one thing, I appreciate any anti missile defense established here, especially in light of our new found vulnerability to North Korea. As far as the "view" goes, those people with "it" are a small minority of this area. I would find a feature such as the SBX interesting, especially as I grow older. I also feel any military item such as this would further utilize NAVSTA Everett, our newest and most ecologically correct military facility. Sincerely, Bernie JMW Fleming b.e.fleming	P-E-0297 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Larry/Rose Goulet To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: FW: SBX/Everett Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 02:45:36 0000 3 24 03 ATTN: SMDC EN V (Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliott) Please see the below message. I apologize for not sending to the correct address directly. Sincerely, Rose Goulet Everett Citizen Original Message From: External.Affairs Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 1:16 PM To: gouletlr Subject: RE: SBX/Everett Ms. Goulet Thank you for your email on the DEIS. However, comments on the EIS should be addressed to: U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command ATTN: SMDC EN V (Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliott) 106 Wynn Drive, Huntsville, AL 35805 by e mail at <mailto:gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil> gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil or by phone at 1 800 823 8823. Public comments are invited and must be postmarked by March 24, 2003. Thank you, MDA External Affairs	P-E-0298	Original Message From: gouletlr Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 2:59 PM To: External Affairs Subject: SBX/Everett 3 24 03 I object to SBX being sited in Everett. I have three points I would like to address. First, Everett has I believe been a good neighbor to the Navy. The way the MDA released the info re: siting in Everett, was not in good faith as a neighbor. Short notice, allowing little community input, not contacting city council. This approach does not promote good PR. Second, the EIS, Vol 2 of 2, Jan '03, section 4.8.8 "Visual Impact" concludes, "Therefore, significant impacts to visual and aesthetic resources are not anticipated due to the proposed action." This conclusion is reached after comparing the size of the SBX to The Abraham Lincoln. The height of The Lincoln is at an isolated portion of the ship, while the SBX height is for the entire platform. This conclusion leads me to believe the report is misleading and presents skewed information in other areas or in its entirety. Third, the April 5, public info input date that has recently been scheduled, does not allow for additional input time from the community. Two sessions on the same date does not allow for wide spread access or input. I believe, the placement of the SBX will have significant visual impact. I believe, the MDA is not acting with the best interest of the community support of the Everett Navy Base in siting the platform in our community. I also believe my input along with the rest of our community will make no difference whatsoever. I submit it none the less. Objecting to SBX in Everett, Rose Goulet	1 2 3

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Denis Hayner To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Cc: posada Subject: No SBX in Everett Date: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 15:54:02 0000 SBX is ugly. Please put it somewhere else. Denis Hayner Lynnwood, WA e mail: dhayner	P-E-0299 1	From: svn <res0pjea> To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: comment on SBX in Everett Date: Fri, 4 Apr 2003 00:06:06 0000 To Whom It May Concern, Well, I have no problem to have a "giant golf ball" in the Everett Navel Station. In fact, I think this will be a unique landscape for the city of Everett. Many cities may have their "the aircraft carrier" but there is not many cities to have a landscape with this one of kind structure. When tourists take a picture of downtown Seattle, the picture is not completed without the Space Needle. If SBX platform is based in Everett in the future, tourists taking pictures of downtown Everett is not the downtown Everett without the SBX platform. An odd looking structure is a great thing. Without SBX platform, downtown Everett is just another ordinary All American city. Sincerely, Andrew H. Resident of Everett	P-E-0300 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Kathy Hunter Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 10:08 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil We OPPOSE the Department of Defense proposal to use Naval Station Everett or Port Gardner Bay, Everett, WA., as a Primary Support Base for the SEA BASE TEST X BAND RADAR. As a homeowner over looking Port Gardner Bay, we OPPOSE this location for the SBX in Test Phase or as a permanent Primary Support Base. We feel our home value would decrease considerably with the visual and aesthetice degradation of our view if the SBX was based in Everett, WA. There are unstudied negative impacts of long term exposure to low level electromagnetic radiation on human health and safety, which is an enormous concern to our family. With owning a business in downtown Everett, the loss of future economic opportunities could be devastating if the SBX was located here. The re development impact for the City of Everett would be greatly affected too. PLEASE take Everett, Washington off your list for the location of the SEA BASED TEST X BAND RADAR. Thank you Jamie and Kathy Hunter Everett, WA.	P-E-0301 1 2 3 4	From: Christianne Loupelle To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: save midway atoll Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 14:18:51 0000 U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command ATTN: SMDC EN V (Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliot) Huntsville, AL U.S.A. e mail at gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Why we should preserve Midway in its current state as a wildlife refuge: 1. Fifteen species of seabirds (more than 2 million birds, including albatross, tropicbirds, boobies, shearwaters, petrels, frigatebirds, terns, noddies) nest on the atoll each year. 2. Midway is home to the largest colony of Laysan Albatross (Phoebastria immutabilis) in the world and the second largest Black footed Albatross (P. nigripes) colony. An endangered Short tailed Albatross (P. albatrus) recovery effort is also underway. 3. It is an important stopover for migrant shorebirds (curlews, plovers, turnstones). 4. The beaches, reef, and surrounding waters support endangered Hawaiian Monk Seals (Monachus schauinslandi), threatened Green Sea Turtles (Chelonia mydas), Hawaiian Spinner Dolphins (Stenella longirostris) and a vast array of rare lagoon, reef, and pelagic fishes. Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) highlights: A major goal of GMD ETR is to establish additional missile launch and support sites. Midway will serve as one such support site. As stated in the EIS, proposed activities GEURoecould have an effect on air quality, biological resources, and hazardous materials and waste at MidwayGEUR¥. The main impacts discussed are those of facilities construction. GEURoelIn Flight Interceptor Communication System Data TerminalsGEUR¥,commercial satellite communications, and mobile telemetry stations will be built at several sites on Sand Island (MidwayGEUR(tm)s main island). These will encompass areas of up to 2 hectares (5 acres) and will be fenced and lighted for security.	P-E-0302

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
They will be sited on areas of existing pavement, but some clearing/excavation may disturb nearby vegetation. An all weather road as well as plumbing/cables will be installed at these facilities. Hazardous waste may be generated from these activities and will be stored in GEURoetemporary storage tanksGEUR¥. A generator will power facilities and will create constant noise that may startle wildlife. Construction (via diesel powered equipment) may temporarily degrade local air quality. For those interested, the several hundred page document can be found at the Missile Defense AgencyGEUR(tm)s website: http://www.acq.osd.mil/bmdo/bmdolink/html/enviro.html http://www.acq.osd.mil/bmdo/bmdolink/html/enviro.html (Scroll down to links under GEURoeDraft Ground based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range Environmental Impact StatementGEUR¥). Some specific concerns that I will be addressing in my own personal letter: 1. MidwayGEUR(tm)s endemic flora and fauna, like many island ecosystems, suffer from decades of competition with aggressive invasive species. As mentioned in the EIS, over 200 plant species have been introduced to Midway since the arrival of residents in 1902. However, little discussion is provided as to how military personnel will minimize the potential for the spread of existing (and introduction of new) invasive species. What precautions will be taken and how will construction areas be restored following disturbance? Will native plants be planted, or will alien species be allowed to colonize these locations? 2. Light pollution (from security lights) is a serious threat to nocturnal birds like the Bonin Petrel (<i>Pterodroma hypoleuca</i>); petrels can become disoriented, colliding with buildings, etc. with lethal force. Not only should USFWS approved lights be used but efforts should be made to minimize lighting altogether. Similarly, fences, power lines, antennas, satellites, and other infrastructure may impede flight patterns and pose a hazard to seabirds, particularly albatross.	1	3. Increased use of motor vehicles for construction and transportation purposes may not only degrade air quality but may increase 1) casualties of na+"ve albatross chicks wandering the roadways and 2) general disturbance to nesting seabirds. 4. While construction activities and facilitiesGEUR(tm) locations may be confined to inshore areas away from hauling out locations of seals and turtles, the increased levels of human disturbance will undoubtedly impact other wildlife via noise pollution (e.g. from generator operation) and regular human presence. 5. The proposed activities increase the potential for an oil spill and/or hazardous waste contamination. The remote location of the atoll could make clean up very difficult and costly. Christianne Loupelle Graduate Student Department of Natural Resource Sciences McGill University From: Christianne Loupelle To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: save midway atoll Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 14:18:40 0000 U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command ATTN: SMDC EN V (Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliot) Huntsville, AL U.S.A. e mail at gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Why we should preserve Midway in its current state as a wildlife refuge: 1. Fifteen species of seabirds (more than 2 million birds, including albatross, tropicbirds, boobies, shearwaters, petrels, frigatebirds, terns, noddies) nest on the atoll each year. 2. Midway is home to the largest colony of Laysan Albatross (<i>Phoebastria immutabilis</i>) in the world and the second largest Black footed Albatross (<i>P. nigripes</i>) colony. An endangered Short tailed Albatross (<i>P. albatrus</i>) recovery effort is also underway.	3 4 5
	2		

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
3. It is an important stopover for migrant shorebirds (curlews, plovers, turnstones). 4. The beaches, reef, and surrounding waters support endangered Hawaiian Monk Seals (<i>Monachus schauinslandi</i>), threatened Green Sea Turtles (<i>Chelonia mydas</i>), Hawaiian Spinner Dolphins (<i>Stenella longirostris</i>) and a vast array of rare lagoon, reef, and pelagic fishes. Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) highlights: A major goal of GMD ETR is to establish additional missile launch and support sites. Midway will serve as one such support site. As stated in the EIS, proposed activities GEURoecould have an effect on air quality, biological resources, and hazardous materials and waste at MidwayGEUR¥. The main impacts discussed are those of facilities construction. GEURoelIn Flight Interceptor Communication System Data TerminalsGEUR¥, commercial satellite communications, and mobile telemetry stations will be built at several sites on Sand Island (MidwayGEUR(tm)s main island). These will encompass areas of up to 2 hectares (5 acres) and will be fenced and lighted for security. They will be sited on areas of existing pavement, but some clearing/excavation may disturb nearby vegetation. An all weather road as well as plumbing/cables will be installed at these facilities. Hazardous waste may be generated from these activities and will be stored in GEURoetemporary storage tanksGEUR¥. A generator will powerfacilities and will create constant noise that may startle wildlife. Construction (via diesel powered equipment) may temporarily degrade local air quality. For those interested, the several hundred page document can be found at the Missile Defense AgencyGEUR(tm)s website: http://www.acq.osd.mil/bmdo/bmdolink/html/enviro.html <http://www.acq.osd.mil/bmdo/bmdolink/html/enviro.html> (Scroll down to links under GEURoedraft Ground based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range Environmental Impact StatementGEUR¥).		Some specific concerns that I will be addressing in my own personal letter: 1. MidwayGEUR(tm)s endemic flora and fauna, like many island ecosystems, suffer from decades of competition with aggressive invasive species. As mentioned in the EIS, over 200 plant species have been introduced to Midway since the arrival of residents in 1902. However, little discussion is provided as to how military personnel will minimize the potential for the spread of existing (and introduction of new) invasive species. What precautions will be taken and how will construction areas be restored following disturbance? Will native plants be planted, or will alien species be allowed to colonize these locations? 2. Light pollution (from security lights) is a serious threat to nocturnal birds like the Bonin Petrel (<i>Pterodroma hypoleuca</i>); petrels can become disoriented, colliding with buildings, etc. with lethal force. Not only should USFWS approved lights be used but efforts should be made to minimize lighting altogether. Similarly, fences, power lines, antennas, satellites, and other infrastructure may impede flight patterns and pose a hazard to seabirds, particularly albatross. 3. Increased use of motor vehicles for construction and transportation purposes may not only degrade air quality but may increase 1) casualties of na+"ve albatross chicks wandering the roadways and 2) general disturbance to nesting seabirds. 4. While construction activities and facilitiesGEUR(tm) locations may be confined to inshore areas away from hauling out locations of seals and turtles, the increased levels of human disturbance will undoubtedly impact other wildlife via noise pollution (e.g. from generator operation) and regular human presence. 5. The proposed activities increase the potential for an oil spill and/or hazardous waste contamination. The remote location of the atoll could make clean up very difficult and costly.	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Mike Mashock To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX siting Date: Wed, 2 Apr 2003 16:46:14 0000 As much as I appreciate the efforts of the military to protect us, I feel the proposed location of the SBX is terribly wrong. 1. The SBX is huge, it is ugly and it is not wanted on the Everett waterfront. We have long labored to remove some of the large structures to improve our skyline. The addition of the SBX would be a step in the wrong direction it is HUGE and UGLY. It needs to be moved outside of Whidbey island where there is a greater expanse of water to 'conceal' it. And less people to view it daily. How about in the Strait of Juan De Fuca? 2. The SBX is a navigation hazard. There is a tremendous amount of sail and motor craft in Port Gardner Bay. The presence of the SBX in the fog will be a navigation hazard. There is too much risk of danger to the citizens in siting the SBX in Port Gardner Bay. 3. Radio interference? Will the systems in the SBX cause interference in our civilian radio and TV reception? In the past I have lived near the Marine Base in Kaneohe, Hawaii. The loud periodic buzz from the radar, on the radio, is still present on some of the audio tapes I made there. This MBX needs to be located further from the large Everett population center. 4. The Navy Base! We already have a large number of huge grey ships in the harbor. We are doing out share to support the Navy and to defend our country. The MBX needs to be moved to another area, I suggest either outside Whidbey Island or North of Everett to be located between Camano and Whidbey Island or in the Strait. Please do not locate (inflict) all of the 'hardware' on one community!	P-E-0303 1 2 3 4	The feelings I am sharing with you are supported by many people in our area. Not all of us have the time or energy to contact you about this issue. Please do not site the SBX in our community. Respectfully, Mike Mashock mjmarsh	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: "McCoy, Rep. John" To: "'gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil'" <gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil>, Subject: RE: SBX X Band Radar Date: Tue, 8 Apr 2003 18:18:04 0000 Dear Sirs, I attended the public forum last Saturday in Everett, WA and was disappointed in the process that was followed. Based on the public hearing comments I recommend that you extend public comments to the EIS. I personally did not become aware of this project until approximately three weeks ago at a town hall meeting. If proper notification was accomplished I would have been notified of the Seattle scoping meetings. Without proper notification due process for the citizens of the 38th Legislative District was not accomplished. With all due respect I request an extension of the public comment period. John R. McCoy WA State Representative 38th Legislative District	P-E-0304 1	From: Patty To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Missile System Date: Tue, 8 Apr 2003 23:31:06 0000 I oppose proposal to locate the SBX Missile System in Everett Washington or any other populated area. The known hazzards are great and there exists many unacknowledged ones. Patricia Johansen Mitchell Marysville, WA	P-E-0305 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Bob and Loretta Mumford Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2003 10:03 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Alaskan missile defense plan Dear Ms. Elliott, I wanted to go on record in support of the Alaskan Missile Defense plan. I have lived in Alaska for 27 years, having moved here as an Airman in the U.S. Air Force assigned to Elmendorf A.F.B. I support any program that would be able to successfully challenge a missile attack, be it either conventional or nuclear, against our nation. In this age of unrest and rouge leadership in other countries I don't see how anyone could oppose a system designed to intercept these threats. If it is best to base these systems in Alaska to protect Alaska and the West Coast then please do it. Whatever "environmental impact" the systems may come with, it is less than what impact a nuclear missile would have on our environment! Thank you for your time. Bob Mumford Anchorage Alaska	P-E-0306 1	From: Michelle Wilson Nordhoff Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2003 3:27 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Draft EIS public comment I'd like to register my NON support for missiles and NMD in Alaska. I would like to know answers to the following 5 questions. 1. Why are there no hearings in Delta Junction and Fairbanks for the Extended Test Range? 2. How are missiles going to be transported from Ft. Greely to Kodiak? 3. Are launches from Kodiak going to affect commercial and subsistence fishing? 4. Is the military going to hold hearings in the villages of Old Harbor and Akhiok, which may be endangered by missile trajectories? 5. Is the US Military going to exempt itself from existing laws like the Endangered Species Act. Thank you. Another Alaskan for Peace without War, Michelle Wilson Nordhoff Anchorage, AK	P-E-0307 1 2 3 4 5

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Mike c papa Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2003 12:17 AM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Comments - GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE EXTENDED TEST RANGE DRAFT EIS I am a resident of the City of Everett, Washington, and did not have the opportunity to attend the public meeting held here on the subject of the SBX platform, but wished to comment on it. Hence this email for the record. My concerns are threefold; visual impacts, the effects on recreational boaters and the impact of the type of radiation this facility will generate. 1) I do not believe the statement that "because this type of activity consistently goes on at Naval Station Everett, there are no visual impacts". When the navy proposes to moor something much taller than a aircraft carrier and almost as long, this is an impact. When Dunlop Towing had their huge crane here for years before it was removed, it was an eyesore. So will the SBX platform. What does the Navy propose to do about this? If this should reduce property values of view properties, will the Navy compensate property owners? 2) I am a recreational boater also am concerned about putting even more of the public waterways off limits when this thing is moored out in Port Gardner Bay. What is the width of the security zone? Will it in fact be moored out in the bay at any time, or only be moored at the naval dock or moved out into the ocean when being used?	P-E-0308 1 2	3) I am also concerned about the health effects of electromagnetic radiation. While docked will this facility be used? What is the effect of the type of radiation this platform emits? I would appreciate answers to these questions. Until then I would prefer you locate this facility somewhere else, preferable a less populated location. According to the newspapers another nearby location would be Indian Island, which in my mind would be better. The Navy owns the whole island so it doesn't matter so much whether it is a visual eyesore or not. Another reason to put it somewhere else is for the benefit of the sailors who would serve on it. The Seattle/Tacoma/Everett area has relatively high housing costs compared to other less populated or desirable areas. I know sailors are not paid princely salaries, and it would be more difficult for them to afford housing in our area than say, Bremerton or the Indian Island area. Thank you for taking my comments and I will await (I hope) a timely reply. Again, at this time I would stress I wish you would take this proposed facility somewhere else. The Naval base as it is here is quite enough, thank you. Sincerely, Michael Papa Everett, WA	3

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Lynn Murray Willeford To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Tue, 8 Apr 2003 19:36:17 0000 My family and I have lived and run businesses for thirty years on South Whidbey Island, which I now learn is diirectly in the line of your proposed BBX system to be based at the Navy's Everett Home Port. There was no notification here of this proposal, and as people on South Whidbey are starting to hear about this draft EIS we are very concerned that #1 we were not considered in the EIS, #2 we do not know the effects of the radar on our health, and #3 we do not know what effect this system will have on our personal and business telecommunications. Can you send me a copy of the draft by mail or e mail, please? My addresses are below. Thank you. Lynn Willeford Langley WA	P-E-0309 1	From: caringwoman Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 6:27 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Re: deis of the gmd Quoting caringwoman@ecomail.org: > I am writing to share my strong opposition to the extension of the GMD. I also > am writing for several groups that wanted me to include their voices with > mine. We all agree that we don't want the impact that this project will have > > here in Hawaii. It is too close to our airport, our people, and our birds & > > other winged wildlife. We are educators, farmers, students,cooks, parents, > and students. We are overwhelmed facing the over 700 toxic areas at Pearl > Harbor; the history of no ongoing clean up at most military posts; & the time > consuming tortures of trying to get a huge ever changing visitor > administration to learn and practise aloha aina. What we were told at the > hearing in March made it clear that there is not enough data to show that > birds will not be harmed long term. I think I have shared enough for the > point > to be made. Please do all that you can to make things right; we need your > help! Malama Pono, M. Doherty, Chisa Dodge, Mona Kim, Ujenna & > Marguerite Johnson, Gary Forth & family. >	P-E-0310 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Timothy Reisenauer To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Protest SBX placement in Everett WA Date: Fri, 4 Apr 2003 05:54:15 0000 Ms. Julia Elliott SMDC EN V U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command P.O. Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807 3801 Dear Ms. Elliott: I am writing to urge you to communicate to the DOD that its plans to possibly station the SBX radar platform here in Everett Washington should be abandoned. Everett citizens do not want this platform in our city. Placing the SBX here is bad for a number of reasons. It * Degrades our property values significantly. The Draft EIS not only fails to address this issue but wrongly states that no mitigations will likely be necessary. Even if we put honest disagreement between bio medical researchers aside, the evidence is clear that the presence of EMR radiating structures near or on a residential property significantly negatively impacts a property's value. Such emissions (for example when transmitted by high intensity electrical lines) undeniably decreases the available pool of buyers willing to purchase the property and expose themselves or their children to the potential health risks posed by prolonged exposure to intense EMR. A decreased pool of buyers leads to a decreased demand for the property, which leads to lower property values and also lower tax revenues.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0311 1	I want to clearly state that legal action which seeks significant compensation to mitigate the damages caused by this platform to our property values will be initiated when the values of our residences are negatively affected by the placement of this platform near our homes. Do you also intend to compensate most or all homeowners in the 13.8 mile potential disturbance radius? This is a major urban center with thousands of homes in that radius. * It also erodes the value of our property by decreasing the premium value placed on non industrialized waterfront views. The costs of mitigation to the DOD will be significant since it will be necessary to compensate most or all the home owners in our areas. This will add millions of dollars to the costs of this project. * The DOD has also failed to discuss the mitigation and compensation that will be required to reimburse the City of Everett and the Everett Port Authority. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement fails to address how the platform degrades the city's efforts to attract non industrial and non resourced based economic development to the waterfront and down town city core. This platform significantly destroys the visual beauty of the waterfront and negatively impacts city and port property values in the following ways: * It destroys the port authority's significant financial investment in revitalizing the 12th street canal and north marina waterfront development project. (What buyer will pay a half million dollars for a shore line condo that looks out on this monstrosity? Who will pay the premium fees required to permanently moor their yachts in the new marina when their berth looks out on this?) Legally the DOD will most certainly face legal challenges that require it to significantly compensate the city and port authority for the losses it causes in the planned waterfront development effort. * It degrades the city's efforts to attract new downtown residents from a broader demographic class as opposed to military and industrial personnel. This initiative is counter to the city's efforts to position itself as an attractive urban residence for people working in the fields of tourism, clean technology, film making, and other service sectors.	COMMENT NUMBER 2 3
---	--	--	---

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
* The DEIS utterly fails to account for the potential risks to our marine and shoreline habitat. (What happens if even a fraction of the tens of thousands of gallons of diesel fuel needed to move the platform spills into our bay?)	4	The SBX is bad for Everett residents in many ways but most certainly it is bad financially for our property values. Clear the DOD will be expected to provide significant compensation to mitigate the loss of value to these homes. There are apx. thirty thousand residential properties that are affected by the 13.8 mile distortion radius. Does the DOD truly wish to provide compensation for this many property owners? This platform is best placed far out to sea, away from densely settled urban areas. I strongly urge you to not place it in our community and consider instead the Marshall Islands site.	
* This project risks potential environmental impacts requiring compensations of unknown magnitude in the medical and aerospace arenas as well. How will the cardiac telemetry unit at the hospital, which also operates on similar technology, be effected? How will the 13 mile no fly zone around the platform created by electromagnetic disturbances effect air traffic both from hospital airlift trauma operations and Boeing air field. The DOD will most certainly be legally challenged to compensate and mitigate Boeing and our hospital.	5	Sincerely, Dr. Timothy M. Reisenauer Everett, WA	
Personally I can attest that the DOD has a poor record of adequately addressing the impact it's technology has on our area. One small example is my automatic garage door opener at my home on Grand Ave. EMR disturbances generated by ship based radar continues to affect my automatic garage door opener. My bay door does not open at times when ship based radar is operational. At other times it opens and closes completely on its own. While admitting that ship based EMR was the cause, the Navy repeatedly asserts that it has "fixed the problem" caused by these signals. Four years have passed and the problem remains an issue for my home and the homes of my neighbors. This is only one small example of the DOD's disregard for the environmental impact that high levels of electromagnetic radiation has on our community. Unfortunately it appears to be a pattern the DOD wishes to continue.			

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Brent Sampson Cc: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Article Date: Sun, 6 Apr 2003 19:17:26 0000 Scott, I read with interest your article in this mornings paper (as well as the Herald's editorial) regarding the placement of the SBX "complex". Although I rarely get involved in matters such as this, it has been perhaps the September 11 incident that has kicked that attitude to a different level. While I feel nobody likes to have something like this "in their backyard", I think due to the way the world is regarding the war and terrorist attacks, the days of being able to look out of a picture window in Everett and see nothing but the sound and the olympic mountains, is a thing of the past! I agree that more study needs to go into the environmental effects of such a complex, but the bottom line is the world has changed and we cannot afford to be as "selective" as we were in the past, over structures like this that are designed to protect us. We need to all get over that! Yes, maybe it WOULD be better in someone elses yard, but it is the attitude that some people still have that something like this is unnecessary. THAT's life as it is in the 21st century and we all should get use to it! I would venture to guess that this will probably just be the tip of the iceberg in terms of other defensive structures and mechanisms we may find necessary to build...maybe now, after all these years, Ronald Reagan's view of "Star Wars" isn't as crazy as it was once thought to be! At least THOSE structures were designed to orbit in space! If we find ourselves thinking once we have tamed Iraq and Saddam Hussein's regime that life will go back to "normal", we all had better think again. Let us not forget all the recent threats North Korea has been "lobbing" over the Pacific. Their government is crazy enough to maybe make good on their threats someday! While that may sound outlandish, who would have EVER guessed two years ago "crazies" would fly passenger jets into the world trade center??? I am afraid the North Koreans have the ability and the tools to make what the Iraqi's do and have, look like an elementary school project!	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0312 1	From: Eileen Simmons To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 02:21:24 0000 I am strongly opposed to having the SBX stationed at the Everett Navy Base. Its sheer size makes it unacceptable. While the water depth may be appealing to those making the decision, Port Gardner Bay itself is a rather small geographic area. A structure such as the SBX would totally dominate the waterfront, and undoubtedly negatively affect any sort of positive waterfront development. In the last century, our waterfront was blighted by sawmills. Please don't locate another blight on our landscape. I am also disturbed that we are building this, and investing untold amounts of money to do so without continuing testing. Eileen Simmons Everett, WA	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0313 1
---	--	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: Phil Sturholm To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Sea Based Test x band radar SBX Date: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 18:16:28 0000 As a resident of Everett I would support stationing the SBX at Everett as long as the radar will not affect the health of any humans or wildlife. Sincerely, Phil Sturholm Everett, Wa.	P-E-0314 1	From: MICHE2531 To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Comment Sheets Needed Date: Thu, 27 Mar 2003 02:10:28 0000 Dear Ms. Julia Elliott, There are many people in Everett, WA. and Snohomish County interested in making comments on the proposed homeporting of the SBX Test X Band Missile Radar. We understand that the Comment Period will be extended to April 24th to provide a public forum in our area. I request that a large quantity (500) of the three part Comment Sheets be sent so that they may be given to these interested parties. I am also aware of the possibility of making comments by phone or e mail and will make this information available to people as well. Please respond to confirm that it is possible to receive more Comment Sheets. I would be happy to provide my shipping address. I thank you for your help in this matter. I am also interested in understanding more about the SBX radar myself and request answers to several questions that I could not find in the text of the DEIS. They are as follows: 1. What is the peak transmitter power of the SBX? 2. What is the average transmitter power of the SBX? 3. Is the transmitter enabled for 5 6 hours per week or ON 5 6 hours per week? 4. What the dimensions / lengths of the antennas? 5. What is the effective area of array in the radome? 6. What is the total amount of RF output? 7. What method of verification will be used to monitor RF levels? 8. Has the DoD prepared plot maps of radiation densities at different power levels for the SBX (MWperCM2), and why are they not included in the DEIS? Thank you for assisting me in finding the answers to these questions. I look forward to you reply. Michelle Trautman Everett, WA.	P-E-0315 1 2

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Grandview1218 To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: (no subject) Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 03:46:25 0000 I oppose the Dept. of Defense proposal to locate the SBX at Naval Station Everett. There are more suitable locations other than in a populated area like Everett. Please consider the other sites you have on the list.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0316 1	From: sourdoughsolar To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Attn: SMDC EN V re: GMD ETR DEIS Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 07:47:53 0000 Attn: SMDC EN V Mrs. Julia Hudson Elliott Comments on the GMD ETR DEIS As you have done for the other data in the DEIS, we ask you to refer to our previous comments on all Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation development at the Kodiak Launch Complex including the initial FAA permit. This long and exhaustive process needs to take into account all our thoughtful and researched comments from all the past comment periods. My first question: are we now seeing your final intentions for the KLC? If not, then we cannot comment adequately on your DEIS. In the past, from the initial onset of the AADC project we knew that the KLC would be strictly military as it has become. We are opposed to the military development of this site, and any rocket/missiles being sent into the sky from Narrow Cape for commercial or military purposes. The State lease to AADC is clear that public access will be maintained at Narrow Cape. With heightened security, liquid fuels, and the very real and imminent threat of earthquakes on the Narrow Cape fault with your present and future buildings built inadequately and improperly for earthquake resistance, you cannot keep the promise made to the Kodiak public. This is unacceptable, and has no benefit to the public. In fact, public use of the area will only put the public in harms way. The proposed barge unloading at Pashagshak beach, Bearpaw ranch, and the beaches near Burton's ranch all have their problems. To develop Pashagshak beach would expand the KLC development beyond the current lease area and violate the Kodiak Island Borough's Coastal Zone management plan for the area that was carefully drafted	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0317 1 2
--	--	--	---

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
forage fish communities that are known to spawn on those beaches. These fish are primary and important forage for the Endangered Stellar's sea lion and whales such as Humpbacks. Bear paw ranch is a prime feeding location for both Resident and migrating gray whales; they would be displaced with this disturbance. All beaches are used by the public for recreation. Tourists come from far and wide to catch Sockeye, Steelhead, Kings, Silver and Pink salmon at the mouth of the Pashagshak river. This is an important revenue source for the Kodiak Island Borough. Do you have the appropriate and required DNR permits? With 10 15 launches a year, the levels of Aluminum oxide and Hydrogen chloride will exceed acceptable levels. Washed into the marine environment, they will pose a threat to the gray whales that feed for extensive periods of time in this area. It is an important layover zone for the gray whales on their exhaustive migration to and from the Bering Sea. With diminished resources in the Bering Sea they require these special fueling locations along the migration route. The Narrow Cape area is perhaps the most important. ENRI's past data is incomplete with respects to Aluminum oxide levels in the fresh water streams and marine environment. The TPS X band Radar and the Sea Band Radar systems will expose the public to electromagnetic radiation. Projected at a 5 degree angle from the horizon, the public in the Narrow Cape area will definitely be affected. What are these effects? Will people in town be affected as well? On slippery and unmaintained paved roads, how will you transport the liquid fuels and other propellants safely without disrupting school buses and other essential services along that highway?	3	Your southwest trajectory puts the people in Old Harbor and Akhiok as well as the scattered lodges and cabins all along the East side of Kodiak Island in danger of falling debris. This would be unavoidable in the likelihood of a launch failure. There is no way you can protect everyone in the rockets path, but you must. In addition, you must protect every single Steller sea lion because they are endangered! There are many rookeries and haulouts on the East side in addition to the Ugak haulout. Without the FAA license, you must choose the No Action Alternative. The FAA should not give AADC this license for the KLC because the public's health and safety and the safety of the public's property will not be protected using the KLC for the GMD ETR for the reasons that we have given above. These include the hazards posed by earthquakes on a very active and shallow fault, the transport of liquid fuels and propellants, and the hazards of falling debris. Thank you. Sincerely, Susan Payne Kodiak, AK Don Dumm Kodiak, AK Letter emailed March 24, 2003 10:45pm Kodiak time.	
	4		
	5		

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
March 24, 2003 Dear Ms. Elliot, I would like to add to the many letters that you have received from the citizens and representatives of Everett, Washington and express my opposition to locating the SBX missile defense system in our port. I cannot think of one benefit that would come as a result of locating the SBX here. I can, however, think of many negative effects. It is unfortunate that the military presenters that were sent to answer questions about the SBX were unable to provide much information in a forum that was poorly attended due to lack of publicity about the hearing and the proposal. Further, it is unfortunate that the Draft EIS had so little concrete information in its many pages. On the other hand, it is clear that there are multiple areas of concern to Snohomish County residents because with a microwave radiation radius of 15 miles and potential air pollution, the effects will be felt by many beyond the boundaries of Everett. The DEIS did not consider the concerns of the local and regional population as part of its review. I will list a number of concerns and questions that must be addressed. 1. Negative impacts on economic development around Port Gardner Bay: The city has promoted local development with the saying, "Great thinking with a view." The SBX structure impacts the view negatively and would be harmful to local promotion including condominium construction downtown and marina development. Property values could be negatively impacted. From the angle of my property, much of the view would be filled with the SBX. What is the impact on local economics? 2. Negative impacts on water traffic: The taxpayer money used by the Port might be compromised if additional access is denied. Already the Navy Pier restricts the use of the water lanes. What effects would there be on the uses of the Port or the marina? 3. Microwave radiation: what is the effect of the exposure to radiation on people and natural systems? 4. Electronic interference: I understand that there are many	P-E-0318 1 2 3 4	unanswered questions about the impact on local emergency response systems, local hospitals, local electronic interception, and effect on pacemakers. What would be the effect on the Navy base? 5. Truck travel on already burdened roads: There has been little discussion of this impact on travel through Everett. 6. Diesel needs and fuel spill possibilities: The 818,000 gallons of fuel on board the SBX must be considered as a risk to the Port, the residents, and the biological resources of the area. 7. Air pollution: What are the effects on air quality while burning 14,000 gallons of diesel daily when the wind will carry the pollutants across the area that already experiences air inversions that trap air west of the Cascade Mountains? 8. What is the effect of the SBX on Paine Field and the airspace around other airfields in the county? Thank you for addressing these concerns. Doris and Clair Olivers	5 6 7 8

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
March 24, 2003	P-E-0319	cultural impacts of the overall military presence in Hawai'i. --The DEIS fails to address the status and title of the affected land and sea areas in light of the U.S. Public Law 103-150, an admission to the illegal U.S. invasion of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893.	7
U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command ATTN: SMDC-EN-V (Mrs. Julia Hudson-Elliott), 106 Wynn Drive, Huntsville, AL 35805 gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil		--The proposed activities are impossible to decipher. The projects are inadequately described. It is impossible to assess the impacts based on the information in the DEIS. The multitude of combinations of proposed actions at a variety of possible sites is unacceptable.	8
To Whom It May Concern:		--There is not a cultural consultation with the Native Hawaiian community, nor is there an adequate assessment of the impact to Native Hawaiian cultural access, rights, cultural practices.	9
I am writing to request that the Missile Defense Agency start over with the public notification, information and extended public comment process. The public must have a clear explanation of the DOD's intentions in Hawai'i. Outreach, notification and public information about this proposal has been wholly inadequate and unacceptable. No copies of the Draft EIS were made available on the Island of Kaua'i, where missile launches are proposed to take place, nor were there any hearings held on Kaua'i. No hearings were held in the Republic of the Marshall Islands.	1	--There is an inadequate assessment of monk seal habitat on Kaua'i and in the NWHI.	10
		--Turtles migrate between the lower Main Hawaiian Islands and the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. There is no proposed mitigation for preventing interaction with our threatened and endangered turtles.	11
The comment period should be extended by at least 45 days, to begin after these meetings are held, to accommodate the public interest and concern that expanded military activity would have on our environment on Native Hawaiian rights and on our economy.	2	--How does this impact seabird habitat, nesting, migration, flight patterns, feeding?	12
--Copies of the DEIS must be made available in all public libraries on Kaua'i and distributed to libraries and to interested parties in the Marshall Islands.	3	-- How does this impact other native species, wildlife, and threatened and endangered species?	13
--Public hearings must be held on Kaua'i and in the RMI, and all persons who commented on previous missile defense environmental documents should be notified about public informational meetings and given notice of the Draft EIS process.	4	Some of the serious deficiencies in the draft include: --Inadequate information on hazard areas for Ground-based Inceptor and target missiles	14
	5	--Inadequate analysis of cumulative impacts of all missile tests	15
--The DEIS fails to address environmental justice concerns related to Hawai'i, especially disparate impacts on Native Hawaiian human and political sovereignty rights, cultural practices and cultural use of affected areas and resources.		--No details about locations of tests of the Sea-based X Band Radar in the Gulf of Mexico and in transit to the Pacific Ocean	16
--The DEIS fails to address cumulative environmental, social and	6	--Incomplete safety analyses of Sea-based X Band Radar operation near Honolulu International Airport	17
		--No mention of treaty restrictions on air-launched and sea-launched targets	18
		--Inadequate analysis of hazards to aircraft from debris from collisions between targets and interceptors	19
		Sincerely,	
		Cha Smith Executive Director	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0320 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Katherine Lynch of Everett, Washington.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0320	The text of comment P-E-0328 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Patricia Neel of Everett, Washington.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0328
The text of comment P-E-0321 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Patricia Neel of Everett, Washington.	P-E-0321	The text of comment P-E-0329 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Kimberli McCabe of Everett, Washington.	P-E-0329
The text of comment P-E-0322 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Larry Fox of Freeland, Washington.	P-E-0322	The text of comment P-E-0330 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Philip Notermann of Seattle, Washington.	P-E-0330
The text of comment P-E-0323 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Mary Lee Griswold.	P-E-0323	The text of comment P-E-0331 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Bill Mulliken of Everett, Washington.	P-E-0331
The text of comment P-E-0324 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Anne Hartley of Langley, Washington.	P-E-0324	The text of comment P-E-0332 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Norma Jean Young of Clinton, Washington.	P-E-0332
The text of comment P-E-0325 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Betty Taylor of Camano Island, Washington.	P-E-0325	The text of comment P-E-0333 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Frederick Olson of Langley, Washington.	P-E-0333
The text of comment P-E-0326 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Patricia Neel of Everett, Washington.	P-E-0326	The text of comment P-E-0334 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Laurie Keith of Langley, Washington.	P-E-0334
The text of comment P-E-0327 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Toni-Marthaller-Andersen of Freeland, Washington.	P-E-0327	The text of comment P-E-0335 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Sally Goodwin of Clinton, Washington.	P-E-0335

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

The text of comment P-E-0336 was the same as that of P-E-0289. This comment was submitted by Robert Kenny of Clinton, Washington

**COMMENT
NUMBER**

P-E-0336

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**COMMENT
NUMBER**

From: Christina Studio Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2003 10:57 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Star Wars Radar Missile Defense system Ms Julia Elliott US Army Space and Missile Defense Command P O Box 1500 Huntsville, AL 35807 3801 Dear Ms Elliot, I am writing to communicate my aversion to the SBX system the military wants to install next. How many billions do we have to spend to defend ourselves against incoming missiles (that don't exist) will at the same time exposing the complete biodiversity of the Puget sound untested electro magnetic waves. I resent being a guinea pig for the military as it plans to continually spiral to ever huger heights global hegemony, while wasting taxpayer dollars on ridiculously ugly behemoths such as the SBX system. Shame on the military for imagining such a monstrosity. Fred Geisler Langley, Wa	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0337 1	From: elisa miller Sent: Wednesday, April 09, 2003 6:53 PM To: gmdetreis@smdc.arm.mil Subject: Putting a SBX offshore of Everett Washington I am a US citizen presently living on Whidbey Island. I am alarmed at the proposal to place an SBX radar station in the waters between Everett, Washington and Whidbey Island. We do not have full information about the health consequences of this unit and I do not wish to be victimized. The need and the utility of the station (and the larger defense program of which it is a part) has yet to be fully debated and fully aired. I will attend every meeting that I can and join my fellow citizens and neighbors to call for further information from you about this possible installation which appears to me to be dangerous, unnecessary and harmful. Elisa Miller, Clinton, Washington	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0338 1
---	--	--	--

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Dale Temple To: "gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil" <gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil> Subject: SBX Feedback Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 19:16:51 0000 Importance: high X Priority: 1 X Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) To Whom it May Concern: We are writing to express our opposition to having the SBX radar system home ported in Everett, WA. While we are ardent supporters of the navy base there are just too many unanswered questions about the affects of this to our health, environment and our community's economic development. I also do not believe that the notification to the people of the region was either proper nor adequate. I question the appropriateness of even having this system in this region. It seems that Hawaii would be the best choice, followed by Midway, then Alaska. Dale & Laura Temple Everett, WA 98201	<table><tr><th>COMMENT NUMBER</th></tr><tr><td>P-E-0339</td></tr><tr><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>1</td></tr></table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0339	1	2	1	From: Ward Hinds To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Cc: etuckm Subject: SBX in Everett, WA Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 18:58:45 0000 X Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) To Whom it May Concern: I must support the concerns that I am hearing in the medical community regarding the unknown full potential effects of electromagnetic radiation on human health from the proposed SBX radar platform. My understanding is that this radar system would be tested while in the Everett port, which would be for about 3 months of the year. I believe it is important to have extensive safety data related to human health at the long term radiation levels that would occur for residents living closest to the SBX before any decision is made to locate the SBX in Everett. Such data should take into account the potential health effects on more sensitive segments of the population and those who may be exposed to other EM radiation who would potentially suffer an additive effect on their health. Such information should be made widely available in the community, with opportunity for public discussion and input before any decision is made. Sincerely, M. Ward Hinds, MD, MPH Health Officer Snohomish Health District Everett, WA 98201	<table><tr><th>COMMENT NUMBER</th></tr><tr><td>P-E-0340</td></tr><tr><td>1</td></tr></table>	COMMENT NUMBER	P-E-0340	1
COMMENT NUMBER											
P-E-0339											
1											
2											
1											
COMMENT NUMBER											
P-E-0340											
1											

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Erich Franz To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX in Everett? Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 18:39:18 0000 X Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) To Whom It May Concern, I reserved a hi end condo in the new marina scheduled to be built in the next few years. If this monstrosity is sited in Port Gardner Bay to ruin the view, I am going to invest and live elsewhere. Erich Franz Everett, WA 98204 P.S. I thought Star Wars was outdated technology because most of the tests I've read about have failed over the past 20 years. The SBX is an insult to humanity, although I guess it provided a few jobs, and it will hold Everett hostage just when the city is starting to be economically revitalized with meaningful projects.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0341 1	From: To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Cc: bicc Subject: SBX Not in Everett, WA Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 18:15:27 0000 X Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) To Whom It May Concern I gave testimony against the SBX in Everett, WA at the second public session in the PUD building on April 5, 2003. About this project: I have a plethora of health concerns; as a taxpayer, I have concerns about the cost of the project; and I have concerns regarding the democratic process. And aesthetics...well, no one can challenge the extreme visual blight of the monster. There was not adequate news coverage (newspaper, radio) concerning the public information meetings. At the very least, the entire process of informing the public must begin again. No preliminary EIS statement was available for me to peruse and educate myself. This is not DEMOCRACY! Air quality, water quality of Puget Sound (remember our endangered species of salmon, orca, gray whales), human health, migrating bird populations, and my grandson (who lives within the 13.8 mile radius of the SBXs transmission of electromagnetic radiation) will be adversely affected. A resounding NO to the Army's plans: Everett, WA already has a Navy base. Everett, WA has finally seen some progress of changing its image from a polluting industrial waterfront. Everett, WA is a highly populated area. NO. People Power exists in Everett YES. If plans for the SBX continue, and if the SBX becomes a reality (wherever it is stationed) the negative repercussions are far worse than what the military thinks it is protecting us from. Do not waste our money. Ask the people if we want protection in the form of this atrocity. Melinda Gladstone permanent mailing address: Snohomish, WA	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0342 1 2
---	--	---	---

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
From: suzanne fageol To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Concerned Citizen Against the SBX Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 17:46:18 0000 X Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) To Whom It May Concern, I am a citizen living on Whidbey Island. I do not want the proposed SBX pointed at me or any other citizen of Island County or Snohomish County. You need to hold more hearings on your proposed testing and you need to test it in a less densely populated area actually, I am against your using such a devise at all. Please stop and hold further hearing with regard to the use of this system. Sincerely, Rev. Suzanne A. Fageol Langley, WA. Whidbey Island	P-E-0343 1	From: Dan Warnock To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 17:41:13 0000 X Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) SMDC EN V, Ms. Julia Elliott US Army Space Missile Defense Command PO Box 1500 Huntsville, AL. 35807 3801 Dear Ms. Elliott, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to give of my opinion of the SBX system. I believe the SBX is potentially an important device for the safety of our country. We have had a good relationship thus far with the navy base with its past and present Commanders. We have both benefited by working together in our community. It is important that those benefits are not lost. Its was quite clear at the community meeting in the city of Everett, by the number of people that took the time to be present and the significant number of highly respected business, professionals, environmental, social and just plan solid individuals that give the same clear message, is not hear, not in Everett. As a former City Council member I respectfully ask you place the SBX in some other location other than Everett. The community and the Navy have built a good home here. This could and probably would, divide the support the Navy base currently has earned. You have already heard many opinions on the health safety and economic impacts the SBX could potentially have on our community. No one is 100 hundred percent clear that either side of the debate is correct. If that can be agreed upon, than please do not make Everett and grand experiment that potentially could negatively impact so many. Sincerely Dan Warnock Everett, WA 98203	P-E-0344 1

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

From: Eve Riley To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 17:37:57 0000 X Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) I am writing to oppose the proposal to place a sea based test x band radar (SBX) in Everett. My house is placed above the marina, and we appreciate the aesthetics of our beautiful port. We even enjoy the navy ships. This SBX will be extremely intrusive to the beauty of the port and the attraction to live and dine in this area...not to mention the chance of health risks and the unknown effects that it may have on the neighboring hospitals sensitive electronics. I understand the need for the SBX, but it should be tested more thoroughly before it is placed into such a populated area. If the SBX is placed in Everett, I am sure that the waterfront businesses and marinas will suffer, as well as the real estate in the area.	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0345 1	From: Susan Berta To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: Comments Re: SBX Radar Platform in Everett, WA Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 17:36:24 0000 X Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) Dear Dept. of Defense, I would like to submit the following comments to be included in your draft EIS for the proposed SBX Radar Platform to be located in Port Gardiner Bay, Everett, WA. 1. Publicity regarding the scoping meeting of this project and related information has not been done to an extent that the general public has been notified or informed about the project or given an opportunity to comment. Residents of neighboring Whidbey Island were especially in the dark about this proposal, and most of us found out about it after the public meeting in Everett took place. 2. The draft EIS therefore will be lacking vital information from a variety of interested and affected parties, as well as comments from the general public who may still be unaware of this proposal. 3. I would ask that you consider starting all over with the scoping process so that your draft EIS will accurately reflect the comments, suggestions, and objections of all communities that would be affected by this project. 4. During the scoping and EIS process for this project, please consider that this area is home to a number of marine mammals that are protected by the Marine Mammal Protection Act, including the Southern Resident Community of orcas which are currently being listed as "Depleted" by the NMFS, and are continuing assessment for a listing under the ESA. These orcas inhabit the waters around Everett and Whidbey Island 6-9 months each year, and this project would most certainly impact their travel, feeding opportunities, and navigational abilities. Port Gardiner Bay is already one of the most toxic areas in Puget Sound, affecting the entire food web of marine life. To add this project to an already threatened area, would lead to further destruction	COMMENT NUMBER P-E-0346 1 2
--	--	---	---

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

COMMENT NUMBER			COMMENT NUMBER	
	of habitat and degradation of the marine food web upon which we all depend.		To: gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil Subject: SBX placement in Everett	P-E-0347
	This area is also home to a resident population of Gray Whales, which remain and feed in the waters between Whidbey and Camano Islands and Port Susan and Possession Sound from March through May each year. Other marine mammals that would be impacted by this project include Harbor and Dall's Porpoise.		April 14, 2003	
	I speak for the whales because they cannot speak for themselves, and because they are dying because of unrelenting human impacts upon their habitat and food sources. I also believe this project would have negative impacts on the health of those of us living in the vicinity of the Radar Platform.		Dear US Army Space Missile Defense Command:	
	And lastly, I object to spending taxpayer's money for this outlandish and outdated "star wars" project when we can't afford to educate our children, provide health care for our citizens, or clean up the environmental disasters and hazardous waste sites we've already brought upon our society through the billions of dollars spent on military projects that weren't needed. Please reconsider this project.... Sincerely, Susan Berta Greenbank, WA	3	I am writing to express my opposition to the placement of the SBX X-Band Radar in the Port of Everett, WA. The very short time that Everett, Mukilteo, Marysville and the Island Communities have had to respond to this proposal is unacceptable. What information we have been able to garner revolves around the following:	
			1. Unknown health risks due to radiation emissions.	1
			2. Anticipated significant decline in property values based on unknown health risks, coupled with loss of esthetically pleasing views of Port Gardner Bay.	2
			3. Anticipated decline of Everett's economy based on new business choosing to not establish in the same area as the SBX.	
			4. Disruption of air traffic.	3
			5. Knowledge that if the SBX was ever called upon to fulfill its function, that it would have a seventy-five percent chance of being in port when called upon to do so.	4
			6. Placement in Everett would be for the convenience of 54 crew members who would be staffing the SBX, including the use of city power and water. Consideration for the aforementioned risks to the community appear to not have priority status over ease and convenience for the Department of Defense.	5
			I sincerely hope that you will remove Everett from the list of potential candidates for the SBX and place it in a non-populated area where there will be no risk to life or livelihood.	
			Yours truly,	
			Constance Hallgarth	
			Everett, WA	

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
To: US Army Space and Missile Defense Command Email: gmetreis@smdc.army.mil Fm: Laura Hartman Snohomish, WA Attention Ms. Julia Elliott: I do not understand the need for sea-based floating radar stations (SBX) when Congress has not approved a budget for building anti-ballistic defense systems in the first place. Despite lots of money thrown at studying ballistic defense, technological problems have not been solved. There is no timetable for solving them, and the proposal for the SBX may be out of date to whatever ultimately becomes approved. The proposal raises several highly controversial issues that remain to be resolved within U.S. political and scientific institutions: The SBX structure poses significant safety issues. 1. It is not enough for the FCC to determine that SBX's radiation emissions are safe. The FCC is an agency responsible for communications. It has no authority in health issues, and none of the proper health agencies or EPA have undertaken any public consideration of the effects of non-thermal electromagnetic radiation on humans. Industry assertions have no credibility without independent review. University of Washington experiments have uncovered disturbing effects of radiation on mice, that raise profound questions on fertility rates of mammals. Therefore, radiation effects on Puget Sound, the human population of Everett, the ocean ecology (analogous to dead zones around cell towers), whales, seals, on down the food chain must be fully established in the environmental review. The comments raised at the Everett forum, that the radar would be fully turned on only sometimes, defeats the purpose of the whole enterprise. What happens during orange alerts? Our FCC only has data for radiation levels at one-half hour durations. It is unacceptable to place human and sensitive species as guinea pigs for these levels for hours, days, weeks....at a time. Other	P-E-0348 1	developed nations have set their standards at one-tenth the level of the U.S. 2. A SBX carrying 800,000 gallons of diesel fuel, poses a severe environmental threat to Puget Sound's highly sensitive fisheries and orca ecology. Maintenance of the SBX, at dock and out in salty seas will be highly susceptible to leaks, even if every weld is perfect, all contractors and bureaucrats are perfectly free of corruption and no budget cuts ever reduce its maintenance budget, and it does not become a terrorist target! (see 2.d.) The premise for the floating radar station is flawed from the start. 1. This anti-ballistic program will not make the U.S. "safe" from terrorism. Terrorists use our own technology against us, very cheaply, enabled by our government bankrupting us on the wrong priorities - i.e. complete absence of security for huge chemical depots, nuclear waste transport (dirty bombs on our highways) and the baffling misutilization of good old fashioned police work (i.e. the CIA and FBI's mishandling of the Moussari case.) - while promoting expensive fantasies like SBX. 2. The program will not make us safer from ballistic attack. a. It will start a new world-wide proliferation of SBX's. Why should the U.S. be the only kid on the block with this new toy? Billions can be made selling the technology to "rogue nations," who can then figure out how to scramble the radar. b. It undermines the whole concept of Detente, which was based on mutually assured destruction. Now (in theory) that the U.S. will not share in the mutual destruction, it can become, as a result of one bad election, a rogue nation itself. Even if we don't see ourselves that way, the rest of the world will, which tends to incite more low-tech terrorism. c. Like all computer programs, like the NASA tragedies, high technology can never be made fail-safe, and even worse in this case, will create catastrophe whenever it reads false positives. d. It is un-securable from low-tech terrorist attack. The radar station may read potential attacks from ballistic missiles that go over the atmosphere, but would not be safe from an old-fashioned cannon ball of a nearby ship, undersea attacks by suicide divers,... or submarines! As stated above the proposal is premature before the highly	2 3 4

Exhibit 8.1.2-1: Reproductions of Email Documents (Continued)

As stated above the proposal is premature before the highly controversial defense systems have been proven worthy, environmental health factors have been fully reviewed and the very strategy has been approved by Congress.

Laura Hartman

**COMMENT
NUMBER**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**COMMENT
NUMBER**

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Suzanne Canja	P-E-0001-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Discussion on disorientation from lighting (section 4.2.2.2) will be expanded. Any lighting associated with the Proposed Action would be properly shielded following USFWS guidelines to minimize reflection. Final assembly of the facility would occur on a previously disturbed paved site inshore to minimize impacts.
	P-E-0001-2	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0001-1
	P-E-0001-3	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Equipment would be prefabricated and only final assembly would occur on a previously disturbed paved site to minimize impacts to wildlife to the greatest extent practicable. Personnel would be instructed to avoid wildlife including nesting seabirds in accordance with current rules. The limited construction and operation of the Proposed Action on Midway is not expected to result in significant impacts to its unique biological resources.
Kathleen Donehower	P-E-0002-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0001-3
Joanna Donehower	P-E-0003-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Section 3.2.2 acknowledges the large variety of wildlife that occurs on Midway Atoll. However, the intermittent operation of the Proposed Action on Midway is not expected to result in significant impacts to its unique biological resources.
Michael Jones - University of Hawaii	P-E-0004-1	Program		Strategic Target System launches from PMRF would be included in existing missile flight test activities. Strategic Target System launches proposed for KLC in the North Pacific Targets Program would not include those proposed in the ETR EIS, however, there would be no more than nine launches of any missiles from KLC.
	P-E-0004-2	Program		See chapter 2.0 of the EIS for this information.
	P-E-0004-3	EIS Process		Comment noted and correction made.
	P-E-0004-4	Safety and Health	4.4.4 4.1.7 4.5.5 4.3.5	See sections 4.4.4, 4.1.7, 4.5.5, and 4.3.5. Each missile flight test event would be modeled. The models incorporate a number of variables such as the missile mass, velocity, trajectory, altitude, reliability and descriptions of the environments that may affect the missile in flight, such as surface and high altitude winds. The Range Safety Office would communicate the extent of the clearance area, time, and date of the flight test, once they are defined, to the FAA, the U.S. Coast Guard, appropriate emergency management agencies, and local police jurisdictions for assistance in the clearance of designated land and sea-surface areas. Other areas under the flight path but not in a predicted impact or debris area would be monitored before the test event to determine the location of population or traffic. Tests do not proceed unless the Range Safety Office determines that the general population, including ship traffic, would be in a safe position.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Miriam Bennett	P-E-0005-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	Sections 2.1.4, 2.1.8, 4.3.5.2.5, 4.6.5.2, and 4.8.5.2 of the EIS indicate the SBX operating and mooring areas and general operational effects. A large body of evidence was used in determining the current IEEE human exposure and measurement practices standards (IEEE C95.1-1999 and IEEE C95.3-1999) on which the EIS EMR analysis is based. The IEEE standards afford the public protection and have safety factors built in. Through the use of software controls, constraints placed on the SBX operating area, and coordination with local, state, and federal agencies, potential interference levels would be below the IEEE standards. The odds that communication-electronics equipment could be affected by the SBX because of high power effects are negligible (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). New information on the potential effects of EMR on human health and communications-electronics has been added as appendix G of the EIS.
Ginger Decker	P-E-0006-1	Program		Comment noted.
	P-E-0006-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	Please refer to section 4.8.6 for an added Socioeconomic section for Naval Station Everett. It addresses concerns regarding Visual and Health and Safety impacts on the socioeconomics of the area due to the SBX. In regards to housing, commercial, and property values, it states that given the possible visual impacts of the SBX, along with the misconception that the SBX would have adverse health impacts to the public, the proposed project could potentially lead to property value impacts. However, the impacts would be minimal due to the fact that the SBX would be an additional structure on an existing military base immediately surrounded by industrial land uses, thereby reducing the potential impacts to property values.
Marie-Anne Hudson - McGill University	P-E-0007-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0003-1
Matt DeBenedetti - Legato Systems, Inc.	P-E-0008-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	Section 4.8.9 states that the area is arguably visually synonymous with historical and present military/Navy uses including the aircraft carrier stationed there.
	P-E-0008-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Matt DeBenedetti - Legato Systems, Inc.	P-E-0008-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	Section 2.1.4.2 and sppendix G of the EIS discuss potential interference with communications and electronics equipment. Under proposed SBX operating conditions, full power operation would involve tracking objects in space with the beam pointed up and constantly moving. The beam would not remain stationary for any period of time. Thus, the odds that communication-electronics equipment could be affected by the SBX because of high power effects during the course of one day are 1/1,000,000 or 0.0001% of the time (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). If interference occurs, the short-term effects would not damage any electronic equipment. These odds are based on conservative calculations that assume the SBX would operate in full power mode for 20 minutes each day at maximum duty cycle. New information on the potential effects of EMR on human health and communications-electronics has been added as appendix G of the EIS.
	P-E-0008-4	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	As stated in section 4.8.2, the SBX would not exceed the FAA 3000 V/m peak power threshold. The SBX could exceed the FAA 300 V/m average power threshold out to 12.1 kilometers (7.5 miles) (65% populated radar) or 19 kilometers (11.8 miles) (100% populated radar). The average power threshold is based upon reducing the time of exposure of aircraft avionics (electronic equipment) to High Intensity Radiated Fields in order to preclude shortening the life of the aircraft avionics. Therefore, the concern here is not interference but is a reduction in life of the aircraft avionics. The SBX would be constrained so that the existing ground-, air-, and sea-based electronics are not impacted. As stated in the EIS, while in port, or at a nearby mooring location, the 20 minutes of daily calibration and tracking would be coordinated in both time and space so as to reduce any potential EMR interference to a negligible level. Based on the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process, the high energy radiation operating area for the SBX would be modified to fit existing airport and airspace requirements. The FAA would provide notice regarding the SBX operating area to local airports and aircraft through a NOTAM.
Dave Potter	P-E-0009-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Equipment would be prefabricated and only final assembly would occur on a previously disturbed paved site to minimize impacts to wildlife to the greatest extent practicable. Personnel would be instructed to avoid wildlife, including nesting seabirds, in accordance with current rules.
	P-E-0009-2	Biological Resources	4.2.2	As stated in section 4.2.2.1, installation and operation would follow all applicable procedures in place on Midway to prevent the introduction of alien species. However, text has been expanded.
	P-E-0009-3	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0009-2
	P-E-0009-4	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Procedures for minimizing the potential for and remediating spills of hazardous materials are discussed in section 4.2.3.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Dave Potter	P-E-0009-5	Hazardous Materials	4.2.3	Approximately, 3,785 liters (1,000 gallons) of diesel fuel would be required for the generator. The fuel would be stored in an AST in the vicinity of the generator. The quantities and types of lubricating oils/hydraulic fluids would depend on fill-up/maintenance requirements, but quantities would be kept to a minimum. The AST and generator would have secondary containment to restrict/collect potential spills and leaks and absorbents would also be available.
	P-E-0009-6	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Discussion on disorientation from lighting (page 4-114) will be expanded. Any lighting associated with the Proposed Action will be properly shielded following USFWS guidelines to minimize reflection. Final assembly of the facility would occur on a previously disturbed paved site inshore to minimize impacts.
	P-E-0009-7	Biological Resources	4.2.2	As stated in section 4.2.2.2, communication cables would be installed along an existing road.
	P-E-0009-8	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Exotic vegetation such as ironwood trees would be removed if located within the area selected for elements of the Proposed Action. No vegetation planting has been proposed; however, if required, native species would be used to the greatest extent practicable.
	P-E-0009-9	Utilities	4.2.3.2.1	As mentioned in section 4.2.3.2.1, pollution prevention, recycling, and waste minimization at Midway Atoll would be practiced in accordance with applicable EPA, State of Hawaii, DoD, U.S. Army, and USFWS requirements.
	P-E-0009-10	Utilities		Thank you for your comment.
	P-E-0009-11	Biological Resources	4.2.2	The number of vehicles required as a result of implementing the Proposed Action on Midway will be minimized to the extent practicable.
Michael Callahan	P-E-0010-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Dave Beames	P-E-0011-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	Based on the additional analysis in section 4.8.9 in the EIS, the proposed project would be visible from some of the surrounding neighborhoods, and there would be a potential for a visual impact. However, the area is arguably visually similar to the present industrial and military uses and aside from the viewer being very near the SBX, it would not obscure panoramic views.
Craig Bender	P-E-0012-1	Transportation		As with other established shipping procedures, all SBX operations, including scheduling, the establishment of any required security areas, coordination with requirements of any freighters or carriers, and other shipping issues would be coordinated with and carried out by the U.S. Coast Guard (see section 4.8.7.2). The Coast Guard would also be responsible for scheduling port usage in a manner to prevent impacts to recreational or commercial water transportation in the area. This coordination would prevent impacts to commercial use of the port.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Craig Bender	P-E-0012-2	Transportation		The design for the SBX now includes retractable thrusters, and, as mentioned in section 4.8.7.2, the plan is to have the SBX at either Pier Alpha or Pier Bravo.
	P-E-0012-3	Transportation		See P-E-0012-1
	P-E-0012-4	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Cynthia Dale	P-E-0013-1	Biological Resources	4.8.3	Comment noted. No significant long-term impacts to seabirds, marine wildlife, or fish are anticipated from operation of the SBX at Naval Station Everett.
	P-E-0013-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	Please refer to section 4.8.6 for an added Socioeconomic section for Naval Station Everett. It addresses concerns regarding Visual and Health and Safety impacts on the socioeconomics of the area due to the SBX. In regards to the ability of Everett to maintain and increase tourism, commercial, and residential value it states that given the possible visual impacts of the SBX, along with the misconception that the SBX would have adverse health impacts to the public, the proposed project could potentially lead to adverse impacts. However, the impacts would be minimal due to the fact that the SBX would be an additional structure on an existing military base immediately surrounded by industrial land uses, thereby reducing the impact to these resources.
	P-E-0013-3	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Christina Donehower - McGill University	P-E-0014-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	As stated in section 4.2.2.2, installation and operation would follow all applicable procedures in place on Midway to prevent the introduction of alien species. However, the text will be expanded. Exotic vegetation such as ironwood trees would be removed if located within the area selected for elements of the Proposed Action. No vegetation planting has been proposed; however, if required, native species would be used to the greatest extent practicable.
	P-E-0014-2	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0001-1
	P-E-0014-3	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Personnel would be instructed to avoid wildlife including nesting seabirds in accordance with current rules. The limited construction and operation of the Proposed Action on Midway is not expected to result in significant impacts to its unique biological resources.
	P-E-0014-4	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Equipment would be prefabricated and only final assembly would occur on a previously disturbed paved site to minimize impacts to wildlife to the greatest extent practicable. The limited construction and operation of the Proposed Action on Midway is not expected to result in significant impacts to its unique biological resources.
	P-E-0014-5	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0009-4

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Farhana Mia	P-E-0015-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0003-1
Jessica Forrest	P-E-0016-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Personnel would be instructed to avoid wildlife including nesting seabirds in accordance with current rules. The limited construction and operation of the Proposed Action on Midway is not expected to result in significant impacts to its unique biological resources. Midway would continue to serve as a National Wildlife Refuge under the direction of the UFWs.
F. Anthony Kurtz	P-E-0017-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	Thank you for your comment.
Jim Anderson	P-E-0018-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0018-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-E-0018-3	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0018-4	Policy		Tests have shown this capability exists and additional tests are proposed to enhance the capability.
	P-E-0018-5	Program		This is beyond the scope of the EIS.
	P-E-0018-6	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0018-7	Program		See P-E-0018-5
Dave Potter	P-E-0019-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	The statement that Midway would continue to serve as a National Wildlife Refuge under the direction of the USFWS will be added to the text.
	P-E-0019-2	Program	2	Construction approximately 35 people for 6 months, operation approximately 20 people for 3 weeks, five times per year.
	P-E-0019-3	Biological Resources	4.2.2	Personnel would be instructed to avoid wildlife including nesting seabirds in accordance with current rules. The limited construction and operation of the Proposed Action on Midway is not expected to result in significant impacts to its unique biological resources.
	P-E-0019-4	Program		See P-E-0018-5
Carolyn Heitman	P-E-0020-1	Policy		Treaty issues are beyond the scope of the EIS.
	P-E-0020-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0004-3

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Carolyn Heitman	P-E-0020-3	Safety and Health	2.1.5 2.3.1.4.3	Refer to sections 2.1.5 and 2.3.1.4.3. The personnel exclusion areas in front of the TPS-X radar would extend for 150 meters (492 feet). The FAA would be requested to establish a warning area for aircraft to remain at least 1,500 meters (4,900 feet) from the radar site. The interference areas for EEDs would be at least 800 meters (2,625 feet) in the presence and shipping phase and 400 meters (1,312 feet) in the handling phase. Also refer to figure 2.3.1-8. Potentially hazardous materials associated with GMD ETR/SBX TPS-X operation and maintenance activities could include diesel fuel for power generation, ethylene glycol (coolant) cleaning solvents, oils/lubricants, adhesives, sealants and paints/primers. The quantities of these materials ordered and used would be kept to the minimum for the work required. Therefore, most would be consumed during use and minimal quantities of potentially hazardous waste would be generated.
	P-E-0020-4	Transportation	2.1.1	As stated in section 4.1.6, transportation of hazardous materials at Kodiak Launch Complex would be conducted according to applicable OSHA, EPA, DOT, DoD, and state regulations and requirements, as well as established project and launch complex Standard SOPs. The hazardous materials contained within the missiles transported to KLC include solid fuel for the rocket and fuel and oxidizer for the EKV's Divert and Attitude Control System propellant system. No separate fueling would occur; therefore, the likelihood of release and environmental effect would be small. For potential targets, the launch operator would be responsible for transporting the fuel in accordance with DOT requirements. Because of the sealed nature of this mode of transport, the likelihood of release and environmental effect is small. Operations involving the transport of explosives (including packaging and handling for movement) would require implementation of written procedures, which would be approved by KLC/AADC. Transport operations will be conducted under the supervision of an approved ordnance officer using explosive-certified personnel as necessary. Consequently, minimal health and safety impacts would be expected during transport of missile components.
	P-E-0020-5	Program		There would be the use of both solid and liquid fuels. A small quantity of liquid propellants (approximately 7.5 liters [2 gallons] of liquid fuel and 5.5 liters [1.5 gallons] of liquid oxidizer) would be used by the EKV portion of the GBI. Approximately 236 kilograms (520 pounds) of hydrazine would be used in the fourth stage of the Peacemaker.
	P-E-0020-6	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	As acknowledged in section 4.1.8.2.1, the ESQDs would not restrict public access to Fossil Beach.
	P-E-0020-7	Safety and Health	2.3.1 4.1.7	See P-E-0020-34

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Carolyn Heitman	P-E-0020-8	Program		PMRF currently has the capability to launch four Strategic Target System Targets per year. MDA would utilize that existing launch capability. No other additional missile launches are planned from PMRF.
	P-E-0020-9	Program		The ait and QRLV are not being considered for launching in the ETR Program; they are listed in the EIS as previously launched vehicles from KLC.
	P-E-0020-10	Policy		See P-E-0020-1
	P-E-0020-11	Program	2.0	While it is true that GBI silos or launch pad would be required construction at KLC for Alternatives 1 and 3, the statement quoted is directed towards the Air Launch targets that would be launched from specifically configured U.S. Air Force cargo aircraft.
	P-E-0020-12	Program		A runway is not planned to be constructed at KLC. As KLC does not have an FAA approved licensed runway, the Kodiak airport would be utilized for any air deliveries proposed.
	P-E-0020-13	Safety and Health	2.1.1 3.1.6.2 4.1.6 4.1.7.	Refer to sections 2.1.1, 3.1.6.2, 4.1.6, and 4.1.7. Hypergolic missile propellants are fuels and oxidizers which ignite on contact with each other; the fuel is monomethyl hydrazine and the oxidizer is nitrogen tetroxide. These propellants are/were transported to PMRF by aircraft or ship because of its (island) location. They are routinely transported over land by commercial cargo carriers from U.S. Government storage depots and contractor facilities to test ranges, including KLC and Poker Flat. The propellants are transported according to DOT and DoD regulations for safety of the public ,and the carrier is transported in approved DOT shipping containers.
	P-E-0020-14	Transportation	2.3.1.16	There are no plans to transport target missiles or interceptors from Fort Greely to the KLC for this project. Fort Greely's only involvement will be as a communications node (see section 2.3.1.16).
	P-E-0020-15	Program		At this time there is no plan to transport targets or interceptors to KLC from Fort Greely. KLC is not being considered a deployment location in the ETR EIS.
	P-E-0020-16	Program		No activities are planned at Fort Greely for the GMD ETR. Activities at Fort Greely were covered in the NMD Deployment EIS, Validation of Operational Concept EA and Validation of Operational Concept Supplemental EA. See appendix B of the GMD ETR EIS.
	P-E-0020-17	Program		The Kinetic Energy Interceptor is not currently proposed for use in the ETR. If determined to be a part of the ETR, further analysis would be required.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Carolyn Heitman	P-E-0020-18	Safety and Health	4.4.4 4.1.7 4.5.5 4.3.5	See P-E-0004-4
	P-E-0020-19	Program		Range Safety will ensure launch trajectories will not impact populated areas.
	P-E-0020-20	Safety and Health		An Environmental Justice impact would be a long-term health, environmental, cultural, or economic effect that has a disproportionately high and adverse effect on a nearby minority or low-income population, rather than all nearby residents. No adverse long-term impacts have been identified at any of the locations analyzed in this EIS. As such, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on the minority or low-income populations that may be present in the vicinity of those locations. Thus, no Environmental Justice impacts are anticipated.
	P-E-0020-21	Biological Resources	4.1.3	As stated in section 4.1.3.5, no significant impacts to biological resources of KLC are expected from nine annual launches. It is not likely that the Proposed Action of five total launches per year, in conjunction with current planned or anticipated launches, would exceed this level of activity. This holds true even in the unlikely chance recurrence of multiple failures along the same azimuth and at precisely the same time of flight.
	P-E-0020-22	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	The five MDA launches are included in the nine launches per year currently authorized at KLC. Section 4.1.8.2.1 on page 4-69 states that ESQDs at KLC would not impact transportation routes and public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road.
	P-E-0020-23	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	The rights to access Kodiak's public recreational areas would not be subject to federal restrictions. As a state established public corporation responsible for the operation of KLC, the AADC would be involved with GMD ETR activities in collaboration with MDA. As discussed in section 4.1.8.2.1 on page 4-69, all Launch Hazard Areas would be established and maintained by AADC in accord with the ILMA for the property. Public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Carolyn Heitman	P-E-0020-24	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	The rights to access Kodiak's public roads and recreational areas would not be subject to federal restrictions. As a state established public corporation responsible for the operation of KLC, the AADC would be involved with GMD ETR activities in collaboration with MDA. As mentioned on pages 4-69 and 4-72, ESQDs and EMR hazard exclusion areas at KLC would not impact transportation routes or public property. At KLC only launch hazard areas, which are established and maintained by AADC in accord with the ILMA for the property, would temporarily restrict public access.
	P-E-0020-25	Hazardous Materials	4.1.6	KLC is a small quantity generator of hazardous waste. This equates to approximately five drums of liquid waste per month, or approximately 1,041 liters (275 gallons), assuming 208-liter (55-gallon) drums. Tables 3.1.6-1 and 3.1.6-2 summarize current management practices and provide a list of potentially hazardous materials typically used and hazardous waste typically generated at KLC. Potentially hazardous materials associated with the GMD ETR activities could include solvents, cleaners, oils/lubricants, paints, primers and adhesives. Since no more than 38 liters (10 gallons) in total of these materials would be present at any one time, most would be consumed during use and minimal quantities of potentially hazardous waste would be generated. Only non-hazardous waste such as construction debris would be transported to the Kodiak Borough Landfill or other solid waste municipal landfill. Potentially hazardous waste could only be transported to an RCRA Part B permitted TSD facility.
	P-E-0020-26	Land Use	4.1.8.2.5	Section 4.1.8.2.5 discusses one potential TPS-X site that does not affect public access of the area.
	P-E-0020-27	Program		MDA's proposed launches from KLC are similar to the previous launches conducted at KLC. The other radar systems on Kodiak have not interfered with any launches and do not pose a threat to missile launches at KLC.
	P-E-0020-28	Biological Resources	4.1.3	It is highly unlikely that all the radars mentioned including the Chiniak radar, which at approximately 24 kilometers (15 miles) away is the closest of those mentioned, would be illuminating simultaneously and focused at the exact same area in space.
	P-E-0020-29	Safety and Health	2.1.1 3.1.6.2 4.1.6 4.1.7.	See P-E-0020-13
	P-E-0020-30	Biological Resources	4.1.3	As stated on page 4-130, the USFWS has not noticed die-offs of birds below the COBRA DANE radar in Alaska, and no die-offs of birds are anticipated as a result of the operation of the SBX.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Carolyn Heitman	P-E-0020-31	Program	2.1.4	See figure 2.1.4-3 for the SBX Performance Regions.
	P-E-0020-32	Program		The studies needed to complete the DD Form 1494 at each of the proposed locations could not be started until the siting process was completed. These studies are scheduled to be completed in the summer of 2003.
	P-E-0020-33	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	As discussed in section 4.1.8.2.1, public access through KLC to Fossil Beach would be limited or denied for each launch day. Furthermore, beach landing areas for optional barge delivery would require a temporary closure of short duration of the barge landing beach.
	P-E-0020-34	Safety and Health	2.3.1 4.1.7	See sections 2.3.1 and 4.1.7. The 434-meter (1,425-foot) ESQD and public transit ESQD of 261 meters (855 feet) indicated on figures 2.3.1-2 and 2.3.1-3 are based on the combined explosive potential of all propellants and pyrotechnic materials associated with GBI launches from KLC, including the interceptor's boosters (solid propellant) and liquid fuel for the EKV. Figure 4.1.7-2 indicates exclusion and warning areas.
	P-E-0020-35	Biological Resources	4.1.3	The launch protection circles shown for launches from the RTS are defined by Range Safety for risks to humans on inhabited islands.
	P-E-0020-36	Biological Resources	4.1.3	The steller sea lion haulouts that have the greatest potential for impacts from the Proposed Action (noise, emissions, and debris) are shown in figure 3.1.3-2 (Ugak Island and Gull Point) and discussed in the text.
	P-E-0020-37	Geology and Soils	3.1.5	Active seismic elements are important to consider in the layout and design of critical facilities and systems, however, it is not uncommon to site very critical facilities in high seismic settings. Nuclear power plant facilities along the central and southern California coast are excellent examples. The potential for surface rupture from active faults at Narrow Cape can be avoided through site-specific fault studies. Likewise, the capability to withstand probable seismic ground motions at a site can be incorporated into the facility design standards.
	P-E-0020-38	Geology and Soils	3.1.5	Detailed fault studies are generally conducted for site-specific locations when a facility is proposed within or near a suspected active fault zone. The trace of such a fault may or may not be observable at the ground surface but may be indicated by any number of different map and interpretive analyses, for example alignment of land forms, photo/satellite lineament interpretation, and/or geophysical techniques. Detailed fault studies generally employ subsurface excavation to validate actual fault locations, and develop recurrence intervals based on paleoseismic evidence. Therefore, detailed fault studies would generally not be warranted for the entire KLC area unless there was an area-wide system requirement driving the need for investigation.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Carolyn Heitman	P-E-0020-39	Geology and Soils	3.1.5	The Affected Environment and Environmental Consequence sections of the Draft EIS incorporate site-specific seismic hazard studies conducted at KLC in support of the U.S. Coast Guard Loran Station, by Carver Geologic, William Lettis and Associates, and International Civil Engineering Consultants, Inc. (U.S. Coast Guard Civil Engineering Unit, 2001; 2002; and 2003). A draft of the most recent of these studies (Seismic Hazard Evaluation, Kodiak Loran Station, Phase III, Ground Motion Analysis) was received and incorporated into the Draft EIS. In addition, the phase II report provide a Seismic Source Model table (incorporated in the Draft EIS as table 3.1.5-1) which itemized the fault source segments in the region. A multi-year regional tectonic evaluation of the Narrow Cape area was in preparation, but yet published by Dr. Gary Carver in cooperation with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In lieu of the published findings, Dr. Carver was able to comment on the fault studies at the Loran Station.
	P-E-0020-40	Program		The drawings, certified by a registered engineer, state that the 1994 UBC is the code to which the facilities are designed. As stated on D-2 a site visit was also made to compare the construction documents to the buildings.
	P-E-0020-41	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0020-42	EIS Process		Public hearings were held to gather comments on the Draft EIS; thus none were included. They are part of the Final EIS.
Matt DeBenedetti - Legato Systems, Inc.	P-E-0021-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Isabel Julian	P-E-0022-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0014-1
	P-E-0022-2	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0001-1
	P-E-0022-3	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0014-4
	P-E-0022-4	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0014-4
	P-E-0022-5	Hazardous Materials	4.2.3	See P-E-0009-5
	P-E-0022-6	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0022-7	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0003-1
Richard Gibson	P-E-0023-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Graeme Marsh	P-E-0024-1	EIS Process	3.6	The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from PMRF on the island of Kauai are current on-going activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned. For this reason, the scoping process and hearings were not held on Kauai but in Honolulu, which is closest to the location of the new proposed activities.
David Skimin	P-E-0025-1	Air Quality	4.8.1	Comment noted.
	P-E-0025-2	Safety and Health	4.4.4 4.1.7 4.5.5 4.3.5	See P-E-0004-4
	P-E-0025-3	Safety and Health	3.1.7	See section 3.1.7.2. By agreement with Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry, the City of Kodiak Fire and Rescue Department would respond to potential wildfires that could erupt in the event of a launch pad mishap. If necessary, the Fire Department would also provide assistance with road closures during launch activities. AADC/KLC emergency response personnel would also respond to any wildfires and would handle all other response and mitigation activities associated with missile launches/mishaps due to the very specific hazardous materials response training and equipment required and the noted limitations of the Kodiak Fire Department.
	P-E-0025-4	Biological Resources	4.1.3	Page 4-106 also states (below the table) that it would take approximately 18 years for 90 percent of the perchlorate to leach out of the solid propellant that lands in the Alaskan ocean waters (8.3 C [47 F]). At this extremely slow rate, the amounts of perchlorate would quickly be diluted.
	P-E-0025-5	Biological Resources	4.1.3	As stated on page 4-106, the temperature for fresh water would be higher and it would take about a year for 90 percent of the perchlorate to leach out. Even at this higher rate, the perchlorate would be diluted as it mixes with the surrounding water. For an accident involving fresh water areas, larger pieces of propellant would be recovered, further minimizing the potential for perchlorate contamination and resultant impacts to fish and other wildlife.
	P-E-0025-6	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Amy Winterscheidt and Bruce McCracken	P-E-0026-1	Policy		Comment noted.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Amy Winterscheidt and Bruce McCracken	P-E-0026-2	EIS Process		Comment noted.
	P-E-0026-3	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.8	Comment noted.
	P-E-0026-4	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	Please refer to section 4.8.6 for an added Socioeconomic section for Naval Station Everett. It addresses concerns regarding Visual and Health and Safety impacts on the socioeconomics of the area due to the SBX. In regards to the redevelopment plan, it states that while it is possible that those that visit and reside in this area may be affected by the SBX, the effects would be minimal in regards to this plan.
	P-E-0026-5	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Frank McCord - Cascade Bank and the Navy Relations Committee	P-E-0027-1	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-E-0027-2	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-E-0027-3	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
David Bird - McGill University	P-E-0028-1	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
Josee Rousseau - McGill University	P-E-0029-1	Program	4.2	Midway would remain a National Wildlife Refuge for all of the alternatives.
	P-E-0029-2	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0003-1
Lari Belisle - Anchorage ARTCC	P-E-0030-1	Airspace Use	4.1.2.2	Added information to section 4.1.2 regarding the three to four uncharted airways or flexible tracks managed by the Anchorage ARTCC that cross the north Pacific, south of KLC, and flexible tracks that cross north of the Central Pacific Route Structure that is coordinated through the Oakland ARTCC. In addition, section 4.11.1 includes information on airways in the broad ocean area.
	P-E-0030-2	Socioeconomics	4.1.10	As stated in section 4.1.10 the notice given to the local communities via local newspapers, broadcast media, and commercial fishing, aviation, and tourist boat trade associations would be extensive. As such, entities with an economic interest in the use of these areas such as the commercial fishing, aviation, and tourist industries of Kodiak would not be significantly impacted by the proposed clearance areas.
	P-E-0030-3	Land Use	3.1.8.2	The text of the EIS has been revised as recommended.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Ivona Xiezopolski	P-E-0031-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0031-2	Policy		See P-E-0020-1
Judith Evered	P-E-0032-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0032-2	Biological Resources	4.11.3	Comment noted. The Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant impacts to marine biological resources.
	P-E-0032-3	Policy		This is beyond the scope of the EIS.
	P-E-0032-5	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0032-6	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0033-1	EIS Process		The Draft EIS has been sent to the Hanapepe Public Library, Kapaa Public Library, Koloa Public and School Library, Lihue Public Library, Princeville Public Library, and Waimea Public Library. The GMD ETR program would not include additional launches from PMRF; all proposed Strategic Target System launches would be included under ongoing activities.
	P-E-0033-2	EIS Process		Most activities are covered by the previous environmental documentation, and therefore scoping was not conducted in the Marshall Islands.
	P-E-0033-3	EIS Process		Due to minimal impacts to the area, scoping was not conducted in the Gulf of Mexico region.
	P-E-0033-4	Program		Comment noted and texted revised to state up to 10 launches per year.
	P-E-0033-5	Safety and Health	ES	See the executive summary. Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation safety procedures are not applicable to PMRF/Hawaii. The sentence should read, "Adherence to FAA and DoD safety procedures relative to radar operations would preclude significant impact to health and safety." That is typographical error.
	P-E-0033-6	EIS Process		Text added to appendix A. The current document is the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range EIS.
	P-E-0033-7	Program		This is an approximate propellant mass for the GBI. There is not a known third configuration of the GBI.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Michael Jones - University of Hawaii	P-E-0033-8	Safety and Health	4.1.7	The 434-meter (1,425-foot) ESQD and public transit ESQD of 261 meters (855 feet) indicated on figures 2.3.1-2 and 2.3.1-3 are based on the combined explosive potential of the all propellants and pyrotechnic materials associated with GBI launches from KLC, including the interceptor's boosters (solid propellant) and liquid fuel for the EKV. The size of the ESQD does not change regardless of the location. 1.1 (class A) explosives pose a detonation risk. 1.3 (class B) explosives are a (rapid-burn) fire hazard, minor blast or fragment hazard, but not a mass explosion hazard. Therefore, if the missile configuration should change and the propellant used is a division 1.3 explosive, the ESQD would be reduced.
	P-E-0033-9	Safety and Health	4.1.7	A description of target missiles that may be used are provided in section 2.1.2; however, final selection of target type would be dependent on the test scenario. Therefore, no quantitative information on target ESQDs are provided. However, ESQD criteria are determined in accordance with DOD 6055.9-STD (DOD Ammunition and Explosives Safety Standards) and the responsible Service's implementing regulations. ESQDs are missile specific and based on the combined explosive potential of the all propellants and pyrotechnic materials associated with the missile/booster configuration. ESQD for any target missile incorporated into the GMD ETR program would be predicated on risk avoidance, minimization of accident impacts and protection of population centers.
	P-E-0033-10	Safety and Health	4.4.4 4.1.7 4.5.5 4.3.5	See P-E-0004-4
	P-E-0033-11	Safety and Health	Appendix C	There are inherent risks with any missile testing activity; however, protection of life and property, on and off range, is the prime concern of Range/Mission Safety personnel. In the fifteen years since the referenced incident, improvements have been made not only in the modes of disseminating flight test information, but in the programs that track and terminate flight and the models that compute launch risk exposure. Refer to appendix C. The RCC Common Risk Criteria for National Test Ranges (RCC 321-02) sets the requirements for minimally acceptable risk criteria to occupational and non-occupational personnel, test facilities and non-military assets during range testing operations. Under RCC 321-02 individuals of the general public shall not be exposed to a probability of fatality greater than 1 in 10 million for any single mission and 1 in 1 million on an annual basis. Also, U.S. Coast Guard vessels and range safety aircraft typically would patrol the area to ensure that it is clear of ships or watercraft.
	P-E-0033-12	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0033-13	Program		See P-E-0018-5

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Michael Jones - University of Hawaii	P-E-0033-14	Land Use	4.4.1.3	As mentioned on page 4-148, the Proposed Action of up to four target launches per year are included in the 30 launches per year currently authorized at PMRF. The GMD launches would be the same as those analyzed in the North Pacific Targets EA.
	P-E-0033-15	Program		If the FAA reissues the launch site operator license for the operation of KLC, then it is anticipated there will be no more than nine launches per at KLC per the regulations stipulated in the license.
	P-E-0033-16	Program		See P-E-0004-2
	P-E-0033-17	Airspace Use	4.6.2 4.8.2 2.1.4.2	DD Form 1494 is in process and will not be completed until after the EIS is final. As with other permits, once a site is selected then the permitting process would be finalized. As stated in section 4.6.2.2, the SBX operating area would be constrained so that the existing ground-, air-, and sea-based electronics are not impacted. In addition, with regard to SBX radar impact to aircraft and avionics, the concern is not interference but is a reduction in life of the aircraft avionics.
	P-E-0033-18	Airspace Use	4.6.2 4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0033-17
	P-E-0033-19	Airspace Use	4.6.2	Table 2.1.4-2 is now referenced, and table 4.6.2-1 has been deleted.
	P-E-0033-20	Program	1.6	Following completion of the EIS, MDA will make decisions regarding the GMD ETR. Those decisions will be documented in a ROD that will be sent to all recipients of the GMD ETR EIS.
	P-E-0033-21	Safety and Health	4.4.4	As indicated in section 4.4.4, before installation and use of any new radar or telemetry unit, EMR hazard reviews would be conducted to establish potential hazards to personnel, fuels and ordnance from EMR. Although the event is not likely to occur, the analysis would consider existing HERP, HERF, and HERO arcs and potential impact of simultaneous operation of TPS-X and current radar at PMRF. The TPS-X radar is a mobile unit and would be removed on completion of GMD ETR test operations. Adherence to PMRF, FAA, and DoD safety procedures relative to radar operations would preclude potential cumulative impact and significant impact to health and safety.
	P-E-0033-22	EIS Process		See P-E-0004-3
	P-E-0033-23	EIS Process		Comment noted and correction made.
	P-E-0033-24	Airspace Use	3.6.2	Text in section 3.6.2 has been corrected.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Michael Jones - University of Hawaii	P-E-0033-25	Air Quality	4.1.1.2	The propellant mass and exhaust product information has been updated in sections 4.1.1.2 and 4.5.1.3.
	P-E-0033-26	Airspace Use	2.1.8	Figures in section 2.1.8 have been modified.
	P-E-0033-27	Airspace Use	2.1.8	See P-E-0033-26
	P-E-0033-28	Safety and Health	1 2	GMD testing activities could include up to five launches per year (interceptors and/or targets) from each launch facility. Since most of these would be an interceptor from one location and a target from another location, there would be approximately 10 launches per year for the entire GMD ETR.
	P-E-0033-29	Safety and Health	4.11.3.4	Comment noted and text revised.
	P-E-0033-30	Policy		Copies of the Fact Sheets that were made available at the the public hearings can be acquired by writing to: U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, ATTN: SMDC-EN-V (Mrs. Julia Hudson-Elliott), 106 Wynn Drive, Huntsville, AL 35805; by e-mail at gmdetreis@smdc.army.mil ; or by phone at 1-800-823-8823.
	P-E-0033-31	EIS Process		Comment noted.
Ben Brisbois	P-E-0034-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0016-1
Mike Milligan	P-E-0035-1	Program		See P-E-0020-5
	P-E-0035-2	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0035-3	Policy		Any new technology or activity beyond the scope of the ETR would require additional analysis.
Karen Button	P-E-0036-1	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-E-0036-2	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0036-3	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0036-4	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0036-5	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0036-6	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0036-7	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0036-8	EIS Process		See P-E-0020-42

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Karen Button	P-E-0036-9	Biological Resources	4.1.3	According to analysis of the socioeconomic resources of the area, page 4-83 states that no significant impacts to local business such as commercial fishing and fish processing are anticipated. Areas within the flight safety zone would be cleared approximately 1 to 4 hours before a launch. The actual launch is expected to last about 30 minutes. The all clear would be given within hours and the areas can then be re-occupied. Only up to five launches per year are planned.
	P-E-0036-10	Socioeconomics		This is not within the scope of the EIS.
	P-E-0036-11	Program		The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide for more realistic flight tests in support of development of the GMD system.
	P-E-0036-12	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
Nola Conn	P-E-0037-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Graeme Marsh	P-E-0038-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Ronald Russell	P-E-0039-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Miguel Checa	P-E-0040-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Paul Miller	P-E-0041-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Robin Connors	P-E-0042-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Marie Le Boeuf	P-E-0043-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Pete Doktor	P-E-0044-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Hattie Berg	P-E-0045-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Kawika Alfiche	P-E-0046-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Ednette Chandler	P-E-0047-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Gary Bart	P-E-0048-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Marti Paskal	P-E-0049-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Deborah Burnham	P-E-0050-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Myra Lewin	P-E-0051-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Richard Burge	P-E-0052-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Kima Douglas	P-E-0053-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Dolores Blalock - Communication Design Dept	P-E-0054-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Scot Ryder	P-E-0055-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Kathy-Lyn Binkowski	P-E-0056-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Diana Richardson	P-E-0057-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Lauryn Galindo	P-E-0058-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
John Kesich	P-E-0059-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Carole Madsen	P-E-0060-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Shawn Dicken	P-E-0061-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
John Grant	P-E-0062-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Michael Douglas	P-E-0063-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Nancy Miller	P-E-0064-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Cindy Brockway	P-E-0065-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
James Danoff-Burg	P-E-0066-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Douglas Cornett	P-E-0067-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Makaala Kaaumoana	P-E-0068-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Yvette Crosby	P-E-0069-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Kevin Correll	P-E-0070-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Maire Susan Sanford	P-E-0071-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Kami Altar	P-E-0072-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Eli Harris	P-E-0073-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Charles Hansen	P-E-0074-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Nahe Kahokualohi	P-E-0075-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Nancy Crom	P-E-0076-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Lori Juiff	P-E-0077-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Pulelehuakeanuenue nue Oshiyama	P-E-0078-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Tammy Robinson	P-E-0079-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Kekama Galioto	P-E-0080-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Dane Nance	P-E-0081-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Bryan Kuwada	P-E-0082-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Rosemary Alles	P-E-0083-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Jessica Manthey	P-E-0084-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Christine Page	P-E-0085-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Shaun Smakal	P-E-0086-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Kalyan Meola	P-E-0087-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Fredy Morse	P-E-0088-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Amy Ono	P-E-0089-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Mike Stephens	P-E-0090-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Gary Manfredi	P-E-0091-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
David M.K. Tane Inciong II	P-E-0092-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Amanda Rang	P-E-0093-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Karen Mavec	P-E-0094-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Joy Chambers	P-E-0095-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Peter Zadis	P-E-0096-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Peter Sandoval	P-E-0097-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Robert Culbertson	P-E-0098-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Paul Williams	P-E-0099-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Kathy Harter	P-E-0100-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Mary Lu Kelley	P-E-0101-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Christina Borra	P-E-0102-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Cathleen Hayes	P-E-0103-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Marion Kelly	P-E-0104-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
L.M. Bubala	P-E-0105-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Eleawani Felix	P-E-0106-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
James Nordlund	P-E-0107-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Jeff Frontz	P-E-0108-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Terry Bunch	P-E-0109-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Deborah Davis	P-E-0110-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Charone O'Neil-Naeole	P-E-0111-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
KatRama Brooks	P-E-0112-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
DJ Colbert	P-E-0113-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Jeffery Courson	P-E-0114-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Nathan Boddie	P-E-0115-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Virginia Gibson	P-E-0116-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Aggelige Spanos	P-E-0117-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Ravi Grover	P-E-0118-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Forest Shomer	P-E-0119-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Timothy Johnson	P-E-0120-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Donna Melead	P-E-0121-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Ana Young	P-E-0122-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
D. Bowman	P-E-0123-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Rudolf Vracko	P-E-0124-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Jessica Ma	P-E-0125-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Joseph Rodrigues	P-E-0126-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Karrina Mount	P-E-0127-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Christopher Kubiak	P-E-0128-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Faye Kurk	P-E-0129-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Toni Ehrlich-Feldman	P-E-0130-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Stephen Thompson	P-E-0131-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Jeremiah Spense	P-E-0132-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Frank Marsh	P-E-0133-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Reagan Hooton	P-E-0134-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Pat Porter	P-E-0135-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Jane Yamashita	P-E-0136-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Monica Kaiwi	P-E-0137-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Matthew McGuire	P-E-0138-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Sanford Higginbotham	P-E-0139-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Dick Miller	P-E-0140-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Nikki Gentry	P-E-0141-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Carlos Altieri	P-E-0142-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Tina Horowitz	P-E-0143-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Annalia Russell	P-E-0144-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Gain Andrea Morresi	P-E-0145-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Miguel Godinez	P-E-0146-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Perry McCorkle	P-E-0147-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Kay Snow-Davis	P-E-0148-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Niyati Brown	P-E-0149-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Shannon Rudolph	P-E-0150-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Lisa Carter	P-E-0151-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
James Albertini	P-E-0152-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Raphael Mazor	P-E-0153-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Adam Mick	P-E-0154-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Larry Ford	P-E-0155-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Jenifer Prince	P-E-0156-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
B McClintock	P-E-0157-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Philip Mohorich	P-E-0158-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Mary Krane Derr	P-E-0159-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Paul Waller	P-E-0160-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Connie Boitano	P-E-0161-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Carroll Dana	P-E-0162-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Jean Flint	P-E-0163-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Jerome Carpenter	P-E-0164-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Philip Simon	P-E-0165-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Cheryl Rosefeld - University of Missouri	P-E-0166-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Emma Kaye	P-E-0167-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Robert Blackiston	P-E-0168-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Forrest Hurst	P-E-0169-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Tod Heintz	P-E-0170-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Alison Hartle	P-E-0171-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Walter Pomroy	P-E-0172-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Robert Lebendiger	P-E-0173-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Ricky Wright	P-E-0174-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Judy Dalton	P-E-0175-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
David Dinner	P-E-0176-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Tom Jackson	P-E-0177-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Robert Kelly	P-E-0178-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Scott Jarvis	P-E-0179-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Dwayne Tarletz	P-E-0180-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Karin Hazelhoff	P-E-0181-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Daniel Lovejoy	P-E-0182-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Scott McKenzie	P-E-0183-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Gary Brady	P-E-0184-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Noelani Puniwai	P-E-0185-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Katie Johnson	P-E-0186-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Bob Tripp	P-E-0187-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Maya Moiseyev	P-E-0188-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Maliu Neilson	P-E-0189-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Michele Chavez-Pardini	P-E-0190-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Donovan Watts	P-E-0191-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Eliza Linser	P-E-0192-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Catherine Rawson	P-E-0193-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Berton Harrah	P-E-0194-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Bill Lewis	P-E-0195-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Kiope Raymond	P-E-0196-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Suki Ewers	P-E-0197-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
William Golove	P-E-0198-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Gregg Schulze	P-E-0199-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Lee Altenberg - University of Hawaii	P-E-0200-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Mark Reif	P-E-0201-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Richard Powers	P-E-0202-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Rhoda Libre	P-E-0203-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Raphael Kaliko	P-E-0204-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.
Leslie Minor	P-E-0205-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
Rick D. Eberharter	P-E-0206-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Jane Seymour	P-E-0207-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Deborah M Wright	P-E-0208-1	EIS Process		The scoping session was held in Seattle because, when the meeting was set up, several other installations in the Seattle area were still being considered. The Seattle location appeared in logical proximity to all locations, and we were ensured the scoping session was widely publicized in the Seattle area, including both the Everett and Bremerton communities.
	P-E-0208-2	Noise	4.8	It is anticipated that the design of the SBX vessel would incorporate methods to minimize noise. While operating pierside, two diesel generators could be operating for up to 3 hours per day. Noise levels from these generators would be expected to dissipate to background levels within several hundred feet.
	P-E-0208-3	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	As described in section 4.8.1.2, it is anticipated that the SBX would be able to dock at Naval Station Everett and connect to utilities there. Requiring two generators for powering the 65 percent of fully populated radar for 3 hours per day. No significant emissions are anticipated from running the two generators for 3 hours per day. The SBX operation would meet all state and federal air quality requirements.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Deborah M Wright	P-E-0208-4	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	Section 2.1.4.2 and sppendix G of the EIS discuss potential interference with communications and electronics equipment. Under proposed SBX operating conditions, full power operation would involve tracking objects in space with the beam pointed up and constantly moving. The beam would not remain stationary for any period of time. Thus, the odds that communication-electronics equipment could be affected by the SBX because of high power effects during the course of one day are 1/1,000,000 or 0.0001% of the time (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). If interference occurs, the short-term effects would not damage any electronic equipment. These odds are based on conservative calculations that assume the SBX would operate in full power mode for 20 minutes each day at maximum duty cycle. New information on the potential effects of EMR on human health and communications-electronics has been added as appendix G of the EIS.
	P-E-0208-5	Safety and Health	4.8.5	See section 4.8.5 and appendix G. A large body of evidence was used in determining the current IEEE human exposure and measurement practices standards (IEEE C95.1-1999 and IEEE C95.3-1999) on which the EIS EMR analysis is based. The IEEE standards afford the public protection and have safety factors built in. Through the use of software controls, constraints placed on the SBX operating area, and coordination with local, state, and federal agencies, potential interference levels would be below the IEEE standards and therefore additional studies are not warranted or planned at this time. As with other standards, the current standard is followed until there is an official change.
	P-E-0208-6	Hazardous Materials	4.7.4 4.8.4	Potentially hazardous materials associated with GMD ETR/SBX maintenance activities could include solvents, oils/lubricants, and paints/primers. The quantities of these materials ordered and used would be kept to the minimum for the work required. Therefore, most would be consumed during use and minimal quantities of potentially hazardous waste would be generated. Table 3.6.4-1 summarizes the discharge restrictions for non-hazardous, potentially hazardous, and some special waste into the ocean.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Deborah M Wright	P-E-0208-7	Safety and Health	4.8.5	Mitigation methods would include safe distance separations and software controls, such as those currently in place on the XBR used at Kwajalein Island in the RMI. Under proposed operating conditions, full power operation would involve tracking objects in space with the beam pointed up and constantly moving. The beam would not remain stationary for any period of time. RF Radiation Hazard Safety Software controls would not allow a full power beam to come in contact with any personnel on the platform or on land. As stated in section 2.1.4, two separate, redundant computer systems would monitor all emission energy levels at locations around the radar to assure safe exposure levels would be maintained. The odds that communication-electronics equipment could be affected by the SBX because of high power effects during the course of one day are 1/1,000,000 or 0.0001% of the time (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). The effects would not damage any electronic equipment and would last for less than 1 second should this occur.
	P-E-0208-8	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Margaret Ann Lyman	P-E-0209-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-E-0209-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	Please refer to section 4.8.6 for an added Socioeconomic section for Naval Station Everett. It addresses concerns regarding Visual and Health and Safety impacts on the socioeconomics of the area due to the SBX. In regards to the effects on marina traffic caused by the SBX, coordination would be adequately advertised through a NOTMAR in order to prevent any conflicts with tribal fishing areas, and to prevent any impacts on current shipping schedules, ship-borne commerce, recreational boating, or general transit.
	P-E-0209-3	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
	P-E-0209-4	Biological Resources	4.8.3	As stated on page 4-242, the SBX vessel would incorporate marine pollution control devices such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues, and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices in compliance with the UNDS provisions of the Clean Water Act. No significant long-term adverse impacts to biological resources are anticipated.
	P-E-0209-5	Program	2.1.4	It is anticipated that the SBX would support approximately five GMD tests per year. Each test would require the SBX to be away from the PSB for approximately 1 month.
Victoria Walker	P-E-0210-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Al & Peggy Pierce	P-E-0211-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Linda & Dennis Finlayson	P-E-0212-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
	P-E-0212-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Crispin Wilhelm	P-E-0213-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Charles Glaisyer	P-E-0214-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Nancy Robert	P-E-0215-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0215-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0215-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Larry Walsh	P-E-0216-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Peggy Katica	P-E-0217-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Chris and Doretta Runo	P-E-0218-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Peggy Kurtz	P-E-0219-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0219-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Peggy Kurtz	P-E-0219-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0219-4	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0006-2
Wendy Zieve	P-E-0220-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0220-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Peggy Toepel - Everett Shorelines Coalition	P-E-0221-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0221-2	Biological Resources	4.8.3	See P-E-0209-4
	P-E-0221-3	Biological Resources	4.8.3	As stated on page 4-130 in the Draft EIS, since birds are not likely to remain continuously within the radar beam and the power density is not expected to exceed levels that could impact birds, the likelihood of harmful exposure is not great.
	P-E-0221-4	Program		Similar radar systems successfully operate with coordination between agencies as part of solution. Numerous other hardware, software, and operational guidelines will ensure the safe operation of the SBX.
Mike Palmer	P-E-0222-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	A socioeconomic section has been added to section 4.8.6 in the EIS.
Bruce Wasell	P-E-0223-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Brian Dale	P-E-0224-1	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	See P-E-0208-3
	P-E-0224-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-E-0224-3	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
	P-E-0224-4	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0209-2

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Ann Peterson	P-E-0225-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Kevin Nasr	P-E-0226-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Mary Kate Olson	P-E-0227-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Greg Rielly	P-E-0228-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Karen Clark	P-E-0229-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-E-0229-2	Biological Resources	4.8.3	Analysis in the EIS is based on effects of other similar radar systems. As stated on page 4-130, a full EMR/EMI survey and analysis would be conducted by the Joint Spectrum Center, in coordination with the FAA, DOT, and other potentially affected users. An operating permit would be negotiated based on the results of this survey.
Julian Dewell	P-E-0230-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4.6	See section 2.1.4.6. For security purposes the SBX would follow standard security practice for U.S. naval vessels of approximately 91 meters (299 feet), but the distance could vary depending on the situation and location of the SBX. In port security distances would be similar to existing naval vessels at that location.
	P-E-0230-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0230-3	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0230-4	Biological Resources	4.8.3	When at home port, the SBX vessel would be moored at the pier. No adverse effects to fish, shellfish, or other wildlife are anticipated. Permanent mooring systems would be put into place at locations without docking facilities, such as Adak or Port Hueneme, after the final site is selected and an environmental review of the area is conducted.
	P-E-0230-5	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Julian Dewell	P-E-0230-6	Air Quality	2.1.4.7	Pier-side utility requirements would be similar to a small ocean-going vessel. While the SBX is underway the estimated fuel consumption would be 54,888 liters (14,500 gallons) per day. That assumes the SBX is in transit with radar operations, and assumes six generators running 24 hours per day. While in transit the SBX exhaust emissions would be similar to other sea-going vessels and would be dispersed over a large area. The SBX operation would meet all state and federal air quality requirements.
	P-E-0230-7	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	As discussed in section 4.8.1.2, the SBX is a mobile source (per 40CFR52.21(b)(5)), and as such the emissions would not be considered with stationary sources. It is anticipated that the SBX would be able to dock at Naval Station Everett, and would connect to utilities there. While at pier side, two generators would be required for powering of the 65 percent or fully populated radar for 3 hours per day. No significant emissions are anticipated from running the two generators for 3 hours per day.
Walt Blackford	P-E-0231-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0231-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Michelle Geck	P-E-0232-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Kitty and Gordy Adams	P-E-0233-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Elspeth Anderson	P-E-0234-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Gloria Chou	P-E-0235-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Mark Nagel	P-E-0236-1	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-E-0236-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0236-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Mark Nagel	P-E-0236-4	Airspace Use	4.8.2	As stated in section 4.8.2, the SBX operating area would be constrained so that the existing ground-, air-, and sea-based electronics are not impacted. New special use airspace is not planned. In addition, with regard to SBX radar impact to aircraft and avionics, the concern is not interference but is a reduction in life of the aircraft avionics.
Karen Stolworthy	P-E-0237-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0237-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-E-0208-4
	P-E-0237-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0006-2
Larry Egge	P-E-0238-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Thomas Murphy	P-E-0239-1	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
Barbara Birman	P-E-0240-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Judy Thomas	P-E-0241-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Linda Beeman	P-E-0242-1	EIS Process		Additional meetings were held 5 April in Everett, Washington concerns. The comment period was also extended.
	P-E-0242-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Shannon Walter	P-E-0243-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0243-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-E-0243-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Shannon Walter	P-E-0243-4	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
William Rubel	P-E-0244-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
	P-E-0244-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Dean Enell	P-E-0245-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Kimberly Hunter	P-E-0246-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0246-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0006-2
	P-E-0246-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0246-4	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-E-0246-5	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
Marsha Cogdill	P-E-0247-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0247-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0247-3	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
Marianne Edain - Whidbey Environmental Action Network	P-E-0248-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
	P-E-0248-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
	P-E-0248-3	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	Text added to section 4.8.1.2 to include dust suppression methods.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Marianne Edain - Whidbey Environmental Action Network	P-E-0248-4	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
	P-E-0248-5	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0248-6	EIS Process		See P-E-0248-11
	P-E-0248-7	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	While at the PSB, the SBX would have hardware and software controls that physically limits the movement of the radar below 10 degrees above the horizon. While in the open ocean the hardware and software limits are reduced to a lower limit of 2 degrees above the horizon. Therefore, the beam would not directly illuminate the surface. Refer to section 2.1.4.2 and appendix G.
	P-E-0248-8	EIS Process		See P-E-0248-11
	P-E-0248-9	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-E-0208-4
	P-E-0248-10	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Marianne Edain - Whidbey Environmental Action Network	P-E-0248-11	EIS Process		DD Form 1494 is in process and will not be completed until after the EIS is final. As with other permits, once a site is selected then the permitting process would be finalized. The basic assumption regarding the SBX operation while in port, or at a nearby mooring location, is that the 20 minutes of daily calibration and tracking would be coordinated in both time and space so as to reduce any potential EMR interference to a negligible level. The SBX would be constrained so that the existing ground-, air-, and sea-based electronics are not impacted. In addition, with regard to aircraft and avionics, aircraft may fly through the mainbeam of a radar, and therefore would be exposed to EMR. Military aircraft must be hardened or protected from EMR levels up to 3500 V/m (peak power) and 1270 V/m (average power). The SBX will not exceed these levels. Civilian aircraft must be hardened or protected from EMR levels up to 3000 V/m (peak power) and 300 V/m (average power) as mandated by the FAA by Notice 8110.71, Guidelines for the Certification of Aircraft Flying through High Intensity Radiated Field Environments. The SBX will not exceed the 3000 V/m peak power threshold. The SBX can exceed the 300 V/m average power threshold out to 12.1 kilometers (7.5 miles) (65% populated radar) or 19 kilometers (11.8 miles) (100% populated radar). The average power threshold is based upon reducing the time of exposure of aircraft avionics (electronic equipment) to High Intensity Radiated Fields in order to preclude shortening the life of the aircraft avionics. Therefore, the concern here is not interference but is a reduction in life of the aircraft avionics.
	P-E-0248-12	EIS Process		Comment noted and correction made on page 2-17/18.
	P-E-0248-13	Safety and Health	3.6.5 3.7.5 3.8.5 3.9.5 3.10.5	The text has been modified to reflect table 2.1.4-2, which lists the maximum potential interference distances that define the ROI based on various subjects that could interact with the radar. Appendix B includes a general description of the health and safety resource area and a detailed discussion of the laws, regulations, and standards concerning maritime safety and EMR.
Maxine Kraemer	P-E-0249-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-E-0249-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-E-0208-4
	P-E-0249-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0249-4	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Mike Curtis	P-E-0250-1	Program		The endorsement or recommendation of home-basing the SBX in Everett is in no way tied to base closures.
	P-E-0250-2	EIS Process		Comment noted.
Scott Kerst	P-E-0251-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Glen Milner	P-E-0252-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-E-0252-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Valerie Steel	P-E-0253-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0253-2	EIS Process		The FCC, DoD, IEEE, and many other industries, agencies, and organizations whose personnel work in close proximity to devices that emit both ionizing and non-ionizing radiation have conducted self and independent studies on potential EMR exposures and have shared and combined the information in order to develop guidelines/standards that are consistent and safe relative to human exposure. The IEEE set of standards is based on hundreds of studies (321 that are referenced in the latest version of IEEE C95.1-1999).
Anne Robison	P-E-0254-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
George and Maribeth Newland	P-E-0255-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Diane Kendy and Michael Nutt	P-E-0256-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Gloria Olson	P-E-0257-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0257-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Philip Jazwieck	P-E-0258-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0258-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Michael Martin and Won Chong Kim	P-E-0259-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Karen Davies	P-E-0260-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0260-2	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	See P-E-0208-3
	P-E-0260-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
Karen Charnell	P-E-0261-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-E-0208-4
	P-E-0261-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
Elizabeth Hallgarth	P-E-0262-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0262-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-E-0262-3	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
	P-E-0262-4	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0262-5	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Sheila Hoopman	P-E-0263-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Corry Venema-Weiss	P-E-0264-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0264-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Robert Setlow	P-E-0265-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Won Chong Kim	P-E-0266-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0266-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Christine Giannini	P-E-0267-1	Biological Resources	4.8.3	As stated on page 4-242, the SBX vessel will incorporate marine pollution control devices such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues, and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices, in design or routine operation to minimize the potential for impacts. Design of the SBX vessel would incorporate methods to minimize generator noise. No impacts to orca communication are anticipated.
	P-E-0267-2	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	See P-E-0208-3
David A. Kurtz	P-E-0268-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
Deane W. Minor	P-E-0269-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-E-0269-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
Donna Witte	P-E-0270-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Judy Thomas	P-E-0271-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Mark Anderson	P-E-0272-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0242-1
Ray McKinnon	P-E-0273-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
Dale and Laura Temple	P-E-0274-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-E-0274-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Kelli Trosvig	P-E-0275-1	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	As discussed in section 4.8.1.2, it is anticipated that the SBX would be able to dock at Naval Station Everett and would connect to utilities there. Two generators would be required for powering of the 65 percent or fully populated radar for 3 hours per day. No significant emissions are anticipated from running the two generators for 3 hours per day. The SBX operation would meet all state and federal air quality requirements.
	P-E-0275-2	Biological Resources	4.8.3	Comment noted. No significant impacts are anticipated to the migration and return of spawning wild salmon and whales known to frequent the Port Gardner Bay area.
	P-E-0275-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Kelli Trosvig	P-E-0275-4	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	As discussed in section 4.8.1.2, according to 40CFR52.21(b)(5) the SBX would be considered a mobile source. A stationary source is defined as a building, structure, facility, or installation, all of which the SBX is not. Under the current test plan, the SBX would be in port for about 5 weeks at a time and then would be in transit or at the test area in the middle of the Pacific Ocean for about 4 weeks. This cycle would be repeated throughout the year.
Margaret Grospitch	P-E-0276-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0276-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
S. Phillips	P-E-0277-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
Mary Jane Anderson	P-E-0278-1	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
	P-E-0278-2	Biological Resources	4.8.3	Analysis in the EIS is based on effects of other similar radar systems. As stated on page 4-130, a full EMR/EMI survey and analysis would be conducted by the Joint Spectrum Center, in coordination with the FAA, DOT, and other potentially affected users. An operating permit would be negotiated based on the results of this survey. The Proposed Action will comply with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Mary Jane Anderson	P-E-0278-3	Safety and Health	4.8.5	A DD Form 1494 would be completed prior to SBX operations and would assist in defining the operating area and defining safe operating angles, power levels, etc. Mitigation methods would include safe distance separations and software controls, such as those currently in place on the XBR used at Kwajalein Island in the RMI. Under proposed operating conditions, full power operation would involve tracking objects in space with the beam pointed up and constantly moving. The beam would not remain stationary for any period of time. RF Radiation Hazard Safety Software controls would not allow a full power beam to come in contact with any personnel on the platform or on land. Section 2.1.4; Two separate, redundant computer systems would monitor all emission energy levels at locations around the radar to assure safe exposure levels would be maintained. The odds that communication-electronics equipment could be affected by the SBX because of high power effects during the course of one day are 1/1,000,000 or 0.0001% of the time (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). The effects would not damage any electronic equipment and would last for less than a second should this occur. To reduce the chance of fuel leaks, the SBX platform would be constructed and operated in accordance with the military, state, federal and international maritime (SOLAS) and (MARPOL 73/78) standard construction and operating requirements for safety and pollution prevention. As such, regular inspections would occur and fueling operations would be monitored and controlled. Any potential breach or leak would be handled in accordance with existing Naval and Coast Guard procedures
	P-E-0278-4	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
	P-E-0278-5	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-E-0278-6	EIS Process		See P-E-0208-1
Miji Ryan	P-E-0279-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0279-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
Ivan Eastin	P-E-0280-1	Biological Resources	4.8.3	See P-E-0275-2
Glen Miller	P-E-0281-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Ken Adams	P-E-0282-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Robert Emery - Friends of Maggie Park	P-E-0283-1	Biological Resources	4.8.3	Comment noted. No significant impacts are anticipated to the migration and return of spawning wild salmon, such as the Chinook salmon, known to occur in the Puget Sound.
	P-E-0283-2	Safety and Health	4.8.5	See P-E-0208-5
	P-E-0283-3	Biological Resources	4.8.3	See P-E-0275-2
	P-E-0283-4	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
	P-E-0283-5	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-E-0208-4
Amy Burton	P-E-0284-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
J. C. and Mary O'Donnell	P-E-0285-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Scott, Kim, Michael, and Kevin Schroeder	P-E-0286-1	Program		A siting study was conducted to identify candidate locations for a PSB. Only those locations that met the exclusionary criteria and application of initial evaluative criteria were carried forward for analysis in the GMD ETR EIS.
John Doyle	P-E-0287-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Lynn Hays	P-E-0288-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
John Hurd	P-E-0289-1	P-E-0319	Multiple	See responses to issues identified for comment number P-E-0319.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
John Hurd	P-E-0289-2	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	As stated in section 4.8.2, the SBX would not exceed the FAA 3000 V/m peak power threshold. The SBX could exceed the FAA 300 V/m average power threshold out to 12.1 kilometers (7.5 miles) (65% populated radar) or 19 kilometers (11.8 miles) (100% populated radar). The average power threshold is based upon reducing the time of exposure of aircraft avionics (electronic equipment) to High Intensity Radiated Fields in order to preclude shortening the life of the aircraft avionics. Therefore, the concern here is not interference but is a reduction in life of the aircraft avionics. The SBX would be constrained so that the existing ground-, air-, and sea-based electronics are not impacted. As stated in the EIS, while in port, or at a nearby mooring location, the 20 minutes of daily calibration and tracking would be coordinated in both time and space so as to reduce any potential EMR interference to a negligible level. Based on the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process, the high energy radiation operating area for the SBX would be modified to fit existing airport and airspace requirements. The FAA would provide notice regarding the SBX operating area to local airports and aircraft through a NOTAM.
	P-E-0289-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	Sections 2.1.4, 2.1.8, 4.3.5.2.5, 4.6.5.2, and 4.8.5.2 of the EIS indicate the SBX operating and mooring areas and general operational effects. A large body of evidence was used in determining the current IEEE human exposure and measurement practices standards (IEEE C95.1-1999 and IEEE C95.3-1999) on which the EIS EMR analysis is based. The IEEE standards afford the public protection and have safety factors built in. Through the use of software controls, constraints placed on the SBX operating area, and coordination with local, state, and federal agencies, potential interference levels would be below the IEEE standards. The odds that communication-electronics equipment could be affected by the SBX because of high power effects are negligible (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). New information on the potential effects of EMR on human health and communications-electronics has been added as appendix G of the EIS.
	P-E-0289-4	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	Please refer to section 4.8.6 for an added Socioeconomic section for Naval Station Everett. It addresses concerns regarding Visual and Health and Safety impacts on the socioeconomics of the area due to the SBX. In regards to the effects on marina traffic caused by the SBX, coordination would be adequately advertised through a NOTMAR in order to prevent any conflicts with tribal fishing areas, and to prevent any impacts on current shipping schedules, ship-borne commerce, recreational boating, or general transit.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
John Hurd	P-E-0289-5	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	Please refer to section 4.8.6 for an added Socioeconomic section for Naval Station Everett. It addresses concerns regarding Visual and Health and Safety impacts on the socioeconomics of the area due to the SBX. In regards to the redevelopment plan, it states that while it is possible that those that visit and reside in this area may be affected by the SBX, the effects would be minimal in regards to this plan.
	P-E-0289-6	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	Please refer to section 4.8.6 for an added Socioeconomic section for Naval Station Everett. It addresses concerns regarding Visual and Health and Safety impacts on the socioeconomics of the area due to the SBX. In regards to housing, commercial, and property values, it states that given the possible visual impacts of the SBX, along with the misconception that the SBX would have adverse health impacts to the public, the proposed project could potentially lead to property value impacts. However, the impacts would be minimal due to the fact that the SBX would be an additional structure on an existing military base immediately surrounded by industrial land uses, thereby reducing the potential impacts to property values.
Gloria Olson	P-E-0290-1	EIS Process		This is beyond the scope of the EIS.
Tracey Hoffman and Carol Grout	P-E-0291-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Chris Beckmeyer	P-E-0292-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
Calvin Bouma	P-E-0293-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
Kim Buckhalter	P-E-0294-1	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
	P-E-0294-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Eugene S Dvornick	P-E-0295-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Joseph E Eichinger	P-E-0296-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0296-2	Safety and Health	4.8.5	See P-E-0208-5
	P-E-0296-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0006-2
Bernie JMW Fleming	P-E-0297-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Rose Goulet	P-E-0298-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-E-0298-2	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0008-1

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Rose Goulet	P-E-0298-3	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Denis Hayner	P-E-0299-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Andrew H	P-E-0300-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Jamie and Kathy Hunter	P-E-0301-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0301-2	Safety and Health	4.8.5	See P-E-0208-5
	P-E-0301-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-E-0301-4	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
Christianne Loupelle - Dept of Natural Resources Sciences, McGill University	P-E-0302-1	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0014-1
	P-E-0302-2	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0001-1
	P-E-0302-3	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0009-11
	P-E-0302-4	Biological Resources	4.2.2	See P-E-0001-3
	P-E-0302-5	Hazardous Materials	4.2.3	See P-E-0009-5
Mike Mashock	P-E-0303-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0303-2	Transportation	4.8.7.2	As with other established shipping procedures, all SBX operations, including the establishment of any required security areas, would be coordinated with the U.S. Coast Guard (see section 4.8.7.2). The Coast Guard would also be responsible for scheduling port usage in a manner to prevent impacts to recreational or commercial water transportation in the area. The design for the SBX now includes retractable thrusters and the plan is to have the SBX at either Pier Alpha or Pier Bravo. The security area would be similar to the existing security area for USS Abraham Lincoln.
	P-E-0303-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-E-0208-4
	P-E-0303-4	Program		See P-E-0006-1
John R McCoy	P-E-0304-1	Program		Public comment period in Everett extended through 15 April 2003.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Patricia Johansen Mitchell	P-E-0305-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Bob Mumford	P-E-0306-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Michelle Wilson Nordhoff	P-E-0307-1	EIS Process		No meetings were held in Delta Junction or Fairbanks because no ETR activities would occur in either location.
	P-E-0307-2	Transportation	2.3.1.16	See P-E-0020-14
	P-E-0307-3	Cultural Resources	4.1.15	Effects to subsistence were analyzed in section 4.1.15 in the EIS.
	P-E-0307-4	EIS Process		These areas would not be endangered by missile trajectories.
	P-E-0307-5	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Michael Papa	P-E-0308-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0006-2
	P-E-0308-2	Transportation	4.8.7.2	See P-E-0303-2
	P-E-0308-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Lynn Willeford	P-E-0309-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
Malama Pono, M. Doherty, Chisa Dodge, Mona Kim, Ujenna & Marguerit Johnson, and Garth Forth	P-E-0310-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Timothy M Reisenauer	P-E-0311-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-E-0311-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
	P-E-0311-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Timothy M Reisenauer	P-E-0311-4	Biological Resources	4.8.3	See P-E-0209-4
	P-E-0311-5	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
Brent Sampson	P-E-0312-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Eileen Simmons	P-E-0313-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0026-4
Phil Sturholm	P-E-0314-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Michelle Trautman	P-E-0315-1	EIS Process		Comment noted.
	P-E-0315-2	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
No Name Provided	P-E-0316-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Susan Payne and Don Dumm	P-E-0317-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0317-2	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	The proposed barge landing sites would not require any construction and all applicable permits would be obtained prior to implementation of the Proposed Action. As stated in section 4.1.8.2.1 on page 4-68, restricted access to the beach landing areas and road closures to the immediate area during unloading would occur. However, such short-term closures would not significantly impact land use. Barge beach landings would comply with the standards of the Alaskan Coastal Management Program. As well, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant impacts to marine biological resources.
	P-E-0317-3	Biological Resources	4.1.3	As stated in chapter 2, up to five launches from each selected launch site would occur per year as part of the Proposed Action. According to the FAA EA, no significant impacts to water quality were anticipated as a result of launching nine missiles per year. The missile launches required as part of the Proposed Action would not exceed the number previously analyzed. As stated on page 4-105 in the Draft EIS, aluminum oxide is only a hazard to aquatic life in acidic environments when it dissociates into as free aluminum cation. Aluminum oxide should not dissolve in water with pH levels between 5 and 9.5. As summarized in the Summary Findings of KLC Environmental Studies 1998-2001, there have been no discernable effects on water chemistry to date, including from the Strategic Target System mishap.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Susan Payne and Don Dumm	P-E-0317-4	Safety and Health	2.1.5 2.3.1.4.3	See P-E-0020-3
	P-E-0317-5	Transportation		Such issues are addressed in several sections within chapter 4, including 4.1.6. All transportation of equipment and materials such as fuels would be conducted in accordance with applicable OSHA, EPA, DOT, DoD and state regulations and requirements as well as established project and launch complex Standard SOPs. SOPs for spill prevention, containment, and control measures while transporting equipment and materials would preclude impacts. The launch operator would be responsible for transporting the fuel in accordance with these requirements. The EKV tanks (containing liquid fuels or oxidizers) would protect against releases in the unlikely event of a transportation accident and therefore would meet DOT requirements. The EKV would have proper placards and only military or commercial carriers licensed to handle or transport hazardous materials would be utilized. Due to the nature of some road conditions, movement of construction equipment and material would cause temporary traffic delays; however, these delays would be temporary and infrequent; public announcements regarding potential delays would be made, and movements during off-peak travel hours would be scheduled to the greatest extent possible. Impacts to roads could also be minimized through the selection of the option of barge transports, also discussed in chapter 4.
Doris and Clair Olivers	P-E-0318-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-E-0318-2	Transportation	4.8.7.2	See P-E-0303-2
	P-E-0318-3	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	See P-E-0005-1
	P-E-0318-4	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	See P-E-0208-4
	P-E-0318-5	Transportation	4.8.6.2	As stated in 4.8.6.2, as many as 50 personnel could leave the SBX for onshore activities at Port Everett. Even given the extreme case of 50 vehicle trips per day, this level would be less than a 0.59 percent over the current level of 8,520 daily vehicle trips generated by Naval Station Everett. The likelihood of all SBX personnel leaving the Naval Station simultaneously is remote, and onshore activities would be of a limited duration (between test missions). No impacts to area roadways, including Everett city streets, are expected.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Doris and Clair Olivers	P-E-0318-6	Hazardous Materials	4.8.5	The SBX platform would be constructed (enclosed double bottom) and operated in accordance with the military, state, federal and international maritime (SOLAS) and (MARPOL 73/78) standard construction and operating requirements for safety and pollution prevention. As such, regular inspections would occur and fueling operations would be monitored and controlled. Any potential breach or leak would be handled in accordance with existing Naval and Coast Guard procedures.
	P-E-0318-7	Air Quality	4.8.1.2	See P-E-0208-3
	P-E-0318-8	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
Cha Smith - KAHEA: The Hawaiian- Environmental Alliance	P-E-0319-1	EIS Process	3.6	The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from PMRF on the island of Kauai are current on-going activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned. For this reason, the scoping process and hearings were not held on Kauai but in Honolulu, which is closest to the location of the new proposed activities.
	P-E-0319-2	EIS Process	3.6	The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from PMRF on the island of Kauai are current on-going activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned. For this reason, the scoping process and hearings were not held on Kauai but in Honolulu, which is closest to the location of the new proposed activities.
	P-E-0319-3	EIS Process		The Draft EIS has been sent to the Hanapepe Public Library, Kapaa Public Library, Koloa Public and School Library, Lihue Public Library, Princeville Public Library, and Waimea Public Library. The GMD ETR program would not include additional launches from PMRF; all proposed Strategic Target System launches would be included under ongoing activities.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Cha Smith - KAHEA: The Hawaiian- Environmental Alliance	P-E-0319-4	EIS Process	3.6	The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from PMRF on the island of Kauai are current on-going activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned. For this reason, the scoping process and hearings were not held on Kauai but in Honolulu, which is closest to the location of the new proposed activities.
	P-E-0319-5	Environmental Justic	3.12	An Environmental Justice impact would be a long-term health, environmental, cultural, or economic effect that has a disproportionately high and adverse effect on a nearby minority or low-income population, rather than all nearby residents. No adverse long-term impacts have been identified at any of the locations analyzed in this EIS. As such, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on the minority or low-income populations that may be present in the vicinity of those locations. Thus, no Environmental Justice impacts are anticipated. Native Hawaiian sovereignty is a political issue that would be best addressed outside an environmental document.
	P-E-0319-6	EIS Process		This is beyond the scope of the EIS.
	P-E-0319-7	Land Use	4.4	Political issues addressing the Hawaiian Kingdom fall outside the scope of the EIS.
	P-E-0319-8	Program		Comment noted.
	P-E-0319-9	Environmental Justic	3.4	All missile launches and related activities at PMRF are a part of the No Action Alternative. Potential impacts to cultural resources have been analyzed in previous environmental documents. The addition of a TPS-X radar at sites analyzed for similar radars in previous environmental documents would have no effect on cultural resources. Consultation concerning cultural resources has been conducted for those previous environmental documents. SBX activities at Pearl Harbor would not impact native Hawaiian cultural resources. Operation of the SBX at the Barbers Point mooring area would be short-term and temporary and would occupy a very small area relative to any potential traditional use areas.
	P-E-0319-10	Biological Resources	4.4.2	Habitat for the Hawaiian monk seal is discussed on pages 3-45 (Midway) and 3-73 (PMRF).
	P-E-0319-11	Biological Resources	4.4.2	The potential for impacts to sea turtles on land is discussed in section 4.4.2 and to free swimming sea turtles in section 4.11.2.3, Pacific Ocean.
	P-E-0319-12	Biological Resources	4.4.2	The potential for impacts to seabirds is discussed in sections 4.4.2 and 4.11.2.3, Pacific Ocean.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Cha Smith - KAHEA: The Hawaiian- Environmental Alliance	P-E-0319-13	Biological Resources	4.4.2	The potential for impacts to biological resources is discussed in sections 4.4.2 and 4.11.2.3, Pacific Ocean.
	P-E-0319-14	Safety and Health	4.4.4 4.1.7 4.5.5 4.3.5	See sections 4.4.4, 4.1.7, 4.5.5, and 4.3.5. Each missile flight test event would be modeled. The models incorporate a number of variables such as the missile mass, velocity, trajectory, altitude, reliability and descriptions of the environments that may affect the missile in flight, such as surface and high altitude winds. The Range Safety Office would communicate the extent of the clearance area, time, and date of the flight test, once they are defined, to the FAA, the U.S. Coast Guard, appropriate emergency management agencies, and local police jurisdictions for assistance in the clearance of designated land and sea-surface areas. Other areas under the flight path but not in a predicted impact or debris area would be monitored before the test event to determine the location of population or traffic. Tests do not proceed unless the Range Safety Office determines that the general population, including ship traffic, would be in a safe position.
	P-E-0319-15	EIS Process		This is beyond the scope of the EIS.
	P-E-0319-16	Program		The exact route planned for the SBX from the Gulf of Mexico to its PSB is not known at this time. Coordination with appropriate agencies will occur prior to operations in the Gulf of Mexico and the trip to the Pacific.
	P-E-0319-17	Airspace Use	4.6.2	As stated in section 4.6.2, the SBX would not exceed the FAA 3000 V/m peak power threshold. The SBX could exceed the FAA 300 V/m average power threshold out to 12.1 kilometers (7.5 miles) (65% populated radar) or 19 kilometers (11.8 miles) (100% populated radar). The average power threshold is based upon reducing the time of exposure of aircraft avionics (electronic equipment) to High Intensity Radiated Fields in order to preclude shortening the life of the aircraft avionics. Therefore, the concern here is not interference but is a reduction in life of the aircraft avionics. The SBX would be constrained so that the existing ground-, air-, and sea-based electronics are not impacted. As stated in the EIS, while in port, or at a nearby mooring location, the 20 minutes of daily calibration and tracking would be coordinated in both time and space so as to reduce any potential EMR interference to a negligible level. Based on the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process, the high energy radiation operating area for the SBX would be modified to fit existing airport and airspace requirements. The FAA would provide notice regarding the SBX operating area to local airports and aircraft through a NOTAM.
	P-E-0319-18	Program		This is beyond the scope of the EIS.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Cha Smith - KAHEA: The Hawaiian- Environmental Alliance	P-E-0319-19	Safety and Health	4.11.1.3	Section 4.11.1.3 discusses the potential impact from intercept debris.
Katherine Lynch	P-E-0320-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Patricia Neel	P-E-0321-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Larry Fox	P-E-0322-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Mary Lee Griswold	P-E-0323-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Anne Hartley	P-E-0324-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Betty Taylor	P-E-0325-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Patricia Neel	P-E-0326-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Toni Marthaller- Andersen	P-E-0327-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Patricia Neel	P-E-0328-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Kimberli McCabe - Port Gardner Bay Recovery	P-E-0329-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Philip Notermann	P-E-0330-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Bill Mulliken	P-E-0331-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Norma Jean Young	P-E-0332-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Frederick Olson	P-E-0333-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Laurie Keith - Whidbey Island No Spray Coalition	P-E-0334-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Sally Goodwin	P-E-0335-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Robert Kenny	P-E-0336-1	P-E-0289	Multiple	See responses to comment number P-E-0289.
Fred Geisler	P-E-0337-1	Policy		See P-E-0026-1

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Elisa Miller	P-E-0338-1	EIS Process		No decision on where to place the SBX will be made until the NEPA process is complete.
Dale and Laura Temple	P-E-0339-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0339-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0242-1
M. Ward Hinds - Snohomish Health District	P-E-0340-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4 2.1.8 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2	Sections 2.1.4, 2.1.8, 4.3.5.2.5, 4.6.5.2, and 4.8.5.2 of the EIS indicate the SBX operating and mooring areas and general operational effects. A large body of evidence was used in determining the current IEEE human exposure and measurement practices standards (IEEE C95.1-1999 and IEEE C95.3-1999) on which the EIS EMR analysis is based. The IEEE standards afford the public protection and have safety factors built in. Through the use of software controls, constraints placed on the SBX operating area, and coordination with local, state, and federal agencies, potential interference levels would be below the IEEE standards. New information on the potential effects of electromagnetic radiation on human health from the proposed SBX has been added as appendix G of the EIS.
Erich Franz	P-E-0341-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Melinda Gladstone	P-E-0342-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0242-1
	P-E-0342-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Suzanne A. Fageol	P-E-0343-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Dan Warnock	P-E-0344-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Eve Riley	P-E-0345-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Susan Berta - Orca Network	P-E-0346-1	EIS Process		The scoping session was held in Seattle because, when the meeting was set up, several other installations in the Seattle area were still being considered. The Seattle location appeared in logical proximity to all locations, and we were ensured the scoping session was widely publicized in the Seattle area. Additional meetings were held 5 April in Everett, Washington concerns. The comment period was also extended.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Susan Berta - Orca Network	P-E-0346-2	Biological Resources	4.8.3	As stated on page 4-242, the SBX vessel would incorporate marine pollution control devices such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues, and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices in compliance with the UNDS provisions of the Clean Water Act. No significant long-term adverse impacts to biological resources are anticipated. As stated on page 4-241, no significant long-term impacts to species such as the whales in the area are anticipated.
	P-E-0346-3	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
Constance Hallgarth	P-E-0347-1	Safety and Health	4.8.5.2 Appendix G	A large body of evidence was used in determining the current IEEE human exposure and measurement practices standards (IEEE C95.1-1999 and IEEE C95.3-1999) on which the EIS EMR analysis is based. The IEEE standards afford the public protection and have safety factors built in. Through the use of software controls, constraints placed on the SBX operating area, and coordination with local, state, and federal agencies, potential interference levels would be below the IEEE standards. New information on the potential effects of EMR on human health has been added to what was section 4.8.5.2 and provided as appendix G of the EIS.
	P-E-0347-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-E-0347-3	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
	P-E-0347-4	Program		Based on five tests per year, the SBX would be at its PSB for 7 months per year. The GMD ETR testing activities would likely occur over a period of approximately 10 years following a decision to proceed. If Naval Station Everett is selected as its PSB, the SBX would likely be docked at one of the two existing piers.
	P-E-0347-5	Program	2.0	See P-E-0020-11
Laura Hartman	P-E-0348-1	Safety and Health	4.8.5	See section 4.8.5. The FCC regulations are primarily based on the 1986 National Council on Radiation Protection Report, but also incorporate portions the 1991 IEEE standard. Refer to P-E-03-40-1 and P-W-0139-4 responses. A large body of evidence was used in determining the current IEEE human exposure and measurement practices standards (IEEE C95.1-1999 and IEEE C95.3-1999) on which the EIS EMR analysis is based. The IEEE standards afford the public protection and have safety factors built in. Through the use of software controls, constraints placed on the SBX operating area, and coordination with local, state, and federal agencies, potential interference levels would be below the IEEE standards, and therefore additional studies are not warranted or planned at this time. As with other standards, the current standard is followed until there is an official change.

Table 8.1.2-2: Responses to Email Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Laura Hartman	P-E-0348-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-E-0348-3	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-E-0348-4	Policy		See P-E-0026-1

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK