

8.1.3 PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT DOCUMENTS—DRAFT EIS

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

Public Hearing Comments

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

Response to Public Hearing Comments

Table 8.1.3-2 presents the responses to substantive comments to the Draft EIS that were received in public hearing transcript form. Responses to specific comments can be found by locating the corresponding commenter ID number and sequential comment number identifiers.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 8.1.3-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Public Hearing Documents)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Jim Sykes	P-T-0001
Greg Garcia - Alaskans for Peace and Justice	P-T-0002
Steve Cleary - Citizens Opposed to Defense Experimentation Code	P-T-0003
Judy Mikels - Ventura County Supervisor	P-T-0004
Brian Miller - Congressman Elton Gallegly	P-T-0005
Charlotte Craven - City of Camarillo	P-T-0006
Robert Lagomarsino - Former Member of U.S. Congress	P-T-0007
Frank Schillo - Retired Ventura Co. Supervisor	P-T-0008
Anthony Volante - Councilmember from City of Port Hueneme	P-T-0009
Kathy Long - Ventura County Supervisor	P-T-0010
Alex Herrera - City of San Buenaventura	P-T-0011
Devon Chaffee - Nuclear Age Peace Foundation	P-T-0012
Bob Conroy	P-T-0013
Wayne Davey - Rockwell Scientific Company	P-T-0014
David Faubion - Ventura Peace Coalition	P-T-0015
Gordon Birr - The Beacon Foundation	P-T-0016
Bill Conneen	P-T-0017
Jack Dodd	P-T-0018
Norman Eagle	P-T-0019
Henry Norten	P-T-0020
Gloria Roman	P-T-0021
Don Hayes	P-T-0022
Carolyn Heitman	P-T-0023
Mike Sirofchuck	P-T-0024
Brad Stevens	P-T-0025
Wayne Stevens - Kodiak Chamber of Commerce	P-T-0026
Mike Milligan	P-T-0027
Pam Foreman - Kodiak Island Convention & Visitors Bureau	P-T-0028
Gary Carver	P-T-0029
John Mohr - Executive Director, Port of Everett	P-T-0030
Horst Petsold	P-T-0031
John Flowers	P-T-0032
Bob Jackson	P-T-0033
Morrie Trautman	P-T-0034
Mark Nagel	P-T-0035
Dave Salsman	P-T-0036
Dale Moses	P-T-0037
Richard Windt	P-T-0038
Walter Selden	P-T-0039

Table 8.1.3-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Public Hearing Documents Continued)

Commentor and Affiliation	ID Number
Daryl Williams - Tulalip Tribes	P-T-0040
Sheila Baker	P-T-0041
MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition	P-T-0042
Elden Boothe - Vandenberg Action Coalition	P-T-0043
James Carucci	P-T-0044
Hobert Parker	P-T-0045
Suzanne Marinelli	P-T-0046
Todd Morikawa - Fellowship of Reconciliation	P-T-0047
Doreen Redford	P-T-0048
Kyle Kajihiro - American Friends Service Committee	P-T-0049
Fred Dodge	P-T-0050
William Aila	P-T-0051
Terri Keko'olani-Raymond - Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific	P-T-0052
Peter Yee - Office of Hawaiian Affairs	P-T-0053
Karen Murray	P-T-0054
William Gosline - 'Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific	P-T-0055
Kalama Niheu - Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific	P-T-0056
Gail Chism/Lowell	P-T-0057
Justin Ruhge	P-T-0058

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK

1 PUBLIC HEARING - GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE
2 EXTENDED TEST RANGE
3 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
4
5

6 MR MICHAELSON: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen and thank you for
7 coming tonight. I am Lewis Michaelson, and I've been asked by the Missile Defense
8 Agency to serve as the moderator for tonight's hearing. This is one of seven Public
9 Hearings being held on the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range
10 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. During tonight's hearing, we will refer to the
11 Ground-Based Midcourse Defense and GMD and we will refer to the Draft
12 Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.
13

14 This public hearing is being held in accordance with provisions of the National
15 Environmental Policy Act and implementing regulations. The act requires federal
16 agencies to consider the potential environmental impacts of their activities in the
17 decision-making process.
18

19 The purpose of tonight's hearing is to provide you with information on the GMD
20 program and proposed GMD Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize the
21 findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your comments on the Draft EIS.
22

23 Let's look at tonight's agenda. After I finish the introduction, Colonel Kevin
24 Norgaard, seated to my left who is the Director of the Site Activation Command for
25 GMD in Alaska, will describe the proposed GMD flight test activities. Then Mr. David
26 Hasley, the Chief of the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, National
27 Environmental Policy Act Compliance Branch, will describe the process called for the
28 National Environmental Policy Act. He will also present the environmental analysis and
29 results of the Draft EIS.
30

31 The last item on the agenda, however the public comment portion, is really the
32 most important. Remember the Draft EIS is just that – a draft. This is your opportunity to
33 tell the GMD Project Office how it can improve its analysis of potential environmental
34 impact before the document is finalized and before a decision is made on whether or not
35 to proceed with the proposed action.
36

37 Now a few administrative points on making comments tonight. If you have
38 already signed up to speak and I have several already that's great. If not and would like to
39 speak tonight, please go to the registration table and fill out one of the cards. Everyone is
40 welcome to speak, but it makes the process run more smoothly if I can call on people
41 from a list. We also have a reserved area up here to my left and that we will be asking
42 people to come up and sit in as I call the list of speakers after the presentations
43

44 Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of four minutes and may speak only
45 once. You may not combine or yield speaking times to other people. Elected officials will

1

MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK

46 be given the courtesy of speaking first. All other speakers will be called up in the order in
47 which they signed up. There is a court reporter here today, seated to my left over at that
48 table making a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all of your oral comments will
49 be recorded accurately. As part of preparing that transcript, an audio and video recording
50 is being made of tonight's hearing as well. The other cameras you see here are for the
51 media.
52

53 If you are uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also provide verbal
54 comments by telephone. There is a toll-free telephone number indicated on the on the
55 handout that you may use for recording those comments. This is the handout that you
56 should have received when you came in and it has a lot of important contact information
57 for you.
58

59 You may also submit written comments. There are four ways to do that. You may
60 hand in written comments that you brought with you tonight, either to me or a person at
61 the registration table. Second, you may use the written comment sheets that are available
62 at the registration table to write down any comments and turn them in tonight. Third, you
63 may mail written comments to the name and address that appear on the comment sheet or
64 again on the handout. Or last of all, you may e-mail comments to the address listed on the
65 handout.
66

67 Your written comments will be entered into the formal record of public comments
68 on the Draft EIS, and they will be given the same consideration as oral comments offered
69 here tonight.
70

71 If you choose to mail in comments, please be sure that to postmark them by
72 March 24, 2003 to be considered in the Final EIS.
73

74 Also, if you would like to receive a copy of the Final EIS when it becomes
75 available there are several ways you can do that. If you have already received a Draft EIS
76 in the mail, you are already on the mailing list and will automatically receive the Final
77 EIS, unless you indicate otherwise. If you provide either oral or written comments, along
78 with your address you will be sent a copy of the Final EIS. If you are not on the mailing
79 list, you may fill out a card such as this and that will place you on the mailing list and
80 then you can choose what type of documentation you would like to receive. You can also
81 request a copy of the Final EIS through the e-mail address and copies of the Final EIS
82 will be placed local libraries in this case it will be in the Anchorage Municipal Library on
83 Denali Street.
84

85 Finally, it's important for you to understand the Government representatives are
86 not here tonight to make any decision. Their main purpose in being here is to listen
87 firsthand to your suggestions and concerns. With that we will begin with Colonel
88 Norgaard's presentation.
89

2

Exhibit 8.1.3-1: Reproductions of Public Hearing Documents

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

COMMENT
NUMBERMISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK

COLONEL NORGAARD: Good evening. I am Colonel Kevin Norgaard. I live here in Anchorage. I am the Director for Site Activation Command for GMD. The Missile Defense Agency, formerly known as the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, is the Department of Defense agency responsible for developing and testing a Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the following charts, I will briefly describe the GMD Extended Test Range, provide an overview of the GMD and how it works, and address the decisions to be made. But before I do, I would like to describe the overall concept of the Ballistic Missile Defense System under development and explain the different segments of the System.

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

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

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

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

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

The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This slide

3

COMMENT
NUMBERMISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK

indicates the proposed locations for the various components in the Extended Test Range. As you can see the extended test range could include components in the Lower 48 through the Pacific and here in Alaska, Kodiak and near the end of the Aleutians unintelligible.

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

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

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

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

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

4

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>178 A Sea-based Test X-Band Radar, or SBX, is proposed to support the Extended 179 Test Range flight-testing. This SBX would be a multi-function radar that would perform 180 tracking, 181 discrimination, and intercept assessment of incoming test missiles. The SBX would be 182 assembled at an existing shipyard on the United States Gulf Coast. 183</p> <p>184 Three conceptual SBX performance regions have been identified to accomplish 185 effective radar coverage for flight-testing. The SBX would operate within the confines of 186 one of the three performance regions based on the needs of the particular flight test 187 scenario. Potential primary support bases have been identified based in part on their 188 proximity to these performance regions. 189</p> <p>190 Approximately 10 to 12 days before GMD operational tests, the SBX would leave 191 the Primary Support Base to travel to its performance region in the Pacific Ocean. The 192 SBX would be stationed at its primary support base between flight test missions. The 193 SBX would have a deep draft, which would restrict it from many harbors. The SBX may 194 dock to a deep draft pier if it is available between missions. If a pier is not available, the 195 SBX would most likely be moored three to ten miles off shore while at the primary 196 support base. Potential locations for the primary support base analyzed in the Draft EIS 197 were Port of Valdez and Adak Alaska; Naval Base Ventura County/San Nicolas Island, 198 near Oxnard California; Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii; Naval Station Everett, 199 Washington; Reagan Test Site, Republic of the Marshall Islands. Daily activities 200 provided by the support base might include logistics, re-supply, and maintenance and 201 repair. Radar operations in the vicinity of the Primary Support Base may include tracking 202 of satellites and calibration devices. Vessels from the primary support base would re- 203 supply the SBX. During transit between the primary support base and the test location, 204 periodic radar operation for satellite and calibration device tracking, including joint 205 satellite tracks with GMD sensors and other pre-mission activities may also occur. 206</p> <p>207 Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS, which may meet some of the enhanced test 208 objectives, include launching target and/or interceptor missiles for the Kodiak Launch 209 Complex, adding interceptor missile launches from Vandenberg Air Force Base, and 210 launching target missiles from mobile platforms over the broad ocean area. The target 211 and interceptor missiles could be launched in sets of two under some testing scenarios 212 from either the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, or Vandenberg Air Force 213 Base. 214</p> <p>215 In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminals would be 216 constructed in close proximity to the proposed Ground-Based Interceptor launch sites and 217 expected intercept area. Existing launch sites and test resources would continue to be 218 used in enhanced test scenarios. 219</p> <p>220 Launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the Kodiak Launch Complex may 221 require up to two additional small mobile radars and telemetry stations in South Central 222 or Southwest Alaska for telemetry and flight safety.</p>		<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>223</p> <p>224 Existing ship-borne sensors would be used for mid-course tracking of the target 225 missile during Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch 226 Complex and Vandenberg Air Force base. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would be 227 constructed and used in tests to perform tracking, discrimination, and assessment of 228 target missiles. 229</p> <p>230 The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for the GMD extended test range 231 testing. For Alternative 1, we would propose the following components: First, single and 232 dual Ground-Based Interceptor launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex, and the 233 Reagan Test Site; Second, single and dual target launches from the Kodiak Launch 234 Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base and the Reagan Test Site; Third, single target 235 launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and a mobile target launch platform. 236 Construction of two Ground-Based Interceptor silos, an additional target launch pad, and 237 associated support facilities would be needed at the Kodiak Launch Complex. We would 238 also construct an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the 239 Kodiak Launch Complex and at a location in the Mid-Pacific. The SBX would be used in 240 tests for tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missiles. 241</p> <p>242 Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1, with the exception that Ground 243 Based Interceptor launches would be from Vandenberg Air Force Base instead of from 244 the Kodiak Launch Complex. The ground-Based Interceptor launch would require 245 construction on an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal and 246 modification of existing support facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base. 247</p> <p>248 Alternative 3 would combine activities proposed for Alternatives 1 and 2 and 249 would include Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch 250 Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base, and construction of the required support 251 facilities. 252</p> <p>253 Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD Extended Test Range would not be 254 established and interceptor and target launch scenarios could not be tested under more 255 operationally realistic conditions. The SBX would not be developed. Testing at the 256 existed GMD test ranges using existing launch areas would continue. 257</p> <p>258 The decision to be made is whether to enhance the current GMD flight test 259 capability by selecting from the list of alternatives presented, including the No Action 260 Alternative. 261</p> <p>262 The Missile Defense Agency is still evaluating the feasibility, safety, and utility to 263 the GMD testing program of conducting a limited number of checkout Ground-Based 264 Interceptor flight tests for Fort Greely. The possibility of such flights is too speculative to 265 be analyzed at this time. The Missile Defense Agency will perform an EIS if and when it 266 proposes to conduct Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely. 267</p>	
5		6	

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

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>268 The Federal Aviation Administration, or FAA which is a cooperating agency for 269 this Draft EIS, will also rely on the analysis to make its environmental determination for 270 a launch site operator license at the Kodiak Launch Complex. 271</p> <p>272 The FAA's alternatives to be evaluated include renewing the current launch site 273 operator license with no modification; issuing a license for the list of activities as 274 identified in Alternative 1; issue a license for the list of activities as identified in 275 Alternative 2; and the FAA's No Action Alternative, which would be to not issue a 276 license renewal for the Kodiak Launch Complex. 277</p> <p>278 At the conclusion of this environmental review process, the FAA will issue a 279 separate decision document to support its licensing determination. The FAA will draw its 280 own conclusions from the analysis presented in the Final EIS and relevant information 281 contained in the FAA's earlier Environmental Assessment of the Kodiak Launch 282 Complex, and will assume responsibility for its decision and any related mitigation 283 measures. This concludes the program overview and now I would like to introduce Mr. 284 David Hasley who will describe the environmental analysis process. 285</p> <p>286 MR. HASLEY: Good evening, my name is David Hasley and I am with the U.S. 287 Army Space and Missile Defense Command my office is responsible for preparation the 288 EIS on behalf of the Missile Defense Agency. And, tonight I will briefly discuss the EIS 289 process and describe the results of our analysis. 290</p> <p>291 The National Environmental Policy Act requires that federal agencies consider 292 the environmental consequences of their proposed actions in their decision-making 293 process. The Missile Defense Agency has decided to prepare an EIS under the National 294 Environmental Policy Act to analyze the environmental effects of extending the current 295 GMD Test Range. 296</p> <p>297 As you may be aware, the first phase in the preparation of an EIS is to conduct 298 what is called scoping, to identify environmental and safety issues that should be and 299 addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping meetings were held in Kodiak, Anchorage, 300 Adak, and Valdez, Alaska as well as Oxnard and Lompoc, California; Honolulu, Hawaii; 301 and Seattle, Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal and state agencies 302 as well as Native Alaskan groups were held to obtain their views concerning the 303 proposed action, its alternatives, and potential effects within their areas of expertise or 304 which were of particular concern to them. Following scoping, the next step was to further 305 refine the possible alternatives being considered for GMD Extended Range testing. The 306 Draft EIS was the then prepared to address reasonable alternatives, including the No- 307 Action Alternative, reasonably foreseeable future actions, and information on cumulative 308 effects. The Draft EIS has been made available to federal and state agencies and to the 309 general public for review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this comment 310 period, public hearings like the one here tonight are being held to receive public input. 311</p>		<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>312 All comments received will be reviewed and considered in preparing the Final 313 EIS. The Final EIS will then be made available to the public for a period of 30 days. No 314 sooner that 30 days after the release of the Final EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will 315 make public its decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Extended Test Range 316 activities. 317</p> <p>318 The Missile Defense Agency identified 15 environmental resource areas that 319 normally require some level of analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on those 320 areas with the most potential for environmental impacts. Each resource area was 321 addressed at each location unless it was determined through initial analysis that the 322 proposed activities would not result in an environmental impact to that resource. 323</p> <p>324 The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with implementing 325 the Proposed Action or its alternatives. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed the 326 environmental issues associated with licenses or permits required to implement the 327 proposed action at each of the potential extended test range sites. As an example, the 328 FAA will utilize the Extended Test Range EIS to support its licensing decision, which 329 has already been proposed to renew the launch sites operator's license for the Kodiak 330 Launch Complex. 331</p> <p>332 The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference several environmental analyses 333 associated with current Ballistic Missile Defense System tests assets that include the 334 Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and 335 Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also incorporated by reference is the analysis of 336 environmental impacts contained in the GMD Validation of Operation Concept 337 Environmental Assessment. 338</p> <p>339 The Draft EIS also analyzed the potential for cumulative impacts from other 340 Department of Defense, Government, and commercial activities in areas where GMD 341 actions are proposed. 342</p> <p>343 The potential environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIS are presented in 344 the next several slides. For you convenience, this information has been reproduced as a 345 fact sheet, which is available at the registration table. I would like to highlight a few 346 resource areas that may be important to you. As you will see, minimal impacts were 347 identified from the implementation of the proposed action because most of the proposed 348 actions are a continuation or similar to existing activities at a number of the various 349 locations. 350</p> <p>351 At the Kodiak Launch Complex, air quality impacts would be minimal for short- 352 term increases in air emissions of both construction activities and launches. The launches 353 would be part of the activities currently licensed for the site. It is not likely that the 354 proposed action of up to five launches in conjunction with other currently planned or 355 participating launches at the Kodiak Launch Complex will receive this level of activity.</p>	

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

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>356 Overall impacts to regional air quality are not expected to be adverse and would remain 357 within National and State and Ambient Air Quality Standards.</p> <p>358</p> <p>359 At the Kodiak Launch Complex, air quality impacts would be minimal for short- 360 term increases in air emissions from construction activities as well as launches. The 361 launches would be part of the activities currently licensed for the site. Its is not likely that 362 the Proposed Action of up to five launches in conjunction with other currently planned or 363 anticipated launches at the Kodiak Launch Complex would exceed the previous analyzed 364 level of activity. Overall impacts to regional air are not expected to adverse and would 365 remain within National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards.</p> <p>366</p> <p>367 Likewise, the impacts to biological resources would be similar to those from on- 368 going activities. Wildlife monitoring at the Kodiak Launch Complex concluded there 369 could be temporary short-term effects on wildlife near the launch complex. However, we 370 expect no adverse impacts to threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>371</p> <p>372 As part of the Geology and Soils analysis we looked at whether facilities built at 373 the Kodiak Launch Complex complied with current building code requirements. In fact 374 1994 building code, which was in effect when the current facilities were built, appears to 375 be more stringent than the current International Building Code of 2000. In addition, no 376 adverse effects to soil chemistry are expected.</p> <p>377</p> <p>378 With respect to Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes, the quantities 379 generated would not exceed the amount anticipated for normal operations at the Kodiak 380 Launch Complex. The Kodiak Launch Complex would manage this under their current 381 plan.</p> <p>382 Under Health and Safety, the Propose Action will not increase the risk to workers 383 and the general public over current operations. Notices of launches will continue to be 384 announced in advance. Launch activities would be within the launch site operator's 385 license currently in place for the Kodiak Launch Complex.</p> <p>386</p> <p>387 Access to Fossil Beach and other nearby public areas would continue to limited 388 during hazardous operations and in the interests of national security, as has been done 389 previously at the Kodiak Launch Complex.</p> <p>390</p> <p>391 There could be a potential lodging shortage during the of tourist season due to the 392 launch activities. To reduce the potential shortage, the Missile Defense Agency is 393 considering construction of an addition to the existing to Narrow Cape Lodge or an 394 additional man-camp.</p> <p>395</p> <p>396 With regard to subsistence, there would be a slight decrease in the amount of land 397 available for subsistence uses because of additional security fencing at the Kodiak 398 Launch Complex. However, the areas that are proposed for fencing are not significant 399 subsistence use areas in the region.</p> <p>400</p>		<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>401 At the Port of Valdez, small quantities of hazardous materials used during construction 402 activities would result in the generation of added waste and would be accommodated in 403 accordance with existing protocol and regulations.</p> <p>404</p> <p>405 The SBX will follow U.S. Navy requirements that to the extent practical ship 406 shall retain its hazardous waste aboard ship for shore disposal. In compliance with 407 Uniform National Discharge Standards, the SBX vessel would incorporate marine 408 pollution prevention control such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and 409 residues and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices, in the design or routine 410 operation. Handling and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be 411 in accordance with State of Alaska, Department of Transportation, and Department of 412 Defense policies and procedures.</p> <p>413</p> <p>414 Implementation of SBX operational safety procedures, including establishment of 415 controlled areas, and limitations on the areas subject to illumination by the radar units, 416 would preclude any potential safety hazard to either the public or to the workforce. An 417 Electromagnetic Radiation/Electromagnetic Interference survey and analysis would be 418 required as part of the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process.</p> <p>419</p> <p>420 Coordination would be required with the U.S. Coast Guard to lessen requirement 421 for Valdez Narrows channel closure and preclude potential delays of oil tankers and 422 cruise ships using the area, as well as to establish any required security zone at the 423 mooring site.</p> <p>424</p> <p>425 As would be expected, the impacts for these three resource areas at Adak are the 426 same as those I just described for the Port of Valdez.</p> <p>427</p> <p>428 This slide show the other sites proposed for the primary support bases analyzed in 429 the Draft EIS and the resource areas that were determined to have a potential 430 environmental concern. Impacts at Naval Base Ventura County, California; Naval Station 431 Everett, Washington; and Pearl Harbor Hawaii are expected to be minimal as described 432 before with the Port of Valdez.</p> <p>433</p> <p>434 The Pacific Missile Range Facility, the Reagan Test Site, and the Vandenberg Air 435 Force Base, like the Kodiak Launch Complex, all have on-going missile operations. 436 Impacts to air quality, hazardous materials and waste and health and safety, would be 437 minimal for continuation of existing launch activities.</p> <p>438</p> <p>439 Likewise, the impacts to biological resources would be similar to those from on- 440 going activities. Therefore, we expect no adverse impacts to threatened or endangered 441 species.</p> <p>442</p> <p>443 In addition to tonight's hearing, written comments on the Draft EIS will continue 444 to be accepted until March 24, 2003, at the address shown on the slide. After the 445 comment period is over, we will consider all comments, as we conduct the analysis.</p>	
9		10	

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

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>446 Again, equal consideration will be given to all comments, whether they are presented 447 here tonight, e-mailed to us or submitted by regular mail.</p> <p>448</p> <p>449 Once the Final EIS is complete, we will mail it to all of the individuals who 450 requested a copy. If you are not on our mailing list you can request a copy by writing to 451 the street address here, or the e-mail address given in the handout, or by filling out a card 452 at the registration table tonight. That concludes the environmental portion of the meeting 453 tonight and I'll turn it back over now to Mr. Michaelson for continuation of the meeting.</p> <p>454</p> <p>455 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. We are ready to begin calling out the names of 456 those you indicating that you would like to make comments tonight. We have a reserved 457 area, right behind this gentleman seated in front of me for speakers. What I would like to 458 do is I will read out the first several names and if you will come up and sit in those seats 459 it will make the process run more efficiently. We will be using this podium right in front 460 of me for public comments. I will be calling on you in which the order you signed up and 461 because we like to record your comments fully and accurately we ask that you speak 462 clearly into the microphone, because of the acoustics it will be important that you speak 463 clearly that to make sure that the Court Reporter can capture everything you have to say. 464 Also, at the beginning of your speaking time state your name for the Court Reporter.</p> <p>465</p> <p>466 We kindly request that you observe the four-minute limit for oral comments. We 467 are using the four-minute in all the hearings in all of the states where they are being held 468 to give everyone a fair and equal chance to make their comments. We greatly appreciate 469 your understanding and cooperation in observing this limit.</p> <p>470</p> <p>471 To aid you in knowing when the four minutes are up, I have a simple method for 472 indicating times. After three minutes, I will raise my index finger indicating that you 473 have one minute left. This should help you find a comfortable place to wrap-up your 474 comments. At the end of four-minutes will hold up my closed hand, indicating it is your 475 time is finished. So it is important to look up at me occasionally from your paper if that is 476 what you are doing so you won't miss the signal.</p> <p>477</p> <p>478 I have one other request, that is: you please withhold any expressions whether for 479 or against anything a speaker has to say. Speaking in public can be very intimidating, and 480 this will ensure that everyone has an equal chance to offer their comments. This will also 481 ensure that the Court Reporter is capturing all of your comments. expressions until the 482 speaker is finished. Thank you in advance.</p> <p>483</p> <p>484 If you choose not to make an oral comments remember that you can also hand 485 them in writing, mail them in, e-mail them in so there is a variety of ways to do that and 486 again written comments are given the same consideration as oral comments offered here 487 tonight.</p> <p>488</p> <p>489 Again, remember there is no decision being made here tonight. The main purpose 490 of the government representatives being here is to learn first hand of your concerns and</p> <p>11</p>		<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>491 suggestions. We are going to read the names of the first several speakers and if you 492 would come up to the reserved area I would appreciate it. Jim Sykes, Greg Garcia, Terry 493 Pauls and Don McKenzie. Actually, we are going to take a minute to rearrange the 494 microphones.</p> <p>495</p> <p>496 JIM SYKES: Thank you very much my name is Jim Sykes. I come from Palmer, 497 AK. I appreciate the mailings. I have received the Executive Summary and one other 498 mailing. I would recommend cutting your postage cost though. These two items cost 499 \$17.00 for the American taxpayer, which, I thought, was a little excessive. I come here 500 tonight because I have two concerns, One is conceptual and the other is environmental. I 501 was recently made aware the top Pentagon evaluator is of Weapons Programs is Mr. 502 Thomas P. Christy issued a report that asked some serious questions about this whole 503 thing. I think they are kind of startling. He is the Director of Operational Test and 504 Evaluation. Another, clause from the report says, in FY02 the GMD, the Ground-Based 505 Midcourse Missile System Program continued to demonstrate the technical feasibility of 506 intercepting a bullet with a bullet against simple target complexes however, due to the 507 stage of development and the following testing annotations the GMD element has yet to 508 demonstrate significant operational capability. I think that is a long phrase meaning it 509 doesn't work. Another, item on the report talked about the early entry weapon into 510 production as being a questionable way to go, and I quote "One of my chief concerns is 511 the potential for systems to circumvent the rigorous acquisition process and enter into full 512 reproduction or into the hands of our war fighters without learning operational 513 capabilities and limitations demonstrated by adequate operational testing and evaluation. 514 Although you might see that as an argument for additional testing we now understand 515 that missiles are going to be installed in Fort Greely without full testing and that brings to 516 question it may make Alaskans at greater risk from one of our own American rockets and 517 then any little fire sticks that North Korea could send our way. And, this concerns me 518 greatly because I don't see any such evaluation of a potential catastrophe from one of our 519 own rockets that is untested landing on our own waters or land here in Alaska. I think it 520 needs to be part of the examination. There is something else, another quote from the 521 report "I recognized and agree in principle with the desired to field new capabilities as 522 soon as possible but that desire should be tempered with responsibility to ensure the 523 weapons will not put the Americans at risk and this is precisely the case that we are 524 facing here with an early deployment and your asking for extended test ranges when the 525 operational capabilities of the rockets haven't even proven to work. In many times in the 526 cases so far and we don't know how many test were dummied up.</p> <p>527</p> <p>528 In relation to the Environmental Impact Statement itself, I did not have the benefit 529 of seeing the whole thing I only have the Executive Summary but I found three troubling 530 entries. One is there is no health or safety issues said to be important enough to recognize 531 in the Impact and Mitigations Summary for the Kodiak Launch Complex and the 532 Ground-Based 533 Interceptor or target. In the broad ocean area there is biological resources said no adverse 534 impact. I think we have to recognize it for a long time, you know kind of seeing the 535 ocean as a big toilet because it takes just takes everything away and nothing happens. I</p> <p>12</p>	<p>P-T-0001</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>

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

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>536 mean I realize it is a part of a closed system of which we are all apart and I don't think 537 we can take either health or safety considerations apart.</p> <p>538</p> <p>539 So, in summary I would say the No-Action Alternative allows the things to 540 continue. I would propose a roll back alternative to stop and take a breath until this think 541 actually makes since and actually works before you ask for anything new and in the 542 second place I would oppose the FAA license renewal for Kodiak until some of these 543 things are done. Thank you very much.</p> <p>544</p> <p>545 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much Mr. Sykes. The next speaker is 546 Greg Garcia.</p> <p>547</p> <p>548 MR. GARCIA: Hello, my name is Greg Garcia. I have received the Draft 549 Environmental Impact Statement, which is indeed a weighed document. I have began 550 looking over it and begun address some of those issues in writing. Rather today I want to 551 address the general issues of the Star Wars Program as policy issue. I was pleased to see 552 that one of the sites was named the Reagan Test Site I think it is an appropriate name for 553 the facility in the Marshall Islands since this name did come from him. So, whether we 554 call it SDI, NMD, BMDs, or GMD no matter how many names you give it it's still 555 basically Star Wars.</p> <p>556 First of all, Star Wars protects us from the least likely attack scenario, the launch 557 of an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile. Number two, it squanders tax payer resources 558 which could be better spent on education health care or basic infrastructure of people for 559 example; highways, courts, etc., as well as legitimate defense needs. Number three, it 560 makes less rather than more secure. It encourages other countries to develop more 561 advanced weapons systems. It discourages countries from abiding by the terms of 562 treaties, which we have chosen to violate or terminate. Number four, it appears to be a 563 program promoted through lobbying the very war industry contractors who are being 564 paid to build the system with taxpayer dollars. At the same time these very corporations 565 will use their clout to weasel out of paying their fair share of the tax burden. Number 566 five, it is a component of a larger plan by the United States Space Command to establish 567 "Full spectrum dominance of the battle field and deny others the use of space". This is 568 not defense but an offensive plan. As a citizen I insist prior to any new construction the 569 military completely clean up all toxic sites in Alaska. Especially, the reactor at Fort 570 Greely and the removal of all radioactive materials associated with it.</p> <p>571</p> <p>572 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Terry Pauls. I will call his 573 name again in case she or he is just stepped out temporarily. The next speaker will be 574 Don McKenzie, Steve Cleary, Thomas Higgins if you have not already made your way 575 up.</p> <p>576</p> <p>577 MR. CLEARY: Thank you Mr. Michaelson. Again, for the record my name is 578 Steve Cleary I am the organizer for Citizens Opposed to Defense Experimentation Code. 579 Which is a collation of 10 Alaskan groups opposed to missile defense deployment here in 580 Alaska. I will try not to echo the concerns already brought up. I did have two specific to</p>	<p>5</p> <p>P-T-0002</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>P-T-0003</p>	<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/25/03 – ANCHORAGE, AK</p> <p>581 the EIS, which we already heard is a ballonomous document. Two particular ones, I 582 guess I will start out with the Sea-Based X-Band Radar proposed to be deployed in 583 Valdez. I noticed the part, again in the Draft EIS talking about EEDs, which Mr. Hasley 584 could respond and I found it really helpful. But, I will quote from the Environmental 585 Impact Statement here "Typical EED applications and the presence phase would fire 586 extinguishers, automotive air bags a missile attached to the wing of an aircraft and 587 military aircraft ejection seats. Now, it goes on further to say the potential impacts from 588 the EEDs from emissions from the XBR or the X-Band Radar are two-fold the EED 589 could be made not to work or the EED could be inadvertently initiated and both of those 590 two seem like a dangerous concept to our air bags, fire extinguishers and some military 591 aircraft are going to work when they shouldn't or they won't ever work again. I don't 592 know if there is a good way to test that. It goes on to give an area and peak time, different 593 beam separations of whether and how much this would effect places like Valdez, Adak or 594 wherever this mobile Sea-Based X-Band Radar would be deployed and that is certainly 595 one concern.</p> <p>596</p> <p>597 A great concern we have here in Alaska and I am sure that you have heard similar 598 things in other parts of the country are missiles coming back down and exploding. We 599 had one roughly are year ago, a year ago November in Kodiak that had to be detonated 600 and we are concerned that if such a missile were fired again from Kodiak with 601 trajectories that might include a safe area where folks inside are living or if they are 602 coming from Greely that they would population centers in danger or such infrastructure 603 devices of the Trans Alaska Pipeline. I know we are not talking about Greely tonight, 604 unfortunately, which I think is a detriment to this whole process if we are disjointed in 605 such a way. But, I would like to conclude by just positing the question even if do decide 606 that we are going to deploy missiles, interceptors or test missiles at Greely by September 607 of 2004, could we even have an EIS process completed? It lends me to think that this 608 process isn't really given the grievance that it should. I mean we had scoping hearings for 609 this part of it a while ago and now we are having the Draft Environmental Impact 610 Statement and if we are going to put 14 missiles in the ground or 10 or 12 at Greely are 611 we even going to have time to study them? Thank you for the ability to talk.</p> <p>612</p> <p>613 MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Thomas Higgins. I will go back to the names 614 that I called earlier, Terry Pauls he stepped out briefly, Don McKenzie and Thomas 615 Higgins. I exhausted the list of speakers that I have for the evening but since we came to 616 this far to get your comments I would like to find out if there is anybody else that has 617 been inspired in the meantime to speak tonight to please take advantage before we 618 adjourn back to the Open House Session I see none. Thank you very much for coming 619 to this portion of it. We will adjourn this portion of it at 7:41 pm and the staff that were 620 available earlier are there to answer other questions that might have occurred to you since 621 you saw the presentation. Thank you very much.</p> <p>622 CERTIFICATION: This hearing was recorded and transcribed by the undersigned to the 623 best his ability and reflects the content presented. DATED: AT ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, 624 on March 14, 2003. A. L. COZZETTI, Court Reporter and Transcriber.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>
13		14	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1</p> <p>GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE EXTENDED TEST RANGE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for coming tonight. I am Julia Elliott, and I am with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I have been asked by the Missile Defense Agency to serve as the moderator for tonight's hearing. This is one of seven public hearings being held on the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement. During tonight's hearing, we will refer to the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense as GMD, and we will refer to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.</p> <p>This public hearing is being held in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and implementing regulations. The act requires federal agencies to consider the potential environmental impacts of their activities in the decision-making process.</p> <p>The purpose of tonight's hearing is to provide you with information on the GMD program and proposed GMD Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize the findings</p>		<p>2</p> <p>presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your comments on the Draft EIS.</p> <p>Let's look at the agenda for tonight. After I finish the introduction, Commander Robert Dees of the Ground Based Midcourse Defense X-Band Radar Project Office will describe the proposed GMD flight test activities. Then Ms. Sharon Mitchell, Program Manager for the EIS, will describe the process called for in the National Environmental Policy Act. She will also present the environmental analysis and results of the Draft EIS.</p> <p>The last item on the agenda, the public comment portion, is really the most important. Remember that the Draft EIS is just that -- a draft. This is your opportunity to tell the GMD Project Office how it can improve its analysis of potential environmental impacts before the document is finalized and before a decision is made on whether or not to proceed with the proposed action.</p> <p>Now a few administrative points on making comments tonight. If you have already signed up to speak, that's good. I have approximately five sign-up cards already. If you have not already filled out a card and would like to speak tonight, please go to the registration table and sign up. Everyone is</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: right;">3</p> <p>welcome to speak, but it makes the process run more smoothly if I can call on people from a sign-up list. We will also have a reserved area up here of six seats that will be for upcoming speakers, so we can move through the process efficiently.</p> <p>Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of four minutes and may speak only once. You may not combine or yield speaking times to other people. Elected officials will be given the courtesy of speaking first. All other speakers will be called in the order in which they signed up. There is a court reporter here today, seated to my left, making a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all of your oral comments will be recorded accurately. As part of preparing that transcript, an audio and video recording is being made of tonight's hearing as well.</p> <p>If you are uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also provide verbal comments by telephone. There is a toll-free telephone number indicated on the handout that you may use for recording those comments.</p> <p>You may also submit written comments. There are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in written comments that you brought with you tonight either to me or to a person at the</p>		<p style="text-align: right;">4</p> <p>registration table. Second, you may use the written comment sheets that are available at the registration table to write down any comments you wish to make and turn them in tonight. Third, you may mail written comments to the name and address that appear on the comment sheet. Or last of all, you may e-mail comments to the address listed on the handout for tonight's hearing.</p> <p>Your comments will be entered into the formal record of public comments on the Draft EIS, and they will be given the same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight.</p> <p>If you choose to mail in comments, please note that they must be postmarked by March 24th, 2003 to be considered in the Final EIS.</p> <p>Also, if you would like to receive a copy of the Final EIS when it becomes available, there are several ways you can do that. If you have already received a Draft EIS in the mail, you are already on the mailing list and will automatically receive the Final EIS, unless you tell us otherwise. If you provide either oral or written comments, you will be sent a copy of the Final EIS. If you are not on the mailing list, you may fill out a request at the registration table. You can also request a copy by sending an e-mail to the address</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p>listed on the handout. Also, copies of the Final EIS will be placed in area libraries. A list of those libraries is available at the registration table and can also be found in the Draft EIS. The Final EIS will also be put on the Missile Defense Agency website listed on the handout.</p> <p>Finally, it is important for you to understand that the Government representatives are not here tonight to make any decision. Their main purpose in being here is to listen firsthand to your suggestions and concerns. With that, we will begin with Commander Dees' presentation.</p> <p>COMMANDER DEES: Good evening. My name is Commander Robert Dees, and I am a technical advisor for the GMD X-Band Radar Project Office. The Missile Defense Agency, formally known as the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, is the Department of Defense agency responsible for developing and testing a Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the following charts, I will briefly describe the GMD Extended Test Range, provide an overview of the GMD and how it works, and address the decisions to be made. But before I do, I would like to describe the overall concept for the Ballistic Missile Defense System under development and explain the different segments of the system.</p>		<p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p>This chart represents the flight of a ballistic missile. A ballistic missile flight path has three basic parts, which we call segments. Those segments are the boost segment, when the missile is thrusting and leaving the atmosphere; the midcourse segment, the middle or ballistic phase; and the terminal segment, where the missile re-enters the earth's atmosphere.</p> <p>Within each of these segments, our missile program has to this point been characterized by discreet, independent programs, which we call elements. Each element worked to shoot down ballistic missiles in a particular segment of flight.</p> <p>Now, however, the Missile Defense Agency is now moving towards an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System. Instead of having discrete, stand-alone elements, we plan to eventually tie the programs for the various elements together so we can shoot down missiles in all segments of flight. Each segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense System could include several elements, which are different ways of providing a defense against the threat missile during the same phase of its flight. All segments and elements are designed to work together as each element is developed. At the same time, each element could provide an effective</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: right;">7</p> <p>stand-alone defense against a specific type of threat.</p> <p>The GMD element is part of the Midcourse Defense Segment of the Ballistic Defense System. The GMD element is the successor to National Missile Defense and includes the same components.</p> <p>The conceptual GMD element would consist of the components shown on the slide. These components are the Ground-Based Interceptor; existing early-warning radars and satellites; the X-Band Radar, which performs tracking, discrimination, and assessment of the incoming missile; the Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System; the Battle Management Command and Control, which is the central communication and control point; and finally, the In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal, which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor while the interceptor is in flight.</p> <p>The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This slide indicates the proposed locations for the various components in the Extended Test Range. Of particular importance locally -- and it may be hard to see -- is the Sea-Based Test XBR & IDT. This is</p>		<p style="text-align: right;">8</p> <p>the part of the system that we are considering for homeporting in the Everett Naval Station.</p> <p>The GMD testing would be of two types. One type of testing would involve increasingly robust Ground-Based Interceptor flight testing in the Pacific region in scenarios that are as operationally realistic as possible. The other type would involve validation of the operational concept through integrated ground tests using GMD components. These are the tests using Fort Greely and other locations analyzed in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment. These ground tests do not involve missile flights or intercepts.</p> <p>The Draft EIS, which is the subject of this hearing, evaluates the first type of GMD testing, involving interceptor flight-testing. This interceptor flight-testing will be the focus of our discussion tonight.</p> <p>As you can see from this slide, the existing interceptor test capability includes the use of the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and the Reagan Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. Current testing includes launching target missiles from Vandenberg Air Force Base and launching</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>9</p> <p>Ground-Based Interceptors from the Reagan Test Site, with intercepts occurring over the broad ocean area. The ground-based radar prototype at the Reagan Test Site is used to track, discriminate, and provide updates to the interceptor during flight, while a radar on Oahu is used as a tracking sensor. For some tests, target missiles are also launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex and viewed by the Early Warning Radar at Beale Air Force Base. Current capability does exist to launch target missiles from the Pacific Missile Range Facility as well. These scenarios present a very limited capability to demonstrate the effectiveness of the GMD element because the Ground-Based Interceptor can be launched only from the Reagan Test Site. This limits our ability to test the system in an operationally realistic environment.</p> <p>The extension of the existing GMD test range would increase the realism of GMD testing by using multiple engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometries, distances, speeds of targets, and interceptors to closely resemble an operational scenario involving attack by one or more threat missiles. We are proposing to add dual target and Ground-Based Interceptor launch capability at the Kodiak Launch Complex and/or at Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also proposed are mobile target launch capability and shipborne radars. The proposed</p>		<p>10</p> <p>Extended Test Range would provide more operationally realistic flight testing, as President Bush and Congress have directed.</p> <p>A Sea-based Test X-Band Radar, or SBX, is proposed to support the Extended Test Range flight-testing. This SBX is a multi-function radar that performs tracking, discrimination, and intercept assessment of incoming target missiles. The SBX would be assembled at an existing shipyard on the United States Gulf Coast.</p> <p>Three conceptual SBX performance regions have been identified to accomplish effective radar coverage for flight-testing. The SBX would operate within the confines of one of the three performance regions based on the needs of the particular flight test scenario. Potential primary support bases have been identified based in part on their proximity to these performance regions.</p> <p>Approximately 10 to 12 days before GMD operational tests, the SBX would leave the Primary Support Base to travel to its performance region in the Pacific Ocean.</p> <p>The SBX would be stationed at its primary support base between flight test missions. The SBX would have a deep</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: right;">11</p> <p>draft, which would restrict it from many harbors. The SBX may dock to a deep-draft pier if it is available between missions. If a pier is not available, the SBX would most likely be moored 3 to 10 miles off shore while at the primary support base. Potential locations for the primary support base analyzed in the Draft EIS were Port of Valdez and Adak, Alaska; naval base Ventura County/San Nicolas Island, near Oxnard, California; Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii; Naval Station Everett, Washington; and Reagan Test Site, Republic of the Marshall Islands. Daily activities provided by the support base might include logistics, re-supply, and maintenance and repair. Radar operations in the vicinity of the Primary Support Base may include tracking of satellites and calibration devices. Vessels from the Primary Support Base would re-supply the SBX. During transit between the primary support base and the test location, periodic radar operation for satellite and calibration device tracking, including joint satellite tracks with GMD sensors and other pre-mission activities may also occur.</p> <p>Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS, which may meet some of the enhanced test objectives, include launching target and/or interceptor missiles from the Kodiak Launch Complex, adding interceptor missile launches from Vandenberg Air Force Base, and launching target missiles from mobile platforms over the</p>		<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>broad ocean area. The target and interceptor missiles could be launched in sets of two under some testing scenarios from either the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, or Vandenberg Air Force Base.</p> <p>In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminals would be constructed in close proximity to the proposed Ground-Based Interceptor launch sites and expected intercept area. Existing launch sites and test resources would continue to be used in enhanced test scenarios. Launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the Kodiak Launch Complex may require up to two additional small mobile radars and telemetry stations in South Central or Southwest Alaska for telemetry and flight safety.</p> <p>Existing shipborne sensors would be used for mid-course tracking of the target missile during Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would be constructed and used in tests to perform tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missiles.</p> <p>The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for the GMD extended test range testing. For Alternative 1, we would propose the following components: First, single and dual</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>13</p> <p>Ground-Based Interceptor launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex and the Reagan Test Site; second, single and dual target launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and the Reagan Test Site; and third, single target launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and a mobile target launch platform. Construction of two Ground-Based Interceptor silos, an additional target launch pad, and associated support facilities would be needed at the Kodiak Launch Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the Kodiak Launch Complex and at a location in the mid-Pacific. The SBX would be used in tests for tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missiles.</p> <p>Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1, with the exception that Ground-Based Interceptor launches would be from Vandenberg Air Force Base instead of from the Kodiak Launch Complex. The Ground-Based Interceptor launch would require construction of an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal and modification of existing support facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base.</p> <p>Alternative 3 would combine activities proposed for Alternatives 1 and 2 and would include Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch Complex and</p>		<p>14</p> <p>Vandenberg Air Force Base, and construction of the required support facilities.</p> <p>Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD Extended Test Range would not be established and interceptor and target launch scenarios could not be tested under more operationally realistic conditions. The SBX would not be developed. Testing at the existing GMD test ranges using existing launch areas would continue.</p> <p>The decision to be made is whether to enhance the current GMD flight test capability by selecting from the list of alternatives presented, including the no action alternative.</p> <p>The Missile Defense Agency is still evaluating the feasibility, safety, and utility to the GMD testing program of conducting a limited number of checkout Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely. The possibility of such flights is too speculative to be analyzed at this time. The Missile Defense Agency will perform an EIS if and when it proposes to conduct Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely.</p> <p>This concludes the Program Overview. Now I would like to introduce Ms. Sharon Mitchell, who will describe the</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>Environmental Analysis Process.</p> <p>MS. MITCHELL: Hello. My name is Sharon Mitchell. I'm with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I am the Program Manager for the preparation of the EIS on behalf of the Missile Defense Agency.</p> <p>The National Environmental Policy Act requires that federal agencies consider environmental consequences of their proposed actions in their decision-making process. The Missile Defense Agency has decided to prepare an EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act to analyze the environmental effects of extending the current GMD Test Range.</p> <p>As you may be aware, the first phase in the preparation of an EIS is to conduct what is called scoping, to identify environmental and safety issues that should be addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping meetings were held in Kodiak, Anchorage, Adak and Valdez, Alaska; Oxnard and Lompoc, California; Honolulu, Hawaii; and Seattle, Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal and state agencies were held to obtain their views concerning the proposed action, its alternatives, and potential environmental effects within their areas of expertise or which are of particular</p>		<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>concern to them. Following scoping, the next step was to further refine the possible alternatives being considered for GMD Extended Range testing. The Draft EIS was then prepared to address reasonable alternatives, including the no-action alternative, reasonably foreseeable future actions, and information on cumulative effects. The Draft EIS has been made available to federal and state agencies and to the general public for review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this comment period, public hearings are being held to receive public input. That brings us to tonight's hearing.</p> <p>All comments received will be reviewed and considered in preparing the Final EIS. The Final EIS will then be made available to the public for a period of 30 days. No sooner than 30 days after the release of the Final EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will make public its decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Extended Test Range activities.</p> <p>The Missile Defense Agency identified 15 environmental resource areas that normally require some level of analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on those areas with the most potential for environmental impacts. Each resource area was addressed at each location unless it was determined through initial analysis that the proposed activities would</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>17</p> <p>not result in an environmental impact to that resource.</p> <p>The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with implementing the Proposed Action or its alternatives. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with licenses or permits required to implement the proposed action at each of the potential extended test range sites.</p> <p>The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference several existing environmental analyses associated with current Ballistic Missile Defense System test assets that include the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also incorporated by reference is the analysis of environmental impacts contained in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>The Draft EIS also analyzed the potential for cumulative impacts from other Department of Defense, Government, and commercial activities in areas where GMD actions are proposed.</p> <p>The potential environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIS are presented in the next several slides. For your</p>		<p>18</p> <p>convenience, this information has been reproduced as a fact sheet, which is available at the registration table for your review. I would like to highlight a few resource areas that may be important to you. As you can see, minimal impacts are identified from the implementation of the proposed action. Most of the impacts are minimal because the proposed actions are a continuation of existing activities at various locations.</p> <p>At the Naval Station Everett, an Electromagnetic Radiation/Electromagnetic Interference survey and analysis would be conducted as part of the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process. The results of the survey would be used to define the safe operating area for the SBX. This area would not interfere with airspace operations and would allow for a safe operating environment.</p> <p>The small quantities of potentially hazardous materials used during construction activities would result in generation of added wastes that would be handled by Naval Station Everett under their normal waste management procedures. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would follow U.S. Navy requirements that, to the maximum extent practical, ships shall retain hazardous waste aboard ship for shore disposal. In compliance with Uniform National Discharge Standards, the</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: right;">19</p> <p>Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar vessel would incorporate marine pollution control devices, such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues, and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices, in design or routine operation. Handling and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in accordance with State of Washington, Department of Transportation, and Department of Defense policies and procedures.</p> <p>Implementation of SBX operational safety procedures, including establishment of controlled areas, and limitations in the areas subject to illumination by the radar units would preclude any potential safety hazard to either the public or workforce.</p> <p>As you can see, the Draft EIS analyzed these resource areas for the other potential primary support bases at Naval Base Ventura County, California; Adak and Port of Valdez, Alaska; and Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Impacts at each of those sites are expected to be minimal.</p> <p>The Kodiak Launch Complex, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, the Reagan Test Site, and Vandenberg Air Force Base all have ongoing missile operations. Impacts to air quality, hazardous materials, and health and safety would be minimal</p>		<p style="text-align: right;">20</p> <p>from continuation of existing launch activities.</p> <p>Likewise, the impacts to biological resources would be similar to those from ongoing activities. We expect no adverse impacts to threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>In particular at the Kodiak Launch Complex, socioeconomic impacts could be expected because of the potential for lodging shortages during the tourist season due to launch activities. To reduce the potential for a lodging shortage, the Missile Defense Agency is considering construction of an addition to the Narrow Cape Lodge and/or the construction of an additional mancamp.</p> <p>In closing, please keep in mind that our goal is to provide decision-makers with accurate information on the environmental consequences of this proposal. To do this, we are soliciting comments on the proposed GMD Extended Test Range Testing. This feedback will support informed decision-making.</p> <p>In addition to tonight's hearing, written comments on the Draft EIS will continue to be accepted until March 24, 2003, at the address shown on the slide. After the comment period is over, we will consider all comments, as we conduct the</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>21</p> <p>analysis. Again, equal consideration will be given to all comments, whether they are presented here tonight, e-mailed, or submitted by regular mail to us.</p> <p>Once the Final EIS is complete, we will mail it to all of the individuals who requested a copy. If you are not on our mailing list, you can request a copy by writing to the street address or e-mail address given in the handout, or by filling out a card at the registration table.</p> <p>I will now turn the hearing back over to Ms. Elliott.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: We will now break for a 5-minute recess, and then we will begin taking your comments. If you would like to make verbal comments, please complete the verbal comment card provided at the registration table and turn it in to a person at the registration table.</p> <p>Please remember that no decision is being made tonight. The main purpose for the government representatives' presence here tonight is to learn firsthand of your concerns and suggestions.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and your courtesy during the evening. 5-minute recess, please.</p>		<p>22</p> <p>(5-minute recess.)</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: We are ready to start calling out the names of those of you who indicated you would like to make comments tonight. As I mentioned earlier, elected officials will be given the courtesy of speaking first. We have a reserved area, which are the front seats up here to my right. I would appreciate it if those elected officials who plan on speaking would begin making their way up here and occupying those seats. I have a list of people signed up so far. I will be calling on you in the order in which you signed up. I will start out by calling the first several names so you can get ready to come up front here to use the mike that's in the center, almost in the center aisle. Because we want to record your comments fully and accurately, we ask that you speak clearly into the microphone. Because of the acoustics in this room, it will be especially important that you speak clearly in order to make certain that the court reporter can capture everything you say. Also, at the beginning of your speaking time, please state your name for the court reporter.</p> <p>We kindly request that you observe the four-minute time limit for oral comments. We use the four-minute limit at these hearings to give everyone a fair and equal chance to make</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>23</p> <p>their comments.</p> <p>To aid you in knowing when the four minutes are up, I have a simple method for indicating times. After three minutes, I will raise my index finger, indicating that you have one minute left. This should help you find a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. At the end of four minutes, I will raise my closed hand, indicating it is time to finish your comments. So it is important to look up from your paper occasionally to see if you are being given a signal.</p> <p>I have one other request that will need to be enforced for the sake of the court reporter. That is, you must withhold any expressions either against or in favor of the speaker until the speaker is finished. Otherwise, there is no way that the court reporter can get all of the comments. So while you may be agreeing with the speaker by clapping or speaking out, you are probably making certain that we are not capturing the comments on the record. Please hold all of your expressions until the speaker is finished. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.</p> <p>We also greatly appreciate your cooperation and understanding in observing the four-minute limit. Also keep in mind that oral comments are only one way to share your thoughts and</p>		<p>24</p> <p>concerns regarding the Draft EIS. You can also hand in written comments tonight, e-mail them, or submit them by regular mail by March 24th, 2003. As I mentioned, written comments are given the same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight.</p> <p>With that in mind, we will begin. Our first speaker is John Mohr. He will be followed by Horst Petsold.</p> <p>MR. MOHR: Good evening. My name is John Mohr. I'm the Executive Director at the Port of Everett. I would like to say that assuming that the no-action alternative is not chosen, the Port is generally supportive of the siting of the SEX platform in Everett. However, it is necessary for us to obtain a more complete understanding of the possible impacts associated with such a facility in Everett. Consequently, the Port recommends that the following items be further studied and evaluated in greater detail in the Project Environmental Impact Statement: One, possible impacts to ship navigation, berthing, and maneuvering at the Port's deep-draft terminal area be considered; possible impacts to recreational, commercial -- recreational and commercial boat traffic in the Snohomish River Channel also be given consideration; certainly possible impacts associated with radar operations while the platform is in port including</p>	<p>P-T-0030</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>25</p> <p>those related to public health and safety be given specific consideration; and finally, possible heightened security measures that might impede shipboard commerce as a result of the siting of the SBX be considered. Satisfactory answers to these questions would help the Port confirm its support of the SBX platform in Everett. Thank you.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Horst Petsold and then John Flowers.</p> <p>MR. PETSOLD: My name is Horst Petsold. I speak with an accent. I hope you understand me. I like to know where you locate the platform in Everett. The next question is: Is there any radiation involved in the testing which affects the public? The next question is: Is any noise involved in the way of electronic noise? I experience right now some electronic noise in my house. I live close to the radio tower. Something is going on. Apparently the Navy is testing something, but we don't know. It's a possibility which I would like to bring up here. Is there any other interference during the testing period? Will the platform work independently, or is the platform connected to any high-voltage or whatever power? For how long will this platform sit over here in Everett? Forever? Or only a period of time during the testing? [Inaudible]. I have a lot of experience in weather science, and I would like to</p>	<p>3</p> <p>P-T-0031</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	<p>26</p> <p>know if there is any possibility under the area. Thank you for listening.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: John Flowers followed by Bob Jackson.</p> <p>MR. FLOWERS: John Flowers. I'm an attorney in Everett. I've practiced law in Washington since 1994, and in California I practiced there since 1966. I'm here tonight to speak for my adult children and my 12 grandchildren, many of whom are too young to understand what's happening, but would be extremely upset with their grandfather if they knew he had an opportunity to speak out against these things and didn't take the opportunity. I want to present to the people who make these decisions the dilemma they are facing. I'm going to spend most of my time -- half of my time on each dilemma. The first dilemma is that all the defects that were pointed out in the Star Wars system in the early '80s that caused it to be cancelled then -- the only information I have is what I read in the newspapers and on the Internet, but I don't believe that those defects have been corrected. Prices have gone way up. We can ill-afford a system that costs billions and billions of dollars in light of our huge budget deficits, which we are dumping on our children and grandchildren. Every Maginot-Line type device like this one in history has been defeated with a small inexpensive countermeasure, which</p>	<p>P-T-0032</p> <p>1</p>

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: right;">27</p> <p>led to more weapons, more expensive weapons, to try to overcome something else. The walls of Jericho were defeated. The walls of Rome were defeated. The Maginot Line in Europe was defeated by a simple end run around it, and this Maginot Line will be defeated as well. The cancellation of the ABM Treaty triggered off -- it's going to trigger off a massive new arms race, which the arms race earlier we experienced up to '89 bankrupted the Soviet Union, caused its collapse just before it bankrupted our country. But let me just pause for a moment and present to you -- and I hope this is answered in your analysis over the coming months -- what if this system works perfectly? What are the consequences of that? We have a long history of developing weapon systems and sharing them with, quote, allies like Osama Bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, the Shah of Iran, Ferdinand Marcos. We give them or sell them these weapons on credit and they have the possession of them, and then they have a regime change and then we have to fight the very weapons that we built. Of course, if this one is built perfectly, we're going to spend a ton of money trying to overcome it. I understand that we are going to share it with China, Russia, and any number of countries around the world who could have a sudden and unexpected regime change. Ladies and gentlemen, this is going to trigger off another arms race. I'm deeply concerned mainly for my grandchildren. Not only the expense involved, the debt we're dumping off on</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">28</p> <p>them, but the extreme danger we're creating for them. We ought to be waging peace and not war. Thank you very much.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Bob Jackson and then Morrie Trautman.</p> <p>MR. JACKSON: My name is Bob Jackson. Twenty years ago, before there was a naval station in Everett, I used to drive out past the Foss Tug Company onto a pier near the spot at which the USS Lincoln and other navy ships now dock. On the end of that pier there was small public place where I could watch sailboats and people out fishing for the day. This was a peaceful place to relax and listen to the sounds of the gulls, sea lions, and the working waterfront. Later the Navy came, and that place is gone. Now a walking and bicycle trail is being planned near the waterfront to give back some of the shoreline access. People will be able to walk down part of that trail to the mouth of Pigeon Creek No. 1 where a small park will again offer this community that close-up, relaxed look out over the bay. On the bottom of Page 34 of the proposed Environmental Impact Statement, the Draft statement, it is written that -- and I quote -- "Because this type of activity consistently occurs at Naval Station Everett, no impacts to visual resources are anticipated," end quote. To whoever wrote this part of the statement, it may not seem like adding the SBX facility would have a</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">P-T-0033</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>29</p> <p>significant impact since there are already navy ships here, but that is wrong. Because of its size and extraordinary design, this floating platform would have a huge visual impact. Besides its actual presence, the SBX facility would be a powerful symbol. It is a \$900 million component in a proposed anti-ballistic missile system that many of us believe should not be built. This is our community. This is where my wife, my neighbors, and I have chosen to live. Many of us are volunteering our time and labor to make this a more desirable community. We already have our fair share of military resources in Everett. I propose that you choose the no-action alternative. If you decide otherwise, I ask that you choose another location. Thank you.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Morrie Trautman followed by Mark Nagel.</p> <p>MR. TRAUTMAN: My name is Morrie Trautman. It's been a little bit hard for us to gain information on this subject through the website and trying to find specific sites. It's hard to address specifics, so I would like to just maybe address some concerns tonight and submit some more in writing later on. One of them is just the very nature of the test itself and that is the open-endedness of it. From what my understanding is is that this is a funded program for a test system that really has no end to it until it goes into --</p>	<p>P-T-0034</p> <p>1</p>	<p>30</p> <p>until it tests out solid and is actually set out in the ocean. In looking at that from a standpoint of a local impact, for us that presence of that thing is forever. If there is no end to the test programs and stuff as they continue, we'll look at it forever. We have already in Everett, by entertaining the Navy and some of the other sites that we have down on the waterfront, have made our contribution to aesthetic deficiencies probably. I don't feel that we're under any obligation to entertain any more or take any more additions. I think we have already made our contribution there. One of the other concerns we have is some of the emissions and stuff or the potential emissions of electromagnetic radiation and electromagnetic interference. What are the safety nets that are in place with this system? What are the redundant safety nets that are in place for the system? What are the what-ifs? What if it fails? What happens? What are the implications to the local population? We have a hospital within blocks that is probably very, very sensitive to these kinds of interferences. So I would like to see that addressed. Thank you.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Mark Nagel followed by David Salsman.</p> <p>MR. NAGEL: My name is Mark Nagel, resident of Everett, Washington. What I saw in here, I guess, I kind of concur</p>	<p>2</p> <p>P-T-0035</p>

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>31</p> <p>with everybody else that came up before me -- a lot of questions. I really don't see the need for this necessarily. I think it's a continuation of some massive delusions by Edward Teller. At any rate, the visual and aesthetic resources -- again, I have no idea how anybody could determine this would have no impact. Zero impact means an absence of something. There is obviously a presence of something here. So how was this measured? Was it just height? Did somebody say, Well, we already have things that are a certain height, so this falls within that height restriction? This clearly is a mass. How much of the mass is above water and is exposed? Is that the measurement that we should be looking for? With regards to measurement, the fellow before me, is there going to be any sort of independent measurements? Can we really trust our government to give us accurate numbers on the emissions that may be radiating from this unit? I would demand that there would be independent testing for various aspects of this. I know that complex systems mean complex failures. Bigger systems mean bigger failures. Are we really prepared for a big failure? It will happen. I was a little bothered by the statement that there are seven public hearings being made. There's not seven in Everett, people. There's one. There's one. So don't take that number to mean anything other than just one hearing here. I have a couple technical questions that can</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>32</p> <p>probably go on the record. They would probably bore everybody here. I guess the operative location is out in the ocean. I'm still, I guess, not sure exactly the various operations of this unit, where, whether this will be towed out and then turned on or it will be operating while it's in the bay. Also, likewise I used to sail out in the bay. I'm concerned about obstruction to our normal recreation. That's what Everett is pushing itself for is a recreational community. What I want to know is what will be the peak and average power levels and on what frequencies? You say that it's safe. Well, there is a over-the-horizon radar in Alaska that's known to cook birds that fly through its beam. I don't consider that to be environmentally friendly for our feathered friends. Technical, is this a phased array or is it a conventional rotating beam? And are there any encoding activities in the outgoing radar pulses? They use all sorts of energy sources to generate data streams. Will this system take advantage of the synthetic ionospheric reflectors that are generated by the Harp -- H-A-R-P -- array on the North Slope in Alaska? And that's it.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: David Salsman followed by Dale Moses.</p> <p>MR. SALSMAN: My name is Dave Salsman. My question is one of trust. I trusted tonight I would come here and receive</p>	<p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>P-T-0036</p>

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>33</p> <p>some information so I could understand the potential problem that this might create in my community. I've got nothing so far, folks, frankly. I'm sorry about that. You show me a picture. The first thing I see here is an example with no frame of reference to Everett or anything else for that matter. Is that as big as Hat Island out there, is it as big as the aircraft carrier when it comes through, or is it like a tug boat? You can't tell from what you're showing us. It's absolutely useless information. I'm a mechanical engineer, retired. I built equipment of a class that would go on that facility for offshore oil rigs. I've installed it in ports. I've installed Navy hardware in ports. Your environmental record is terrible, okay, from personal observation. If it can happen, it will happen. It happened yesterday. It was all over everything. I'm not an expert on radar, but I am an expert on my mother-in-law's garage door opener. When the aircraft carrier came in, we had hearings like this, I'm sure, and everything was explained like this, I'm sure; but when they turned the radars on down at the naval base, my God. My mother-in-law's garage door came open four or five times in the middle of the night -- an 85-year-old lady with the garage door open in the middle of the night. It didn't impress me a whole lot. What really didn't impress me was the Navy's humming and hawing for the next six months and denying the fact that it was the aircraft</p>	1	<p>34</p> <p>carrier. A matter of trust. If we can't trust you folks to tell us what's happening, when it's happening, give us assistance in the technical solution of problems, then we don't want you here. Okay? Is that understood? We don't want you here unless you face up to the real problems and be upfront with us. I guess that's what I would like to say tonight. This could be a problem. It might not be a problem. We probably need this. I've got a next door neighbor who is on the Lincoln tonight flying drones over God knows where from the deck of that aircraft carrier. He isn't home with his family. I've got some sympathy there, but you people when you're working in a community like this and bring this kind of facility in, let's at least be upfront after the fact when you're operational so we can solve problems as they come up. Okay? Thank you.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Dale Moses and then Richard Windt.</p> <p>MR. MOSES: My name is Dale Moses. I have been a citizen here in the county for about nine years. I currently work for the County. I don't intend to speak for the County. I would like to state a case that I'm in favor of the SBX project coming here. The previous speaker said we don't want you. I don't include myself in that "we." I suspect there are a few other people that would not want to be included in</p>	P-T-0037

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: right;">35</p> <p>that "we" either. I don't speak for anyone else. I'm only speaking for myself. I may bring a slightly different perspective than some of the folks in the room. I was a navy officer for 35 years. I was in a project office, the cruise missile project office. I went through a couple siting exercises, so I would like to speak a bit from what the project may see in bringing the SBX to Everett. Specifically I think the whole area here in Puget Sound, particularly Everett, could be superb for the project. You've got a workforce that's the best of any location that I have ever been stationed. You've got a quality of life here in the area and several people have spoken to that already, but that also attracts a very high caliber of engineer and of technician, and I think that would be important for the project from your standpoint as well. I think you will also find a high level of support from the community if you were to be here and working from here. Yes, there are perhaps some interesting histories of garage door openers. I happen to be involved in that case, and I might point out that it doesn't happen anymore. We solved the problem. It took the leadership of the community and some technical expertise in all to get to it. There will be problems with this, I'm sure, but I think from what I've seen in the community that the leadership and the elected officials and so forth will work to solve those problems. I may not be totally -- get</p>	1	<p style="text-align: right;">36</p> <p>everybody in this room to agree with me, but I think it's a very strong pro-military community and a pro-government and a pro-defense community as well, and I found that nine years ago when I first arrived. It's one of the reasons why my family and I have stayed. Lastly, I can't speak for the naval station anymore, but I think you will find it a host organization that can give you some pretty darned good service. I may have a little bit of bias in that because I had something to do with it for a couple years. So in conclusion, I hope that you will continue the project. I can't speak for its technical abilities, but I think it's the kind of thing the country needs to be investigating unfortunately, but nevertheless needs to do it. I would like to see Everett have a piece of it. Thank you very much. I might also point out I enjoy watching ships, and this is just another ship to watch. It's fun to watch sailboats. It's fun to watch eagles. It's also fun to watch ships. Thanks.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Richard Windt followed by Gail Chism/Lowell.</p> <p>MR. WINDT: Good evening. My name is Richard Windt. I'm on the Everett Board of Parks Commissioners. I was a lieutenant in the navy. My brother is in the army, lieutenant colonel retired. He lives in Huntsville. He has repeatedly been based in Kwajalein, Vandenberg, and Redstone</p>	P-T-0038

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>37</p> <p>Arsenal. I'm familiar with the need for some of these things, and yet I cannot think of a worse place than Everett to put this. It's a large metropolitan area, and you don't place things like this in a large metropolitan area. You place them in Valdez. Almost all the other points that you plan on locating this are better. Jetty Island is a beautiful beach. It's just like an ocean beach. You get out there, and you're completely away from everything. Beautiful. We send boats across there all summer long so our citizens can go over there and enjoy it. What they will be looking at is a 250-foot-high dome sitting right out there. Everett has the largest marina north of Marina del Ray in California. It's a pleasure-boating capital. There were sailboat races out there Sunday. I have been stopped in my boat going by the naval base. What is the area of restricted flow around this when it's out there? Is it really going to interfere with pleasure boating in the city? I just think it's poor planning to put this in Everett. I hope you do not consider Everett the base for this. Thank you.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Gail Chism/Lowell.</p> <p>MS. CHISM/LOWELL: First of all, I want to thank everybody for coming here tonight because I'm an average citizen living in an above-average city, and I think that our voices of the</p>	1	<p>38</p> <p>average citizen needs to be heard. I'm a 57-year resident of Snohomish County, and I have been actively involved in my community and the City of Everett for a number of years. I just learned about this Monday, so my questions aren't really fine-tuned. But the question of liveability and what that means to me does not mean that. We have taken our fair share. The Navy is here. They've done a good job of integrating into the community, but when the EIS was done before they came, the people that were hired to do the EIS as far as the bay and everything, environmental impacts, they quit in protest because what their studies showed and what they found to be true was not the final report. So that does go to trustability and accountability. Also, the fair share is the whole Puget Sound area. We've got Whidbey Island, Bremerton, Fort Lewis, Everett. We've done our fair share. View is very important. In microwave tower fights, view was an overriding consideration, and that's just one little poll sticking up. I see that as a real detriment. I wonder about the wake coming in and out. Tourism -- I don't really think people are going to come to say, Where is this new radar thing? We have given up a lot of our waterfront, and we are just now trying to take it back and give more to the people of Everett that have put their lives on doing everything to make it a better city. Are there any appeals to this, and what's the process? I also want to talk about the no-entry</p>	

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

EVERETT, WASHINGTON

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: right;">39</p> <p>zone and how far that would be. Is it going to be different than what the ships are now? I ask you to take a no-action position and to choose -- if you do decide to go ahead with this, to take it out of Washington state. Thank you.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: That is all the cards that I have. Is there anyone here who did not submit a card and would like to speak?</p> <p>MR. SELDEN: My name is Walter Selden, and I live in Everett. My first observation is if this is under full strength, this thing should be put far away from us. That would be testing. If you want to test it under full strength, you can't do that here. I guess how do you do it in half measure? How long is it going to be here? Would it be here and where would it be? Consistent questions. I agree with everyone with one exception. If I ran a business that was a -- and this was my business, would I want this in our bay under quarter-strength or a small-percentage strength, and what effect on us would that be? So if you're testing it, can you not test it under full strength where it needs to be tested full strength? It seems to undermine the whole theory of it being used here is to be here at all. The other thought is, without being completely flippant, it seems when I saw that picture I thought of the moon. My last word</p>	<p>P-T-0039</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">40</p> <p>is: Lunacy.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Sir, may I ask you to leave the card for me? Thank you.</p> <p>MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Daryl Williams. I live in Marysville, Washington. I work for the Tulalip Tribes in their Governmental Affairs Office. I'm not going to go into any detailed comments right now because just we found out about this two days ago and haven't had anything to review yet. First of all, I would like to say that we think the Navy has been a good neighbor for us here in Everett. When the base was being developed, we were involved in negotiations for that base because of impacts to our commercial fishing operations. The tribes of this country negotiated treaties that basically allowed the United States to take title to the land, but the tribes gained certain rights as a part of that, and our commercial fishing operations are one of those rights retained in our treaties. The tribes also realize that some sacrifices have to be made in order to provide the early-warning systems that this country needs for military actions. I think that the tribes and the military can work together to work out a solution that's agreeable to both of us if this area is selected. I would like to invite a meeting between the military and the</p>	<p>P-T-0040</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>

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

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>41</p> <p>tribes to discuss the issues. With that, I thank you.</p> <p>MS. ELLIOTT: Is there anyone else? Thank you for your courtesy tonight, thank you for your interest, and thank you for your participation. Good night.</p>		<p>42</p> <p>STATE OF WASHINGTON)) ss I, Toni L. Ziomas, CSR and COUNTY OF SNOHOMISH) Notary in and for the State of Washington, residing in Lynnwood in said county and state, do hereby certify:</p> <p>That the foregoing hearing was taken before me and completed on February 27, 2003, and thereafter transcribed under my direction:</p> <p>That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any party to this action or a relative or employee of any such attorney of counsel, and I am not financially interested in the said action or the outcome thereof:</p> <p>That I am herewith securely sealing the hearing and delivering the same to Sheryl Stubbs of Teledyne Solutions, 5000 Bradford Drive, Suite 200, Huntsville, AL 35805-1953.</p> <p>IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my Notarial Seal this _____ day of _____, 2003.</p> <p>_____ Toni L. Ziomas, CSR NOTARY PUBLIC</p>	

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

1

1 *** (ROUGH DRAFT ONLY) ***

2 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Good
3 evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for coming
4 tonight. I am Lewis Michaelson, and I have been asked by
5 the Missile Defense Agency to serve as the moderator for
6 tonight's hearing. This is one of seven public hearings
7 being held on the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended
8 Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement. During
9 tonight's hearing, we will refer to the Ground-Based
10 Midcourse Defense as GMD, and we will refer to the Draft
11 Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.

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

17 The purpose of tonight's hearing is to provide
18 you with information on the GMD program and propose GMD
19 Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize
20 the findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your
21 comments on the Draft EIS.

22 Let's look at the agenda for tonight. After I
23 finish the introduction, Commander Robert Dees of the
24 Ground-Based Midcourse Defense X-Band Radar Project Office
25 will describe the proposed GMD flight test activities.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

2

1 Then Mr. David Hasley, the Chief of the U.S. Army Space and
2 Missile Defense Command, National Environmental Policy Act
3 Compliance Branch, will describe the process called for in
4 the National Environmental Policy Act. He will also present
5 the environmental analysis and results of the Draft EIS.

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

14 Now a few administrative points on making
15 comments tonight. If you've already signed up to speak --
16 and we have several already -- that's great. If you have
17 not, please go to the registration table and fill out a
18 card. Anyone who would like to speak tonight, we'd
19 appreciate it, as long as we can do it from a sign-up list.
20 Everyone is welcome. We also have a reserved area up here
21 that I'll ask people to come sit in when we get ready to
22 take speakers after the presentations.

23 Each speaker will be allowed of four minutes, and
24 they speak only once. You may not combine or yield
25 speaking times to other people. All other speakers will be

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

3

1 called in the order in which they signed up.

2 There's a court reporter here today, seated to my
3 left, making a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that
4 all of your all comments will be recorded accurately. As a
5 part of preparing that transcript, an audio recording is

6 being made of tonight's hearing as well. You may have also
7 noticed the television cameras here. Those are not part of
8 the military's effort here. That's cable television who's
9 here tonight doing that.

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

16 involved and make comments.

17 You may also submit your comments in writing, and
18 there are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in
19 written comments you brought with you tonight either to me
20 or to the person at the registration table. Second, you
21 may use the written comment sheet, again available at the
22 registration table, and hand that in. Third, you may mail
23 written comments to the name and address that appear on the
24 comment sheet. And, finally, you may e-mail comments to
25 the address listed on the handout.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

4

1 Your written comments will be entered into the
2 formal record of public comment on the Draft EIS, and they
3 will be given the same consideration as oral comments
4 offered here tonight. If you do choose to mail in
5 comments, please note that they must be postmarked by
6 March 24th, 2003, to be considered in the Final EIS.

7 If you'd like to receive a copy of the Final EIS
8 when it becomes available, there are several ways you can
9 do that. If you already received the Draft EIS, then
10 you're already on the mailing list and will automatically
11 receive the final, unless you indicate to us otherwise. If
12 you provide either oral or written comments and provide us
13 with your address, you will also be sent a copy of the
14 Final EIS. If none of those apply to you and you would
15 like to receive it, there's a separate card at the
16 registration table. You can sign up to receive the Final
17 EIS. Also, copies of the Final EIS will be placed in the
18 local libraries, and a list of those libraries is available
19 at the registration table and can be found in the Draft
20 EIS. The Final EIS will also be put on the Missile Defense
21 Agency website listed on the handout.

22 Finally, it is important for you to understand
23 that the Government representatives are not here tonight to
24 make any decisions. Their main purpose in being here is to
25 listen firsthand to your suggestions and concerns.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

5

1 And with that, we will begin with Commander Dees'
2 presentation.
3 MR. AILA: Can I ask you a question, sir? I have
4 a question regarding your presentation.
5 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I'm sorry.
6 As far as the ground rules for the meeting tonight?
7 MR. AILA: Correct.
8 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Yes. What
9 is your question?
10 MR. AILA: Well, two questions. First, is
11 this -- my understanding is this is a scoping?
12 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): No, that is
13 incorrect. Scoping was already held on this at the time of
14 the notice of intent. This is a public hearing on the
15 Draft EIS. That's at a later stage of a National
16 Environmental Policy Act process.
17 MR. AILA: So we're past -- we're past scoping?
18 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Correct.
19 Was there a second question?
20 MR. AILA: Was a meeting held on Oahu?
21 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): For scoping?
22 MR. AILA: Yes.
23 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): David?
24 MR. HASLEY: Yes.
25 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Yes.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

6

1 MR. AILA: Do you know when that was?
2 MR. HASLEY: It was --
3 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Can you use
4 the microphone.
5 MR. HASLEY: -- September, as it turned out.
6 COMMANDER DEES: November?
7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you remember when it
8 (inaudible)?
9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
10 MR. AILA: September?
11 MR. HASLEY: Yeah. September '02. It was held
12 at the Best Western, which is very close to here.
13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thanks.
14 MR. AILA: Second question.
15 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.
16 MR. AILA: Second question was that -- I'm a
17 native Hawaiian, and I reserve the right to give my
18 testimony.
19 (Court Reporter interrupts to preserve record.)
20 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): You know
21 what, the problem with what we're doing right now is that
22 unless it's spoken on the microphone, we can't hear it.
23 That mic won't do you any good. These sound like questions
24 of clarification that maybe we can deal with.
25 MR. AILA: They should be -- they should be

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

7

1 answered before we start.

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

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

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

12 MR. AILA: For the record, my name is William
13 Johnson. I'm a junior. I come from Makua, Waianae --

14 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.

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

16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): All right.
17 What's your second question?

18 MR. AILA: Second question. First of all,
19 (inaudible). I come from a verbal society, an oral
20 society. So four minutes is not enough for me to, I think,
21 present my thoughts to you, which is what your purpose is
22 here tonight. Okay? So can we have some flexibility? I
23 mean, there aren't that many folks in here tonight; that
24 maybe the four minutes could be *exercised or maybe I can
25 speak for four minutes, and if anybody's -- everybody's

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

8

1 done and there's time, we can come back.

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

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

13 MR. AILA: I disagree because, you know, I'm not
14 in Alaska. I'm not in the Marshals. I'm not in
15 California. I'm in Hawaii where my ancestors come from,
16 and we're an oral society.

17 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

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

21 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

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

23 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): All right.

24 Thank you.

25 COMMANDER DEES: But we can take additional

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

9

1 verbal comments by the phone --

2 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Yes.

3 COMMANDER DEES: -- and also by (inaudible).

4 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

5 COMMANDER DEES: I know --

6 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): If you want
7 to make additional verbal comments, there's --

8 MR. AILA: One -- one of the problems with that
9 is when we speak in Hawaii, we often trigger other people's
10 thoughts. And I've seen the federal government do this
11 many, many times.

12 By limiting the testimony in private, there is
13 not this cross fertilization of thoughts. And, you know,
14 that's very effective if you don't want our thoughts. If
15 you don't want our thoughts, don't come out and ask us.

16 There's not a lot of guys here tonight. We got
17 plenty of time. I don't see what the problem is. Just be
18 flexible. You're in Hawaii. We do things differently out
19 here.

20 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.

21 When we take a break, we'll confer. In the
22 meantime, would you start your presentation, please.

23 COMMANDER DEES: Good evening. I'm Commander
24 Robert Dees of the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense X-Band
25 Radar Project Office. The Missile Defense Agency, formerly

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

10

1 known as the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, is the
2 Department of Defense agency that's responsible for
3 developing and testing a Ballistic Missile Defense System.
4 In the following charts, I'll briefly describe the GMD
5 Extended Test Range, provide an overview of the GMD and how
6 it works, and address the decisions to be made. Before I
7 do, I'd like to describe the overall concept of the
8 Ballistic Missile Defense System and explain the different
9 segments of the system.

10 This chart represents the flight of a ballistic
11 missile. The ballistic missile flight path has three basic
12 parts, which we call segments. Those segments are the
13 boost phase -- when the missile is trusting and leaving the
14 atmosphere -- the midcourse phase, which is the middle or
15 ballistic phase, and the terminal segment, when the missile
16 reenters the earth's atmosphere. Within each of these
17 segments, our missile program has to this point been
18 characterized by discrete, separate programs, which we call
19 elements. Each element worked to shoot down a ballistic
20 missile in its particular segment of flight.

21 Now the Missile Defense Agency is moving toward
22 an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System. Instead of
23 having discrete, stand-alone elements, we plan eventually
24 to have the programs integrated together so we can shoot
25 down missiles in any segment of flight.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

11

1 Each segment of the missile defense system would
2 include several elements which are different ways of
3 shooting down the threat missile during that phase of
4 flight. All the elements are designed to work together as
5 each element is developed. At the same time, each element
6 can provide an effective stand-alone defense for a specific
7 type of threat.

8 The GMD element is part of the Midcourse Defense
9 segment of the missile defense system. The GMD or
10 Ground-Based Midcourse Defense element is a successor to
11 the National Missile Defense and includes the same
12 components.

13 The conceptual GMD element would consist of the
14 components shown on the slide. These components are the
15 Ground-Based Interceptor, existing early warning radars and
16 satellites, the X-Band Radar, which performs tracking,
17 discrimination, and assessment of the incoming missile; the
18 Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System; the
19 Battle Management Command and Control, which is the central
20 communications and control point; and, finally, the
21 In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal.
22 We normally abbreviate that as ID -- abbreviate that as
23 IDT. That transmits commands to the Ground-Based
24 Interceptor while the interceptor's in flight.

25 The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

12

1 conduct more *operationally realistic testing of the GMD
2 element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This
3 slide indicates the proposed locations for the various
4 components of the Extended Test Range.

5 Of particular interest here in Hawaii, out at
6 PMRF, we've already been launching targets. That part
7 would continue. We've also got the Sea-Based Test X-Band
8 Radar, which includes an IDT to talk to the interceptor
9 onboard the platform. That would be a vessel that would
10 take the X-Band Radar and could relocate to test areas. In
11 between the test, it would return to a port that would be
12 its primary support base. Oahu's in consideration for the
13 location of the primary support base.

14 The GMD testing is of two types. One type of the
15 testing would involve increasingly robust Ground-Based
16 Interceptor flight testing in the Pacific region in
17 scenarios that are as operationally realistic as possible.
18 The other type is a validation of the operational concept
19 through integrated ground tests of the GMD components.
20 These tests include Fort Greely and other locations
21 analyzed in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept
22 Environmental Assessment. The ground tests do not involve
23 missile flights or intercepts.

24 The Draft EIS that's the subject of this hearing
25 evaluates the first type of GMD testing which does include

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

13

1 interceptor flight testing. The interceptor flight testing
2 will be the focus of the discussion tonight.

3 As you can see from this slide, the existing
4 interceptor test capability includes the Kodiak Launch
5 Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, the Pacific Missile
6 Range Facility, the Reagan Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll in
7 the Marshall Islands.

8 Current testing includes launching target
9 missiles from Vandenberg Air Force Base, and launching
10 ground-based interceptors from the Reagan Test Site. The
11 intercepts occur over the broad ocean area.

12 The ground-based radar prototype at the Reagan
13 Test Site is used to track, discriminate, and provide
14 updates to the interceptor during flight. The radar at
15 Kaena Point in -- here at Hawaii is also used as a tracking
16 sensor. For some tests, the target missiles are also
17 launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex and viewed by the
18 Early Warning Radar at Beale Air Force Base current
19 capability does exist to launch target missiles from the
20 Pacific missile range facility as well. The scenarios that
21 are done with existing test (inaudible) are -- provide a
22 very limited capability to demonstrate the effectiveness of
23 the GMD element because the ground-based interceptor can be
24 launched only from the Reagan Test Site. It limits the
25 ability to test the system in an operationally realistic

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

14

1 environment.

2 The extension of the existing GMD test range
3 would increase the realism of the GMD testing by using
4 multiple engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometries,
5 distances, speeds of targets, and interceptors -- will
6 closely resemble an operational scenario involving attack
7 by one or more threat missiles. We're proposing to add
8 dual target and ground-based launch -- or ground-based
9 interceptor launch capability at the Kodiak Launch Complex
10 and/or at Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also proposed are
11 mobile target launch capability and shipborne radars. The
12 proposed Extended Test Range would provide more
13 operationally realistic testing as directed by President
14 Bush and Congress.

15 The Sea-based Test X-Band Radar, or SBX, is
16 proposed to support the Extended Test Range flight testing.
17 This SBX would be a multifunction radar that would perform
18 tracking, discrimination, and interceptor -- intercept
19 assessment of incoming target missiles. The SBX would be
20 assembled at an existing shipyard on the United States Gulf
21 Coast.

22 Three conceptual SBX performance regions have
23 been identified to accomplish effective radar coverage for
24 the flight testing. The SBX would operate within the
25 confines of one of the three performance regions based on

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

15

1 the needs of that particular flight test scenario.
 2 Potential primary support bases have been identified based
 3 in part on their proximity to the performance regions.

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

8 The SEX would be stationed at its primary support
 9 base between flight test missions. The SEX will have a
 10 deep draft which would restrict it from many harbors. The
 11 SEX may dock at a deep draft pier if it is available
 12 between missions.

13 The analysis that we're doing, what you'll find
 14 in the EIS documents, mooring off Barbers Point they/that
 15 could be used for stationing the SEX. It's possible that
 16 different ports could be used if they're found to be
 17 suitable. But that analysis is not yet done.

18 If a pier is not available, then the SEX would be
 19 moored offshore 3 to 10 miles from its primary support
 20 base. Potential locations for the primary support base
 21 analyzed in the Draft EIS include the Port of Valdez and
 22 Adak, Alaska, Naval Base Ventura County/San Nicolas Island,
 23 which are near Oxnard, California; Pearl Harbor, Honolulu
 24 Hawaii; Naval Station Everett in Washington; and the Reagan
 25 Test Site, Republic of the Marshall Islands.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

16

1 Daily activities of the SEX provided by -- or
 2 supporting the SEX provided by the primary support base
 3 might include logistics, resupply, maintenance, and repair.
 4 Radar operations in a vicinity of a primary support base
 5 may include tracking of satellites and calibration devices.

6 The intent is that we would do maintenance, which
 7 would include radiation of the SEX, from where its moored
 8 or tide to a pier, after coordination with proper
 9 authorities to ensure that we don't interfere as documented
 10 in the EIS.

11 Vessels from a primary support base would
 12 resupply the SEX. During transit between the primary
 13 support base and its test location, periodic radar
 14 operations for satellite and calibration device tracking,
 15 including joint satellite tracks with GMD sensors and other
 16 premission activities may also occur.

17 Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS, which
 18 support some of the enhanced test objectives, include
 19 launching target and/or interceptor missiles from the
 20 Kodiak Launch Complex, adding interceptor missile launches
 21 from the Vandenberg Air Force Base, and launching target
 22 missiles from mobile platforms over the broad ocean area.
 23 The target and interceptor missiles could be launched in
 24 sets of two under some test scenarios from either the
 25 Kodiak Launch Complex, the Regan Test Site, or Vandenberg

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

17

1 Air Force Base.
2 The In-Flight Interceptor Communication System
3 Data Terminals would be constructed in close proximity to
4 the proposed ground-based interceptor launch sites and
5 expected intercept areas. Existing launch sites and test
6 resources would continue to be used in the enhanced test
7 scenarios. Launching ground-based interceptors from the
8 Kodiak Launch Complex may require up to two additional
9 small mobile radars and telemetry stations in South Central
10 or Southwest Alaska for telemetry and flight safety.
11 Existing shipborne radars would be used for
12 midcourse tracking of a target missile during ground-based
13 interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch Complex
14 and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Sea-Based Test X-Band
15 Radar would be constructed and used in tests to perform
16 tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target
17 missiles.
18 The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for the
19 GMD Extended Test Range testing. For Alternative 1, we
20 proposed the following components: First, single and dual
21 ground-based interceptor launches from the Kodiak Launch
22 Complex and the Reagan Test Site; second, single and dual
23 launches from the Kodiak -- target launches from the Kodiak
24 Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and the Reagan
25 Test Site; third, single target launches from the Pacific

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

18

1 Missile Range Facility and mobile target launch platform.
2 Construction of two ground-based interceptor silos, an
3 additional target launch pad, and associated support
4 facilities would be needed at Kodiak.
5 We would also construct an In-Flight Interceptor
6 Communications System Data Terminal at the Kodiak Launch
7 Complex and at a location in the Mid-Pacific. The SBX
8 would be used in tests for tracking, discrimination, and
9 assessment of target missiles.
10 Alternative 2 is similar to Alternative 1 with
11 the exception that the ground-based interceptor launches
12 would be from Vandenberg Air Force Base instead of from the
13 Kodiak Launch Complex. The ground-based interceptor launch
14 would require construction of an IDT and modification of
15 existing facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base.
16 Alternative 3 combines the activities for
17 Alternatives 1 and 2 and would include ground-based
18 interceptor launches from both Kodiak and from Vandenberg
19 Air Force Base and construction of the required support
20 facilities.
21 Under the no-action alternative, the GMD Extended
22 Test Range would not be established and interceptor and
23 target launch scenarios would not -- would not be tested
24 under more operationally realistic conditions. The SBX
25 would not be developed. Testing at the GMD test ranges

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

19

1 using existing launch areas would continue.
 2 The decision to be made is whether to enhance the
 3 current GMD flight test capability by selecting from the
 4 list of alternatives presented, including the no-action
 5 alternative.

6 The Missile Defense Agency is still evaluating
 7 the feasibility, safety, and utility to the GMD test
 8 program to conduct a limited number of checkout
 9 ground-based interceptor test flights from Fort Greely.
 10 The possibility of the flights is too speculative to be
 11 analyzed at this time.

12 (We'll wait for the plane.)

13 The possibility of doing a limited number of
 14 checkout ground-based interceptor test flights from Fort
 15 Greely is still too speculative to be analyzed at this
 16 time. The Missile Defense Agency will perform an EIS if
 17 and when it proposes to conduct the ground-based
 18 interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely.

19 This concludes the program overview. Now I would
 20 like to introduce Mr. David Hasley, who will describe the
 21 environmental analysis process.

22 MR. HASLEY: Good evening. My name is David
 23 Hasley, and I'm with the U.S. Army Space and Missile
 24 Defense Command. My office is responsible for the --
 25 preparing the EIS on behalf of the Missile Defense Agency.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

20

1 Tonight I'll describe the EIS process and present the
 2 results of our analysis.

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

9 As you may be aware, the first phase in the
 10 preparation of an EIS is to conduct what is called scoping,
 11 to identify environmental and safety issues that should be
 12 addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping meetings were
 13 held in Kodiak, Anchorage, Adak and Valdez, Alaska; Oxnard
 14 and Lompoc, California; Honolulu, Hawaii; and Seattle,
 15 Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal
 16 and state agencies were held to obtain their views
 17 concerning the proposed action, its alternatives, and
 18 potential environmental effects within their areas of
 19 expertise or which are of particular concern to them.

20 Followings scoping, the next step was to further
 21 refine the possible alternatives being considered for GMD
 22 extended range testing. The Draft EIS was then prepared to
 23 address reasonable alternatives including the no-action
 24 alternative, reasonably foreseeable future actions, and
 25 information on cumulative effects.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

21

1 The Draft EIS has been made available to the
2 public, to federal and state agencies for review and
3 comment for a period of 45 days. During this comment
4 period, public hearings, like the one being held tonight,
5 are being held to receive public input.
6 All comments received will be reviewed and
7 considered in preparing the Final EIS. The Final EIS will
8 then be made available to the public for a period of 30
9 days. And no sooner than 30 days after release of the
10 Final EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will make public its
11 decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Extended Test
12 Range activities.
13 Now, the Missile Defense Agency has identified 15
14 environmental resource areas that normally require some
15 level of analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on
16 those areas with the most potential for environmental
17 impacts. Each resource area was addressed at each location
18 unless it was determined through initial analysis that the
19 proposed activity would not result in environmental impact
20 to that resource.
21 The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues
22 associated with implementing the proposed action for its
23 alternatives. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed the
24 environmental issues associated with licenses and permits
25 required to implement the proposed action at each of the

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

22

1 potential Extended Test Range sites.
2 The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference
3 several existing environmental analyses associated with
4 current Ballistic Missile Defense System test assets that
5 include the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site,
6 the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and Vandenberg Air
7 Force Base. Also incorporated by reference is the analysis
8 of environmental impacts contained in the GMD Validation of
9 Operational Concept Environmental Assessment.
10 The Draft EIS also analyzed the potential for
11 cumulative impacts from other Department of Defense,
12 Government, and commercial activities in areas where GMD
13 actions are proposed.
14 The potential environmental impacts identified in
15 the Draft EIS will be presented in the next several slides.
16 For your convenience, this information has also been
17 reproduced as a fact sheet, which was available at the
18 registration table or on the tables in front of the boards
19 tonight.
20 I would like to highlight a few of the resource
21 areas that might be important to you. As you will see,
22 minimal impacts were identified from the implementation of
23 the proposed action. Most of these impacts are minimal
24 because the proposed actions are actually a continuation of
25 existing activities at the various locations.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

23

1 At Pearl Harbor, an Electromagnetic
2 Radiation/Electromagnetic interference survey and analysis
3 would be conducted for the radar as part of the spectrum
4 certification and frequency allocation process. Results of
5 the survey would be used to determine potential
6 interference issues and define the safe operating area for
7 the SBX. This area would be defined to minimize
8 interference with airspace operations and allow for safe
9 operating environment.

10 The small quantities of potentially hazardous
11 materials which may be used during construction activities
12 would result in generation of added waste that would be
13 handled by Pearl Harbor under their normal waste management
14 procedures. The Sea-based Test X-Band Radar would follow
15 U.S. Navy requirements that, to the maximum extent
16 practicable, ships shall retain their hazardous waste
17 aboard for shore disposal. The SBX vessel would
18 incorporate marine pollution control devices, such as
19 keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues
20 and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices
21 during the routine operation. Handling and disposal of
22 hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in
23 accordance with State of Hawaii, Department of
24 Transportation, and Department of Defense policies and
25 procedures.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

24

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

6 Coordination would be required with U.S. Coast
7 Guard to preclude potential delays of ships using the area,
8 as well as to establish any required security zone at the
9 mooring site.

10 This slide shows the other sites proposed for
11 primary support bases which were analyzed in the Draft EIS
12 and the resource areas that were determined to have a
13 potential environmental concern. Impacts at Naval Base
14 Ventura County, California; Naval Station Everett in
15 Washington; and at Adak and the Port of Valdez in Alaska
16 are similar to those described at Pearl Harbor and are also
17 expected to be minimal.

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

24 Likewise, the impacts to biological resources
25 would be similar to those from the ongoing activities, and,

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

25

1 therefore, we expect no adverse impacts to threatened
2 or endangered species.

3 In particular, at Kodiak Launch Complex, there
4 was determined a potential shortage of temporary
5 accommodations during the tourist season due to our launch
6 activities. To reduce this potential shortage, the Missile
7 Defense Agency is considering construction of an addition
8 to either the Narrow Cape Lodge and/or construction of an
9 additional mancamp in that area.

10 In addition to tonight's hearing, written
11 comments on the Draft EIS will continue to be accepted
12 until March 24th, 2003, at the address shown on this slide.
13 After the comment period is over, we will consider all
14 comments as we conduct our analysis. Again, I'd like to
15 stress, equal consideration will be given to all comments
16 whether they're presented here tonight, e-mailed, or
17 submitted by regular mail to us.

18 And once the Final EIS is complete, we will mail
19 it to all the individuals who requested a copy. And if
20 you're not on our mailing list, you can request a copy by
21 writing to the street address or e-mail address given in
22 the hand out or by filling out a card at the registration
23 table tonight.

24 I'd like to -- now I'd like to turn the hearing
25 back over to Mr. Michaelson.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

26

1 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thanks,
2 David.

3 We are going to take a five-minute recess to
4 allow us to reconfigure the podium and the projector here
5 so we can get one in place for those of you who want to
6 speak tonight.

7 So far I have three cards filled out, and if
8 you've not already filled one out and would like to speak
9 tonight, please do fill one out. Oh, we have two more.
10 Good. And we'll collect all of those before we start.

11 So if you'll bear with us for about five minutes,
12 we'll be right back.

13 (Recess taken.)

14 We are ready to begin again.

15 We were asked during the meeting for some
16 flexibility in the hearing rules as it regards for further
17 comments. And after conferring, we have decided that we
18 will allow everyone to take their first four minutes, and
19 then assuming someone would like a second helping, they can
20 come back up for that for another four minutes.

21 So, with that, I'm ready to start calling the
22 names of the people who signed up to speak.

23 Again, it will make the process run more smoothly
24 if the first several people -- I'll call out your names --
25 if you would come sit in these seats directly in front of

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

27

1 me, front row, that say "Reserved" on them.
 2 And we're ready to start calling those names.
 3 We kindly request that you reserve the
 4 four-minute limit, and then we'll have the second one. And
 5 I have a way of indicating how that's going to work. When
 6 you've been speaking for three minutes -- you know,
 7 actually, I'm giving instructions for oral comment right
 8 now, and I know some of the people who requested they would
 9 like to speak, I'm not sure that they are currently tooning
 10 in to what's being said here. So I'm a little concerned
 11 that we're going to get our rules crossed here if we don't
 12 listen to what's going on.
 13 I'll be calling you -- on you in the order in
 14 which you signed up: Because we want to record your
 15 comments fully and accurately, we ask that you speak
 16 clearly into the microphone at the podium. And because of
 17 the acoustics, it will be especially important that you
 18 speak clearly in order to make sure that the court reporter
 19 can capture everything you say. And, at the beginning of
 20 your speaking time, if you would, please, state your name
 21 for the court reporter.
 22 To aid you in knowing when the four minutes are
 23 up, I have a simple method for indicating times. After
 24 three minutes, I will raise my index finger like this,
 25 indicating that you have one minute left. This should help

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

28

1 you find a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. And
 2 at the end of four minutes, I will raise my closed hand,
 3 indicating it's time to finish. So it's important for you
 4 to look up occasionally from your paper, if you're reading
 5 from one, so that you can see the signal.
 6 I have one other request, and that is: Speaking
 7 in public can be very intimidating for many people, so we
 8 ask that you please withhold any expressions either against
 9 or in favor of the speaker until that speaker has finished.
 10 If you choose not to make oral comments,
 11 remember, again, that you can also hand in or send in
 12 written comments, e-mail, mail, and they are given the same
 13 consideration as oral comments offered here tonight, and as
 14 was mentioned, you can offer additional oral comments by a
 15 toll free telephone line.
 16 With that --
 17 MS. KEKO'OLANI: I have a question.
 18 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. Can
 19 you come up here and ask. Can you ask it from here.
 20 *MS. KEKO'OLANI: Okay.
 21 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Is this
 22 about the procedure?
 23 MS. KEKO'OLANI: Yes, it is.
 24 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. Sure.
 25 Go ahead.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

29

1 What is your name?
2 MS. KEKO'OLANI: *Nap [AOU] Keko'olani.
3 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.
4 What's the question?
5 MS. KEKO'OLANI: My question is: Do you have an
6 interpreter? You're in Hawaii.
7 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): We are --
8 MS. KEKO'OLANI: For you -- for you, you know,
9 you need to have somebody that will be able to interpret.
10 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): We were --
11 MS. KEKO'OLANI: Have you folks brought an
12 interpreter?
13 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. We're
14 going to answer that question.
15 MS. KEKO'OLANI: Okay.
16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): An
17 interpreter was not brought. We are recording this on a
18 tape, and if anyone speaks in Hawaiian, we will be able to
19 translate it from that. But we do not have a translator
20 here. Okay?
21 So I'm ready to start calling the names. First
22 up are Doreen Redford, Kyle Kajihira, Fred Dodge, Suzanne
23 Marinelli, and Todd Morikawa. Would you please come up and
24 sit in your seats up front here.
25 And Doreen Redford, you are first.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

30

1 MS. REDFORD: Hi. My name is Doreen Redford.
2 I'm from Pearl City area. I have two things to say. One
3 is from me. One is from my friend.
4 I just want to say that, you know, you guys want
5 peace. You be peace. You want war. You prepare for it.
6 You folks make a living at it. You pollute our scenery,
7 you pollute our land, and you pollute our minds, destroying
8 beauty and life. You say it's for our protection.
9 For my friend -- he asked me to write -- read
10 this for him. Aloha kakou. My name is Vincent Kana'e
11 (phonetic) Dodge, and I'm a resident of Lualualei. Thank
12 you for the opportunity to share my mana'o.
13 We are the people of this country. You are our
14 military. We pay you to protect and serve us. Your job is
15 to protect and serve us.
16 We are not responsible for the past, yet every
17 moment we live with this and are affected by the past. Our
18 military has a shining record of abuse, destruction, and
19 broken promises which we are and will be dealing with for
20 generations to come.
21 We are responsible for today, the present, as we
22 create -- as we create tomorrow, the future. We are
23 telling our military to change -- to stop abusing our
24 sacred trust, to stop destroying the aina, the land that
25 feeds us, and to keep your promises. The people whom you

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-T-0048

1

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

31

1 are protecting will no longer allow you, our military, to
2 destroy us with a myth of national security or for any
3 other reason.

4 We, the people whom you are protecting, are
5 telling you, our military, to change, to acknowledge the
6 local destruction, desecration, and abuse that have been
7 inflicted upon us; to clean up the toxic mess you have
8 created everywhere. You have been in these islands to
9 restore and return the land as promised.

10 We need you to rectify and restore the well-being
11 of this aina far more than we need you to continue your
12 history of your destruction here and all over this earth.
13 We are your people. We, your people, are telling you, our
14 military, that you must change now.

15 May your poi bowl always be full. Vincent Kana'e
16 Dodge.

17 Aloha and thank you.

18 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Kyle
19 Kajihiro.

20 MR. KAJIHIRO: Aloha kakou.

21 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Aloha.

22 MR. KAJIHIRO: My name is Kyle Kajihiro. I'm the
23 program director for the American Friends Service
24 Committee. The AFSC is a Quaker organization that works
25 for peace and justice. And we oppose the development and

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

P-T-0049

1

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

32

1 deployment of missile defense systems in general and this
2 particular Ground-Based Midcourse Extended Test Range.

3 One of our reasons is that I think it's
4 misleading to call this missile defense because this system
5 is really about offense. The so-called missile defense --
6 this is quoting Joseph Gerson who wrote "The Politics and
7 Geopolitics of Missile Defenses."

8 Quote, "So-called missile defenses have been
9 conceived as a shield to reinforce U.S. offensive strikes.
10 The idea is to make it safe for the U.S. to threaten or to
11 initiate first strike."

12 And this analysis is confirmed by the
13 announcement of the new U.S. nuclear posture, which
14 includes first nuclear strike as one of the range of
15 possible options. This was never on the table before
16 because deterrence was the -- was the -- the guiding
17 doctrine.

18 Also, missile defense is a trojan horse, which --
19 which helps the pentagon and aerospace industry to
20 militarize space under the pretext of defense. Right now,
21 there are international treaties that preserve space for
22 peace. But U.S. missile defense and space command policies
23 are moving towards the militarization of space.

24 We're concerned that missile defense violates
25 international treaties and is destabilizing. And in July,

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

2

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

33

1 2001, the Russian foreign ministry spokesperson reacted
2 very angrily to U.S. missile defense tests over the
3 Pacific. He warned that this missile defense contributes
4 to a situation, quote, "Which threatens all international
5 treaties in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and
6 nonproliferation, which are based on the 1972 antiballistic
7 missile treaty," end quote.

8 On July 13, 2002, George Bush unilaterally and
9 without a vote of congress, withdrew the United States from
10 the ABM Treaty.

11 (Reporter interrupts to preserve record.)

12 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): (Inaudible.)

13 MR. KAJIHIRO: So I don't see these issues
14 being addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact
15 Statement, and I think that, you know, as citizens of the
16 world, we -- you have a responsibility to address these
17 things because these are impacts on all of us.

18 We just had a meeting last night in Waikane where
19 the community was saying we don't want any Marine Corps
20 training in our lands. And the scope of their question was
21 so narrow, and we had people from the Philippines who came
22 and said how do you -- how do you address the impact on our
23 people when U.S. troops are being sent over there, and it's
24 resulting in human rights violations and killings of
25 innocent civilians under the *guides/guise of a war on

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

34

1 terror.

2 And so these -- these broader impacts must be
3 addressed. You can't just be a narrow scope.

4 I'd like to know: How will the development and
5 deployment of missile defense systems affect the
6 international security environment? What international
7 laws and treaties would apply to the proposed action?
8 Discuss restrictions imposed by treaties and laws on air
9 and sea launch tests.

10 I'd like to see you address how missile defense
11 increases Hawaii's risk as a target. And military -- from
12 a military point of view, Hawaii is considered a
13 target-rich environment. So -- because of its enormous
14 military presence. So I'd like to see this Draft
15 Environmental Impact Statement address that question.

16 The other issue that I have is that the process,
17 I think, was flawed and really discouraged public
18 participation. If you look at past environmental documents
19 that were prepared regarding Pacific missile range, you had
20 hundreds of people commenting on the notification list, but
21 none of them were notified about the scoping process or
22 even this Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

23 I was on that list. I never received a
24 notification. There's no document in Kauai where the test
25 launches are happening. I called the library there, and

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

35

1 they said there was no document there. There are no
 2 hearings on Kauai. This is the only hearing. The fact
 3 that you have only two --
 4 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Excuse me,
 5 Mr. Kajihiro. You're -- I even let you go a little bit
 6 over. I want to make sure we get through everybody's first
 7 chance, and then you can come back up for a second helping.
 8 So --
 9 MR. KAJIHIRO: Okay. Let me just finish this --
 10 this point, if I could --
 11 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.
 12 MR. KAJIHIRO: -- about the public participation.
 13 The fact that there were only two comments from
 14 Honolulu in your scoping process tells you something about
 15 the inadequacy of the public participation.
 16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.
 17 MR. KAJIHIRO: So I would like to request that a
 18 30-day extension be given to the common period so that we
 19 can notify people that there is this process underway and
 20 that people can make their comments known.
 21 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. Thank
 22 you.
 23 MR. KAJIHIRO: And that's part one of my
 24 testimony. Thank you.
 25 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): All right.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

7

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

36

1 Thank you.
 2 Fred Dodge.
 3 MR. DODGE: Aloha kakou and dear people. I'd
 4 like to face --
 5 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Sir, I'd
 6 prefer since you're -- these people came to hear what you
 7 had to say --
 8 MR. DODGE: Right. Well, let me --
 9 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): -- that --
 10 MR. DODGE: -- do it this way.
 11 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.
 12 MR. DODGE: I -- I'm just --
 13 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Just look
 14 over this way occasionally, would you? All right?
 15 MR. DODGE: Yeah, I'm doing this on purpose.
 16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I know that,
 17 but --
 18 MR. DODGE: Yeah
 19 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): -- the point
 20 is --
 21 MR. DODGE: Yeah
 22 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): -- they came
 23 here to listen to you.
 24 MR. DODGE: Yeah. My name is Fred Dodge. I
 25 happen to be a medical doctor. I'm a family practitioner

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-T-0050

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

37

1 at the Waianae Coast Comprehensive Health Center, but I'm
2 here mainly today as a citizen of Waianae.

3 There are many things unacceptable with the GMD,
4 the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense, and the Draft EIS. And
5 you've heard the two previous speakers address some of
6 this. I'm sure other -- there will be some other people
7 that will submit testimony either tonight or to you. But I
8 will limit my comments to two issues.

9 First, the Sea-based X-Band Radar. It's a very
10 strong radar, and I believe it to be very dangerous to
11 humans and other living things. It heats tissues -- radar
12 does. As a result of heating tissues, this type of
13 electromagnetic radiation can and has caused in humans and
14 animals a range of conditions ranging from cataracts to
15 death. Furthermore, it can interfere with airplane and
16 airport electronics.

17 The -- I noticed that you had said in your
18 presentation that the effect on air travel -- air transport
19 would be minimal. That kind of scares me because, as a
20 physician, I can tell patients that some of the medications
21 I use for some very serious illnesses that require serious
22 medications can result in side effects when we try to
23 minimize this, as you do.

24 An example would be -- I've been around medicine
25 for a long time, but when I first started, many physicians

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

1

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

38

1 were giving penicillin for colds, for instance. We know
2 that it doesn't help at all for a simple viral illness.
3 But some people died from those penicillin shots, even
4 though we tried to minimize this by having them wait after
5 the shot and so on and so forth.

6 So it scares me. I think that that sea-based
7 radar should not be placed at all near airports or
8 anywheres in our islands or anywhere, period. It's just
9 really too dangerous. Okay.

10 Second, all the information that I've ever
11 received -- and I've tried to keep up with this thing --
12 that I've ever received from independent, reliable,
13 reputable scientists tells me that the whole Star Wars
14 project is very likely to fail and is tremendously
15 wasteful. And let's call it by its original name, I think
16 President Regan -- we used to call it Star Wars. I don't
17 know how it got away from that. I like that Star Wars
18 name.

19 And, as Mr. Kajihira mentioned, it will escalate
20 the arms race without a doubt. We don't need it. The
21 world doesn't need it. This project should be abandoned,
22 and the billion saved should be used for human needs, such
23 as health insurance for 39 million Americans who don't have
24 any health insurance.

25 In closing, let me quote from the former

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

2

3

4

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

39

1 president, General Dwight D. Eisenhower. He spoke these
2 wise words: "Every gun that is made, every warship
3 launched, every rocket fired signifies in a final sense a
4 theft from those who are not fed, those who are cold and
5 not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money
6 alone." And it's spending a lot of it, I might add. But
7 he said, "It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the
8 genius of its scientists, and the hopes of its children."

9 Thank you very much for this opportunity. Aloha.

10 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you,
11 Mr. Dodge. Suzanne Marinelli.

12 MS. MARINELLI: Thank you. I'm Suzanne
13 Marinelli. I'm not going to be addressing any of my own
14 beliefs about this program's *ethicacy or need tonight.
15 I'm going to read from an article that was published today
16 in the Weekly Defense Monitor, a publication of the Center
17 for Defense Information, a very reputable organization.

18 This is an article written by their research
19 associate, Victoria Samson (phonetic). And I'm not going
20 to read you the whole thing because we don't have half an
21 hour for me to go on. But I will do excerpts.

22 "Testifying in front of the Senate Armed Services
23 Committee on February 13, Secretary of Defense, Donald
24 Rumsfeld, released some startling information. The
25 Department of Defense asked in the physical year 2004

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

P-T-0046

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

40

1 budget request for a waiver that would allow the pentagon
2 to skip operational testing for some of the Missile Defense
3 Agencies' programs, claiming that the systems didn't need
4 to be perfect before being deployed. Rumsfeld argued that,
5 quote, "It makes sense to waive operational testing when
6 reasonable people look at the situation and say that it's
7 time to do that.

8 "This could set a precedent where weapons are
9 hurried into production before they have completed their
10 testing, resulting in the fielding of unreliable systems
11 that unnecessarily endanger American lives. The
12 technologies needed to meet the 2004-2005 deployment
13 schedule, primarily, the Ground-Based Midcourse Missile
14 Defense -- GMD -- and the Sea-based *AGS Ballistic Missile
15 Defense programs, would be able to skip operational testing
16 before moving into initial production, and in doing so,
17 bypass federal law regulating defense acquisition."

18 "The *standards of weapon systems must meet
19 before it can move into production or clearly lay it out in
20 the U.S. code governing federal law. Title 10, Chapter
21 141, Section 2399, says that a major defense acquisition
22 program may not proceed beyond low-level initial production
23 unless initial operational test and evaluation of the
24 program is completed."

25 "Operational testing serves the very important

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

41

1 purpose of ensuring that the weapons do what they are
2 supposed to do. It is not a frivolous or an expendable
3 part of the procurement process.
4 "The GMD system has yet to demonstrate
5 significant operational capabilities" -- this is according
6 to the Department of Defense, Thomas *Christy (phonetic) --
7 "and its testing program needs to go beyond the typical
8 proof of concept demonstration in order to provide a higher
9 confidence in estimates of operational capability."
10 "What is eye opening is that these programs are
11 the furthest along of all the missile defense systems.
12 What is even more disheartening is that, if this
13 operational waiver is granted to missile defense programs,
14 other weapon systems will likely attempt to follow suit.
15 This could result in an arsenal of weapons that may or may
16 not work. Confidence in our military technology is too
17 important to be worked out on the battle field during the
18 fog of war."
19 My question relating to this article is this: If
20 this waiver is granted, when would it take effect? How
21 would the testing program be modified? Would it be
22 scrapped all together? And what increased risk to life --
23 human and otherwise -- would be at stake in all of the
24 facilities that the program is involved with? Thank you.
25 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

1

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

42

1 Now, the next speakers I have listed are Todd Morikawa,
2 William Aila, and Terry Keko'olani-Raymond.
3 MR. MORIKAWA: Hello. Aloha kakou. I want to
4 congratulate -- well, Kyle said --
5 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Today, would
6 you just give us your name, please, to start with.
7 MR. MORIKAWA: Todd Morikawa.
8 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thanks.
9 MR. MORIKAWA: Kyle said some interesting and I
10 think really some good -- good ideas about -- and so did
11 terry when I talked to her earlier, about how this is not
12 really addressing the policies of the government. This is
13 kind of a -- a go ahead to where you're letting us say our
14 thing, and then you're going to do your thing anyway. Or
15 that's the way we feel. Maybe -- maybe we're wrong. Maybe
16 I'm wrong.
17 The other thing is the 30-day extension and where
18 there should be more *debate in the community as we know,
19 in the news, Bush just approved 4 billion dollars for the
20 defense department *(in addition) to the creation of the
21 Department of Homeland Security, which has also been
22 appropriated a large amount of money.
23 And the headlines in our newspaper just last week
24 read there are no tax books for students -- biology
25 textbooks -- just basic textbooks. That shows you the

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

P-T-0047

1

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

43

1 priorities in our country today in black and white. And
 2 The Advertiser is usually a very probusiness newspaper, and
 3 it's very characteristic of this lack of funds for
 4 education and as Fred mentioned, healthcare, which is not
 5 happening in the United States.

6 I'm here to talk about the opposition that is
 7 widespread to the -- what I believe and many believe is
 8 part of a U.S. hegemony and domination -- political,
 9 economically, and militarily -- primarily through superior
 10 technology, militarily, troop strength, and superior
 11 weaponry, which is part of a racist militaristic and
 12 jingoistic society that has systematically oppressed --

13 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Excuse me.

14 MR. MORIKAWA: -- and is a war against the
 15 poor --

16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Excuse me,
 17 Todd. Are you --

18 MR. MORIKAWA: -- people of color.

19 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): -- reading
 20 from something?

21 MR. MORIKAWA: Yes.

22 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Yeah. It's
 23 going way too fast for her to pick it up, so --

24 MR. MORIKAWA: Okay. I'll speak slower.

25 The other issue is the land itself on Kauai is

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

2

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

44

1 stolen from the Hawaiians. It's a similar issue to the
 2 Okinawan, the Philippines, and bases, and other military
 3 occupations in South America, the Middle East, all over
 4 Europe and the world that have also been stolen through
 5 military violence and where the military will proceed to
 6 operate on that land whether for combat training, or
 7 so-called peacekeeping; for example, this Star Wars or this
 8 missile -- shooting down missiles or this X-Band radar
 9 supposedly under the -- we know we have our missiles that
 10 are called peacekeepers.

11 Thirdly, the U.S. military conducts these
 12 operations -- kind of overlapping -- regardless of what the
 13 people on the particular land feel and often to the
 14 detriment and destruction environmentally, physically, and
 15 spiritually of cultures and sacred lands and has resulted
 16 in genocide of people.

17 What war teaches children is violence is an
 18 acceptable way of solving conflicts. Much of the violence
 19 toward the U.S. military involves peoples of the world who
 20 are struggling for --

21 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Todd --

22 MR. MORIKAWA: -- freedom and their rights.

23 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Todd, you're
 24 reading really fast.

25 MR. MORIKAWA: Okay. I just have less than a

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

3

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

45

1 minute.
2 Allies and friends of the U.S. are --
3 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Actually,
4 Todd, I'm not counting this against you. I just want to
5 clarify something.
6 If you've got a written comment, you can turn it
7 in, first of all.
8 MR. MORIKAWA: Right. But I really -- I'm almost
9 finished
10 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): And second
11 of all --
12 MR. MORIKAWA: I just --
13 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): -- you can
14 take another four minutes after --
15 MR. MORIKAWA: I'd just like to respond.
16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I understand
17 that, but if you want it to be heard and recorded, it has
18 to be spoken at a rate that she can capture it.
19 MR. MORIKAWA: Okay. Well, I just have a few
20 things.
21 That the allies in the 'front of the U.S. are
22 generally determined by those who comply with U.S. policies
23 for this worldwide empire, and -- and those who don't are
24 generally labeled as terrorists or communists and such --
25 **red,** socialists.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

46

1 So the conclusion is there's opposition to the
2 X-Band radar. Worldwide opposition as well as opposition
3 within the Hawaiian community to the missile defense
4 systems and to other military presences here as well as
5 towards the military in Hawaii as a whole. And I'd like to
6 end by saying we refuse to be cowed, bought out,
7 intimidated, silenced, or harassed for our opposition to
8 this huge war machine, on our support of viable and
9 sustainable alternatives to U.S. military, political, and
10 economic domination.
11 Lastly, if our concerns are ignored, which has
12 often been in the past, a lot of us (inaudible) are pretty
13 fed up with the government and this whole kind of process
14 and the track record of the military. And there ought to
15 be an environmental assessment because, like, one of the
16 effects of the electromagnetic radiation is to the
17 dolphins, the whales, like what the doctor was saying.
18 I'm finished. Some of the suggestions real
19 quickly are the Department of Peace --
20 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.
21 Todd --
22 MR. MORIKAWA: -- The World Charter, the Hague
23 Appeal for Peace.
24 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Todd --
25 MR. MORIKAWA: Thank you.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

47

1 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. Thank
 2 you. And go ahead and --
 3 MR. MORIKAWA: I'm sorry for interrupting you,
 4 sir. I just -- this forum is -- as many have commented,
 5 it's -- it's not really a back-and-forth dialogue. It's
 6 like I'm just --
 7 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): It's not
 8 intended to be --
 9 MR. MORIKAWA: Yeah.
 10 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): -- a
 11 dialogue.
 12 MR. MORIKAWA: Exactly. That's --
 13 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): It's
 14 intended to --
 15 MR. MORIKAWA: That's --
 16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): -- receive
 17 comments.
 18 MR. MORIKAWA: That's the complaint.
 19 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. Thank
 20 you, sir.
 21 MR. MORIKAWA: We'd like something that's more
 22 (inaudible).
 23 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): William
 24 Aila.
 25 MR. AILA: Aloha kakou. My name is William Aila.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

P-T-0051

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

48

1 I come from the district of Waianae on the island of Oahu.
 2 Let me first start off by saying that I'm very
 3 disappointed in the -- and this is a comment to the
 4 process -- that the process -- because this is the first
 5 time that I've participated. The comment to the process is
 6 the -- the arrogance that I feel from -- from the entities
 7 that are putting on this -- this public hearing.
 8 Number one, you're in Hawaii. You didn't even
 9 have a pule you're not in California. You're not in
 10 Anchorage. You're in Hawaii. I don't know who advises you
 11 guys, but No. 1 thing when you do anything in Hawaii, you
 12 open with a pule. So we'll consider this a learning curve
 13 for you folks. Don't ever come back and ask us of our
 14 opinion in Hawaii without arranging somebody to have a pule
 15 or asking somebody in the audience to have a pule.
 16 The arrogance of that four-minute -- there's only
 17 six guys that signed up, and, come on. You got the room
 18 until how long. Let's -- let's put the walls down, and
 19 let's -- let's behalf like we're in Hawaii, and then we can
 20 have a dialogue. Because if you're asking us to have a
 21 dialogue, make it comfortable for us to dialogue. Okay?
 22 So right off the bat, this process is not pono because you
 23 didn't recognize that you're in a different place. That's
 24 you're not in the United States. You're in Hawaii.
 25 Number two, this meeting should have been on

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

1

2

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

49

1 Kauai, because those are the folks that are affected the
2 most. And it's very -- it's really expensive for them to
3 fly over here. This meeting should have been on Kauai, and
4 there should have been another meeting on Oahu because you
5 plan to put something out here in Kalaheo. Not Barbers
6 Point. Kalaheo.

7 So I'm going to use the rest of my time to fix
8 what you've broken and offer a pule.

9 *(Prayer in Hawaiian.)

10 And I would point out that -- I'm pretty close to
11 my four minutes now, so I'll step back. The pule was to
12 make things pono once again, because it wasn't pono.

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

19 So I'll come back.

20 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

21 Next -- next speaker is Terry Keko'olani-Raymond.

22 MS. KEKO'OLANI-RAYMOND: Aloha kakou.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Aloha.

24 MS. KEKO'OLANI-RAYMOND: *(Hawaiian speaking.)

25 I'm going to make my comments short. First of

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

P-T-0052

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

50

1 all, this whole process is very intimidating, as Bill said.
2 So I want to underscore how aole pono this process is for
3 our kind of people. Okay?

4 Another comment I would like to make is: I would
5 really like to know what efforts you made to do your out
6 reach to the community to bring them here for real and for
7 you to listen to their -- to their mana'o. You don't have
8 that many people here. How come? And yet this thing is so
9 big, and it will have such a huge impact on our people here
10 in (**kamawananui), which is the Pacific, the North
11 Pacific.

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

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

25 And, by the way, the Pacific range facility, as I

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

1

2

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

51

1 understand it, is on an old burial ground; isn't that
 2 correct? Wahili (phonetic); right? Yeah. So you folks
 3 have to do this kind of stuff.
 4 Okay. The other thing is is I would like to ask
 5 a few questions. All right? Can you answer my questions?
 6 Is this part of the process?
 7 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): No, it's
 8 not.
 9 MS. KEKO'OLANI-RAYMOND: How come?
 10 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Basically,
 11 we had the half-hour before it started for people to ask
 12 any questions that they had.
 13 MS. KEKO'OLANI-RAYMOND: Okay. I --
 14 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Let me
 15 finish.
 16 MS. KEKO'OLANI-RAYMOND: Go ahead.
 17 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): After we're
 18 done taking comment, that all of the staff that are here
 19 will be happy to go back and answer questions that you may
 20 have. But this is your four minutes to --
 21 MS. KEKO'OLANI-RAYMOND: Okay. You know, four
 22 minutes for this Environmental Impact Statement, which
 23 looks like a doorstop. Okay? I mean, there's so many
 24 points in this thing. How do you think people can even
 25 address. It takes you four minutes just to look at the

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

52

1 page and the picture on top. You know, this isn't -- this
 2 isn't right. So somehow you have to really find a way to
 3 educate the people on what you want us to pay attention to.
 4 This is a huge document. Look. Yeah?
 5 And the other thing -- these are my questions,
 6 though, and I hope the staff answers it.
 7 When you say that you have a part of your Draft
 8 Environmental Impact Statement, you've gone to cultural
 9 resources, what cultural resources, I'm curious to know? I
 10 would like to know the answer. Who did you -- who did you
 11 consult with as far as the Hawaiian -- you know, our
 12 (**Kanakamouli) people.
 13 And I would like to know -- it says here that you
 14 folks consulted with state and federal agencies. Did you
 15 consult with OHA, Office of Hawaiian Affairs? Were they
 16 contacted? You know? So somebody on the staff, please let
 17 me know, and I would like one of the Olelo people to come
 18 when they're answering my question so that they could put
 19 it on Olelo too. Okay?
 20 Okay. That's it. Mahalo.
 21 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.
 22 The next speaker is Karen Murray.
 23 MS. MURRAY: I told myself I wasn't going to
 24 speak tonight. But --
 25 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Can you just

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

3

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

53

1 state your name.

2 MS. MURRAY: Karen Murray.

3 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you
4 very much.

5 MS. KEKO'OLANI-RAYMOND: There's so many levels
6 to this thing, you know. But what it basically comes down
7 for me is that this -- the military -- the American -- the
8 United States military has done more damage to Hawaii than
9 any terrorist, than anything that happened at Pearl Harbor.
10 There are -- when -- at a time when kupuna are
11 telling us, oh, there was so much sea life. There was so
12 much -- like, you could get oysters from Pearl Harbor, you
13 know. At a time when there is so many -- such high
14 incidences of deformity in the fish embryo -- two heads,
15 bent spines -- showing up.

16 And then you have the other level. I mean, from
17 a cultural level, why are we supposed to trust the American
18 culture that does so much damage to its own people?
19 They -- they feed -- after seeing what happened with Mad
20 Cow Disease in England, they go ahead and do the same
21 thing. They do the same thing to create Cow Disease, and
22 they didn't care because of the bottom line. They didn't
23 care.

24 Now, look, they take a wonderful food, like --
25 like salmon, and they can't even do that right. They're

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

54

1 farming it in the Atlantic Ocean, and they're farming it in
2 a way that's causing a very good source of -- of nutrients
3 to become more damaging to people than it is nutritious.

4 Then they have genetically modified plants, and
5 the terminator seed to where you have to buy your seeds
6 from them because the plants will no longer go to seed.
7 Okay?

8 From this culture, we're supposed to trust --
9 we're supposed to trust people with that technology? We're
10 supposed to trust people with something like Star Wars?

11 There are so many levels that this is on that --
12 that it's inconceivable to me that people in the government
13 think that people -- that -- that they think that people
14 trust them anymore. More people aren't here because,
15 first, then don't know about it, but even if they did, some
16 people just don't think that it matters. And, you know,
17 I'm not sure that it does because I think people -- when
18 people speak out, they go, oh, yeah, isn't that nice, you
19 know, and then they -- they go and do what they were going
20 to do anyway, whether it's -- whether it's in the open or
21 whether it's done quietly, it's done anyway.

22 That's all.

23 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.

24 Next speaker is Peter Yee.

25 MR. YEE: Aloha kakou. My name is Peter Yee.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT NUMBER

P-T-0053

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: center;">COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">55</p> <p>1 I'm the director of nationhood and native rights from the 2 Office of Hawaiian Affairs.</p> <p>3 I had not intended to speak this evening, but I 4 have heard the concerns of the community, and I want to 5 express my concern as well.</p> <p>6 We found out at the Office of Hawaiian Affairs 7 about this hearing the way that everybody else here did -- 8 through a small ad in the newspaper. We were not contacted 9 as is usually the protocol. I wish to withhold any 10 substantive comments, but I must protest about the 11 procedural aspects of this -- of this entire comment 12 period. It was not pono, as it was said before. It's 13 wrong. And I encourage you to consider extending the 14 comment period as well.</p> <p>15 Thank you.</p> <p>16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.</p> <p>17 That exhausts the number of speaker cards that I 18 have, but in case anyone else has in fact been inspired to 19 speak, I want to make sure everyone has had their first 20 opportunity before we ask people who would like to speak 21 for a second time.</p> <p>22 Is there anyone who has not yet spoken here 23 tonight who would like to do so? If not, if it's all right 24 with you, I'll call all the names again, and if you'd like 25 to come up to speak a second time, please do so.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222</p>	1	<p style="text-align: center;">COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">56</p> <p>1 Doreen Redford. Kyle Kajihiro.</p> <p>2 Okay. Kyle.</p> <p>3 MR. KAJIHIRO: Another concern that we have with 4 the Draft EIS is how the analysis of impacts at the Pacific 5 missile range was treated. I quote from the document. 6 Quote, "Areas that are not expected to be affected 7 sufficiently at PMRF to warrant further discussion include 8 air space, cultural resources, geology and soils, land use, 9 noise, transportation, utilities, visual and aesthetic 10 resources, water resources, and environmental justice. 11 That's pretty much the whole range of impacts, 12 and I don't see how this can be a serious document if it's 13 not looking at those things. One area that is always a 14 concern is -- in Hawaii is environmental justice. I don't 15 think there's any -- any government action that can be done 16 which does not impinge upon an environmental justice 17 concern, especially as it relates to land, as it relates to 18 culture and the environment.</p> <p>19 Are you familiar with Public Law 103-150? This 20 was the so-called apology bill to acknowledge that the 21 United States acted illegally when it invaded Hawaii in 22 1893 and overthrew the queen. As a result, a 23 reconciliation process was called for.</p> <p>24 So to continue to perpetuate the military use of 25 land, especially seeded lands, in Hawaii, it perpetuates</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222</p>	P-T-0049 8

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

57

1 the injustice that was done. So you can't have true
2 reconciliation. You can't have true environmental justice
3 if you're not dealing with some restoration of the harm
4 that was done even if it was 100 years ago, you know.
5 Environmental justice is not an empty exercise of
6 compliance, yeah. It has to be about addressing a harm.
7 Is it has to be about fixing a broken relationship.
8 One of the things that's also not adequately
9 addressed is cumulative impacts. And when we talk about
10 cumulative impacts, we're talking about more than just
11 what's happening on that little launch area at the Kauai
12 test facility, you know. Cumulative impacts for people in
13 Hawaii as it pertains to military actions includes the
14 200,000 acres that the military occupies here. You know,
15 one quarter of this island is controlled by the military.
16 That is a quarter of the land that is not available for the
17 public to use, that's not available to native Hawaiian
18 practitioners to do the things that they need to do so that
19 their culture can survive, yeah. So these are cumulative
20 impacts.
21 Not only that, the Army is now proposing to
22 acquire 23,000 acres on Hawaii island, another 2,000 acres
23 here on Oahu as part of its transformation. That's added
24 to the cumulative impacts. Last night, we -- I mentioned
25 the meeting out -- regarding Waikane Valley. The Marine

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

9

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

58

1 Corps wants to go back and train in Waikane, and the
2 community strongly opposed it.
3 The military is the largest polluter in Hawaii.
4 It has over 1,000 contaminated sites, and it's still --
5 they're still finding more every year.
6 So those need to be considered in your document.
7 When you look at what are the impacts, these are cumulative
8 impacts that affect Kauai and all of us.
9 And, finally, you know, programs like missile
10 defense are promoted as a way of defending democracy,
11 defending freedom and our rights, but, you know, what's
12 happening when these programs get instituted and
13 restrictions are placed on these lands, it's making the
14 people here less free. How do you measure the impact on
15 that?
16 The people of the west side of Kauai are less
17 free to use their beach and the resources there. We are
18 less free to go up to Kaala and Kaena Point and use those
19 resources when the testing is going on, an exclusion zone
20 is created, a has zone is created. So how do you measure
21 that impact in the Environmental Impact Statement?
22 I think your document is inadequate and you need
23 to come back and, as William said, you know, talk to the
24 community on our terms.
25 Thank you.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

10

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)</p> <p>59</p> <p>1 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.</p> <p>2 MR. KAJIHIRO: Oh. And I have here 698 names</p> <p>3 opposed to any military expansion, including expansion of</p> <p>4 missile tests on Kauai. I would like to enter that into</p> <p>5 the record.</p> <p>6 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.</p> <p>7 MR. KAJIHIRO: Mahalo.</p> <p>8 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): You can give</p> <p>9 those to me. Thank you. Thanks.</p> <p>10 Again, I'm calling the names a second time in</p> <p>11 case anyone would like to come up and add to their original</p> <p>12 comments.</p> <p>13 Fred Dodge. Suzanne Marinelli. Oh, Fred?</p> <p>14 MR. DODGE: Yeah. I yield to (inaudible).</p> <p>15 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Suzanne</p> <p>16 Marinelli.</p> <p>17 MS. MARINELLI: Hi. I just have another</p> <p>18 procedural concern.</p> <p>19 I think that expanding the comment period for an</p> <p>20 additional 30 days would be -- in the long run, it would</p> <p>21 save you a lot of time and money, and I recommend it for</p> <p>22 other reasons besides those two.</p> <p>23 In addition, I would request that sets of all of</p> <p>24 the documents that are relevant to this program be</p> <p>25 deposited not just in the library at Lihue, Kauai, but in</p> <p>CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222</p>	<p>P-T-0046</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>	<p>COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)</p> <p>60</p> <p>1 all of the libraries on Kauai. It's a little bity island.</p> <p>2 It's only 35 miles across as the nene flies. However, it's</p> <p>3 a very rural community, and getting from one end of the</p> <p>4 island to the other to read a document that isn't currently</p> <p>5 there at all is very difficult for people. So please make</p> <p>6 all of your records available at all of the public</p> <p>7 libraries on Kauai.</p> <p>8 Thank you.</p> <p>9 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.</p> <p>10 Todd Morikawa.</p> <p>11 Please speak at a rate that she can --</p> <p>12 MR. MORIKAWA: Okay. I'll speak slower this</p> <p>13 time. Thanks for giving me a second chance.</p> <p>14 First, I want to stress what I had said earlier.</p> <p>15 I want to reiterate that we ought to listen to the world</p> <p>16 opinion and specifically the communities that are</p> <p>17 affected -- not only on this issue, but I believe</p> <p>18 universally on any issue that affects people -- that we</p> <p>19 should listen to how they feel and how they're affected by</p> <p>20 it, rather than power imposed from the top, decisions from</p> <p>21 some executive branch or a privileged elite government.</p> <p>22 Therefore, as Ab Lincoln (has said by) of and for the</p> <p>23 people. That is one that is truly Democratic.</p> <p>24 And I want to repeat again that this opposition</p> <p>25 in this momentum is -- is growing. Although you don't see</p> <p>CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222</p>	<p>P-T-0047</p> <p>4</p>

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

61

1 a lot of people here, it could be because of what people
2 mentioned that is hasn't been really -- people haven't
3 really been contacted. And, therefore, I would again state
4 that my agreement with the 30 day extension so that more
5 people can be allowed to express and more dialogue be
6 continued.

7 Also, if we look at the -- again, the racial --
8 the racial breakdown of who is occupying what power and we
9 look at communities of color and the poor, I'd want to
10 reiterate again that it does seem that our justice system
11 and our political and military decisions are often not in
12 favor of -- or I would say the war against people of color,
13 against the poor, and against the indigenous people. Just
14 have to talk to the native Americans. They're (inaudible)
15 the (**kanakamaui) that are in solidarity with what I'm
16 saying. These ideas are not new.

17 Again, I want to reiterate that the world
18 momentum is growing. The momentum here in Hawaii, as well
19 as in the mainland, is overwhelming. And I think it's
20 about time that we start adopting a society based on
21 inclusivity rather than exclusivity -- again, a society
22 that is (of, by, and for the people) not governed by a
23 bunch of talking-heads or puppets or people that are of
24 privilege or have money that decide what happens to the
25 rest of the people.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

62

1 And I think this is really what the American
2 dream is talking about. And it's a slap in the face to
3 Dr. King and to the Civil Rights Movement and to the many,
4 many struggles which we've come to -- in order to -- where
5 the world is today to -- to really go backwards and take
6 these rights away from people and start again to racially
7 profile or to continue to -- to not return stolen lands, to
8 continue to occupy territories and areas around the world
9 where it's very clear, as I said, that the people that are
10 affected who are often voicing strong opposition -- for
11 example, in Okinawa or many of the other areas -- and where
12 it -- it just seem that's the military or the state
13 department or whoever the folks are that are in charge
14 of -- like the state department and foreign policy, either
15 aren't listening or, again, have their own agenda which
16 seems to be involving a world which is depending not upon
17 equality and human rights and humanitarian interest but
18 primarily around the acquisition of material and oil and
19 power for even the Ku Klux Klan and, I mean, White
20 Supremacy and this and that.

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

24 Thank you.

25 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

HONOLULU, HAWAII

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: center;">COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">63</p> <p>1 William Aila.</p> <p>2 MR. AILA: Okay. Aloha kakou again. With</p> <p>3 regards to some of the specifics in the summary of impacts</p> <p>4 and mitigation regarding the SBX, which I assume is the</p> <p>5 platform with the radar on it -- okay? -- the impacts and</p> <p>6 mitigation summary, Pearl Harbor is misleading because we</p> <p>7 all know that that vessel as conceptualized with the</p> <p>8 75-foot draft would never be able to get into Pearl Harbor.</p> <p>9 It would never be able to get into any harbor in Honolulu,</p> <p>10 including Honolulu Harbor or the Kalaeloa Deep Draft Harbor</p> <p>11 which current depth is 42 feet. And even if they go with</p> <p>12 the dredging that they have planned would only take it to</p> <p>13 47 feet. So we're really talking about offshore Kalaeloa.</p> <p>14 And it should be stated that way. Because if it was stated</p> <p>15 that way, I would probably have a lot more fishermen here</p> <p>16 with me tonight with concerns because then they would</p> <p>17 understand that it impacts them. As it's summarized here,</p> <p>18 Pearl Harbor, it doesn't impact them. So you need to be a</p> <p>19 little bit more truthful in how you communicate what is</p> <p>20 being proposed.</p> <p>21 I also see that there's no discussion on cultural</p> <p>22 resources. And I was very surprised to see the -- or hear</p> <p>23 from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs' representative that</p> <p>24 there was no consultation done with OHA. That would be in</p> <p>25 violation of the National Historic Preservation Act. And</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222</p>	<p>P-T-0051</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">64</p> <p>1 that would make a pretty good lawsuit to stop the whole</p> <p>2 thing if you didn't do that. So he mentioned that. You</p> <p>3 guys better catch on to that one.</p> <p>4 With regards too cultural resources, just because</p> <p>5 there's no pile of rocks out there doesn't mean that the</p> <p>6 proposed area is not a cultural resource or would not have</p> <p>7 impact on cultural resources because if the area is chosen</p> <p>8 and the mooring is established there, there's sure to be a</p> <p>9 security zone around this vessel, for lack of a better</p> <p>10 word.</p> <p>11 And depending on where you put the vessel, the</p> <p>12 security zone would exclude myself and my fellow fishermen</p> <p>13 from Waianae and from Ewa and Puuloa from access to an area</p> <p>14 where we've had access to, oh, for, you know, countless</p> <p>15 generations -- all the guys that are behind me -- my</p> <p>16 Kupuna.</p> <p>17 It also doesn't take into account the impact on</p> <p>18 historical cultural -- prehistorical -- well, prehistorical</p> <p>19 is a better -- a bad way to say it -- all historical</p> <p>20 cultural resources from the -- from the view of</p> <p>21 (**Kakuiheva), an Oahu chief whose Kalaeloa was his</p> <p>22 favorite fishing grounds. And that would put him in about</p> <p>23 the 16th century, which would impact Hawaiian cultural</p> <p>24 resources by preventing people from fishing that ground who</p> <p>25 have genealogical ties to that ground. So it's not just a</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222</p>	<p>5</p>

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

6

7

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-T-0052

4

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

65

1 pile of rocks. We have to constantly tell the Army the
2 same thing, too, so you're not alone in that one.

3 In closing, I would seriously recommend you
4 consider a 30-day extension, as mentioned by other
5 speakers. If you want the truth and you want the input,
6 what's 30 more days.

7 Have a meeting on Kauai, because those are
8 guys -- outside of this SEX, those are the guys that are
9 most impacted. Those are the guys who have Kupuna buried
10 under the ground in which you're crossing over and doing
11 your testing and operating. Okay? Make that pono. Talk
12 to those guys.

13 And ultimately, I would recommend that there not
14 be any deployment of this SEX platform in Hawaii. Okay?

15 Thank you very much for the opportunity. Thanks
16 for -- I see some understanding now and some heads being
17 nodded and your faces and stuff. So just remember next
18 time, most important thing, pule first.

19 For you, it's very important that you not try to
20 write those Hawaiian words down if you're not Hawaiian
21 because when you speak Hawaiian and when you believe
22 Hawaiian, words can bring life, and if you misspeak them,
23 words can bring death. So you have to be very, very
24 careful. For yourself, I would recommend you not try to
25 put those down. Okay?

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

66

1 Thank you.

2 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I have had a
3 couple of new cards turned in to me of people who would
4 like to speak, so I'm trying to decide here whether to --
5 since we only have three more of the cards that were going
6 to speak a second time, let's go ahead and do those, and
7 then we'll take the new speakers.

8 So the next person that would have a second
9 chance is Terry Keko'olani-Raymond.

10 MS. KERO'OLANI-RAYMOND: I just forgot to add one
11 question, actually, that I would like to have answered, and
12 that is: What right do you have to the air space if
13 someone -- I need to have you folks define that for me, to
14 explain it to me, and to document to me what right you have
15 to the air space.

16 And, also, in the cultural part of this, you need
17 to understand how our people see space, yeah. Not -- in
18 the heavens, what it means to us. And, also, you have to
19 understand how our people view the ocean. That is like
20 your land, yeah. That is similar. You know, this is where
21 we have our -- our navigations that have gone on. This is
22 where we come from, yeah. In our Kumulipo talks about us
23 as a people coming from the ocean, you know. So our ties
24 to the ocean are very deep. Okay?

25 So I -- but I do want you -- someone to explain

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

67

1 to me specifically what right do you have to the air space.
 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The land title.
 3 MS. KEKO'OLANI-RAYMOND: Oh, also, and I'd like
 4 to know about the land title. You got the title -- clear
 5 title.
 6 Is that what you mean? Okay.
 7 Mahalo.
 8 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.
 9 Karen Murray, if you would like to come up again.
 10 If not -- oh, yes? All right.
 11 MS. MURRAY: I had one more thing to say --
 12 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.
 13 MS. MURRAY: -- but I forgot. But I --
 14 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): If you want,
 15 I can call you again after these people.
 16 MS. MURRAY: That's okay
 17 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.
 18 MS. MURRAY: I do want to also say that I -- I
 19 agree with them that they should -- we should -- about the
 20 30-day extension and also about having it -- having some on
 21 Kauai -- having one, if not two, meetings on Kauai.
 22 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): On Kauai?
 23 MS. MURRAY: Yeah.
 24 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. Thank
 25 you.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

P-T-0054

1

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

68

1 MS. MURRAY: Yeah
 2 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thanks.
 3 All right.
 4 Peter Yee. Don't know -- probably don't --
 5 doesn't have anything to add. Okay.
 6 The next three speakers that I have -- let's see
 7 here -- are Kalama Niheu, William -- and I can -- I think
 8 this is Gustine or Gustino (phonetic), and Kekua Hunter.
 9 So Kalama Niheu would be first.
 10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
 11 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): If you would
 12 prefer to go -- are you William?
 13 MR. NIHEU: Yeah.
 14 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. Go
 15 ahead.
 16 You weren't here before when we went through --
 17 go ahead and step up there if you want -- through the
 18 ground rules. We have a four-minute time limit. There was
 19 a request for flexibility, so we are allowing a second shot
 20 at that after everyone's had their first. So what I'd like
 21 to do, if you want to take advantage of, is go through the
 22 three and then come back to you. And so that you know when
 23 the four minutes are up, I'll put up an index finger
 24 indicating you have one minute left, and then that means
 25 we're done. Okay?

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

P-T-0055

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-T-0055

1

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

69

1 MR. NIHEU: Okay.
2 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thanks. If
3 you'd just start by giving us your name and then go ahead.
4 MR. NIHEU: My name is William Gosline
5 (phonetic). I'm a member of ohana [KOE], uh, and nuclear
6 free and independent Pacific.
7 From my understanding, what it looks like you
8 folks are trying to do is further U.S. domination of the
9 Pacific arena. As things have come out recently in the --
10 in the so-called war on terrorism, I don't see how what you
11 folks are trying to put in -- what you folks are trying to
12 implement is going to make any of us any safer. We're
13 talking about people -- we're talking about a military
14 machine that is scene times the resources of the next
15 person on the list. And you guys want more and more, more
16 domination, more resources so that -- so that the whole of
17 the U.S. military and the interest behind it can -- can
18 continue a stranglehold on the planet.
19 I'm totally against this -- opposed to this. It
20 doesn't -- I don't see how it's going to make any of us any
21 safer.
22 That -- that's about all I have to say.
23 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you
24 very much for coming down.
25 Kalama Niheu.

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

70

1 MS. NIHEU: **(Hawaiian speaking.)
2 My ancestors come from the island of Niihau.
3 Even though I live on Oahu, I am very close to the people
4 who live there.
5 I understand my genealogy. I understand the
6 connections that my ohana in particular has to Kauai, in
7 particular, west side. And I know some of my own ohana who
8 has worked with the Pacific Missile Range Facility for many
9 many years.
10 But I come here speaking as a part of my ohana,
11 the Niihau ohana. And a significant for portion of us are
12 sincerely outraged by these proposals of expanding the
13 Pacific Missile Range Facility and all of the military
14 outreachings. We consider it like the tentacles of a he'e
15 going to strangle the people of the world. And I am very
16 embarrassed to go and walk among my Polynesian cousins and
17 face them with the understanding that the eye of the
18 he'e -- the head of this stranglehold comes from our own
19 lands.
20 I have just come the other -- night before from
21 the Marines saying they want to expand out to the Windward
22 side. You guys want to expand. You guys want to keep on
23 building, growing, pushing your tentacles out will this
24 protect you against box cutters?
25 What you guys are doing is you're further

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

P-T-0056

HONOLULU, HAWAII

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)</p> <p>71</p> <p>1 expanding the very techniques that make the United States 2 hated throughout the world.</p> <p>3 And we say, no, we want no part of it. We want 4 no part of what you guys are doing. It was forced upon us, 5 and you guys are now forcing it upon the people throughout 6 the world. And I told the major of the Marines the other 7 night, and I'm telling you guys now. I hold you guys 8 personally accountable for the actions that you guys are 9 perpetuating.</p> <p>10 You guys might feel you guys are nothing but 11 wheels and the great machine, but you guys are actively 12 participating in the oppression of people throughout the 13 world. When you -- these military games that you guys are 14 expanding, and you're thinking about North Korea, the 15 Philippines, and I know eventually China is on the radar 16 for what you guys are trying to fight against.</p> <p>17 And I say, when those children and -- wherever 18 they are -- Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Korea, Philippines -- 19 when they cry because their parents have been murdered by 20 the overwhelming force of the United States and the 21 military might that you guys represent, you guys are 22 personally responsible because you come here as a 23 representative for what that means.</p> <p>24 And I would like to just think -- want you to 25 think at night when they declare war on these places and</p> <p>CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222</p>	1	<p>COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)</p> <p>72</p> <p>1 those bombs are dropped and those bullets are shot and 2 another child's father or mother or even a little child 3 itself is skilled, you guys are personally responsible 4 because you guys participated in the entire infrastructure 5 that made it possible.</p> <p>6 And why does that not outrage you? Why does that 7 not keep you up at night? Why does the cry of a little 8 child who speaks in Ilocano, (**Kanakamouli), in Chinese 9 not offend you?</p> <p>10 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I'm sorry. 11 MS. NIHEU: One second. 12 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Sorry, 13 Kalama. 14 MS. NIHEU: I'm going to be done in about 30 15 seconds. 16 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay. 17 MS. NIHEU: It's because that comes from a deep 18 and ugly word, and it's horrible because it starts with a 19 "errrr." And I don't know if you understand what I'm 20 saying, but I hope that when this -- when those calls are 21 made and those children cry out, that you will be able to 22 step out of your own ignorance of your own self-imposed 23 arrogance and see beyond who you are.</p> <p>24 Mahalo. 25 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Kekua</p> <p>CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222</p>	

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

73

1 Hunter.
2 MR. HUNTER: My name is Chris Kekua Hunter.
3 I wasn't going to come up and speak, but just
4 seeing the disrespect displayed when someone's just trying
5 to give you this simple -- just asking you simple
6 questions, the simple extension of a little bit of time
7 because our ideas are more than four minutes long --
8 (Court reporter interrupts to preserve record.)
9 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Can you
10 raise the microphone so we can hear you.
11 MR. HUNTER: -- because of the fact that our
12 ideas are more than four minutes long, we would not be able
13 to squeeze them into that small of a period of time, and
14 the -- just the callousness that -- almost arrogance, I
15 guess.
16 I've been -- I've been taught all my life to
17 respect my elders, but it's times like these that I really
18 have a hard time thinking of that when I see the kupuna of
19 my community just being slammed like that. And it's almost
20 as if we're being in a position, but I know that most of
21 the people here have probably just come off work, know that
22 it's going to be a long night for them. I know it's
23 probably going to be one for me. It's probably going to be
24 a long night for everybody here. But just a little bit of
25 civility displayed to everybody else who's here would go a

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

74

1 long way.
2 That's all I have to say. Thank you.
3 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.
4 William, did you have anything to add?
5 Kalama, would you like to come up and speak again
6 as the other people had the opportunity to do?
7 MS. NIHEU: I just want to address some of the
8 people out here who I see who I really respect and admire.
9 I bring up my son because I was raised to believe
10 in fighting for what I believe in, and it didn't mean
11 holding a gun. It didn't mean going on to somebody else's
12 land and taking away from them who I don't need. It didn't
13 mean creating a bigger and more expensive means of killing
14 other people. It didn't mean taking *to excess the
15 resources of the world and hoarding it, and when the people
16 cry out for water, when they cry out for land, when they
17 cry out for justice, get it shoved down their throat in the
18 name of the American way.
19 So I'm raising my son to live on what we call
20 pono. And I don't think that you guys understand what that
21 would mean because pono means every effect that you make
22 upon the environment, you have to understand the
23 consequences.
24 We don't leave diapers on the beach. We don't
25 leave our rubbish behind. We have a small car to minimize

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

75

1 the amount of gas that we use. We recycle our clothes on a
2 day-to-day basis between the generations. And we do not go
3 into another person's land and (**mahaoli) and say, In the
4 name of my freedom, in the name of my desires, I am going
5 to oppress you. In the name of my freedom, I will take away
6 yours. In the name of my wealth, I will take away your
7 resources. In the name of fighting the war on terrorism, I
8 will terrorize you.

9 This is what this means to us. This beautiful
10 map you have over here about all this radar and all these
11 guns and all these missile range facilities, that's what it
12 means to us. That's what it means.

13 And I'm bringing -- I bring my son. We bring our
14 children every time to see what happens, and we show them
15 what the media will not show. It's situations like the
16 Afghanistan orphans and children who were -- what do you
17 call it -- collateral damage. Collateral damage. It's
18 easy to be collateral damage when they're not your own
19 people. Then you look at 9/11, how many people cried out
20 because those blond-haired blue-eyed children, none of whom
21 were killed -- none.

22 And I asked you guys to think about the type of
23 war you're perpetuating. Because 9/11 is just the next
24 step in evolution. You cannot control the evolution of
25 warfare. You cannot. You might try, but then a single

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

76

1 person with a box cutter can tear it all down because, you
2 know what, the humanity is eternally creative. And if the
3 only outlet you have -- you give them for creativity is
4 destruction, that's going to be what's going to happen.

5 And I cried for those people in the tower -- the
6 twin towers on 9/11, and I cried for the people of
7 Afghanistan, and I'll cry for your children too --

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

10 MS. NINEU: -- when the eventual result will
11 happen.

12 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.
13 Kekua, did you have anything you wanted to add?
14 No? Okay.

15 Is there anyone who has not yet spoken tonight
16 who would like to do so? If not, we will go ahead and

17 adjourn this portion of the meeting, but I want to indicate
18 again that the staff that's here is happy to join you back
19 over at the tables if there are any other things that you
20 would like to answer.

21 So --

22 MR. KAJIHIRO: (Inaudible.)

23 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I'm sorry.
24 I can't hear anything unless it's on this. Is this a -- is
25 in a procedural question? Yes, I'd like to answer any

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

HONOLULU, HAWAII

COMMENT
NUMBER

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

77

1 procedural questions.

2 MR. KAJIHIRO: I'm just wondering if we could do
3 the question and answer in plenary so that everyone has the
4 benefit of hearing the information. You know, it's hard --
5 it's hard to -- when it's broken up, it's really hard to,
6 you know, as William was saying, get ideas from other
7 people.

8 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): The reason
9 that -- that we're not incline today do that is because
10 during this public comment period, it is not the intent of
11 the military to answer questions here tonight. Okay? They
12 want to explain anything that they can to you about the
13 proposed action, but they're not here to speculate on
14 anything that may come down the road or what decisions that
15 may be made, so --

16 MR. KAJIHIRO: Well, I understand you can't --
17 you can't speak to the decisions, but I think there were
18 other question that's we thought we could ask and have
19 answered. But it was apparent that you were just listening
20 to our comments. So I think it would be good to be able to
21 ask those questions for clarification for more information
22 about the process, about the proposal, and I think people
23 would like to hear that. Yes?

24 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I will need
25 to confer with them for a moment here. I don't make the

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)

78

1 rules. I simply enforce them as the moderator.

2 MR. KAJIHIRO: Okay.

3 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): So if you'll
4 hold on.

5 MR. KAJIHIRO: Sure.

6 (Recess taken.)

7 HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): I've
8 conferred with the gentlemen over here, and what we'd like
9 to do is -- what we have found is that some people do
10 prefer to do things in a large setting, and other people
11 prefer to ask their questions one on one and get much more
12 technical or specifics.

13 So, again, in order to be flexible and
14 accommodate, if you're -- what we'd like to do is take 15
15 minutes to do some question and answer in the large group.
16 They requested that we not do that on the record because
17 part of the concern is that they want to make sure that
18 anything that they're saying since they're kind of
19 answering questions off the cuff here. And then after that
20 15 minutes, we'll -- for anyone who has any individual
21 comments, we'll do that.

22 So if you'd like -- why don't we just have
23 everyone take turns asking questions because someone might
24 ask questions that would take up the whole 15 minutes. So
25 why don't you ask one question. If they can answer it,

CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222

COMMENT
NUMBER

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

HONOLULU, HAWAII

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<div><p>COPYING PROHIBITED HRS 606-13/HRCF RULE 30 (f) (2)</p><p>79</p><p>1 they will. If it turns out it's a speculative-type</p><p>2 question or something that needs to be resolved with other</p><p>3 technical experts before it would appear in the Final EIS,</p><p>4 then they may have to decline to try and answer that</p><p>5 question.</p><p>6 So who would like to ask the first question?</p><p>7 (Whereupon, court reporter was instructed to go</p><p>8 off the record.)</p><p>9</p><p>10</p><p>11</p><p>12</p><p>13</p><p>14</p><p>15</p><p>16</p><p>17</p><p>18</p><p>19</p><p>20</p><p>21</p><p>22</p><p>23</p><p>24</p><p>25</p><p>CARNAZZO COURT REPORTING COMPANY, LTD. (808) 532-0222</p></div>		<div>THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK</div>	

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

KODIAK, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p style="text-align: center;">GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE EXTENDED TEST RANGE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PUBLIC HEARING</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Monday, February 24, 2003 6:00 - 9:00 p.m. Kodiak High School Commons</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Recorded and Transcribed By: Jacqueline K. Herter, CERT Court Reporter for Deposition Services, Ltd.</p>		<p>(On record)</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We are going to be having a presentation tonight so we encourage any of you who may be optically challenged or otherwise to move to a forward seat for a better view except for this front row which will be reserved for speakers.</p> <p>Thank you for coming tonight. I am Lewis Michaelson, and I've been asked by the Missile Defense Agency to serve as a moderator for tonight's hearing. This is one of seven public hearings being held on the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement. During tonight's hearing, we will be referring to the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense as GMD and referring to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.</p> <p>This public hearing is being held in accordance with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and implementing regulations. The Act requires federal agencies to consider the potential environmental impacts of their activities in the decision-making process.</p> <p>The purpose of tonight's hearing is to provide you with information on the GMD program and proposed GMD Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize the findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your comments on the Draft EIS.</p> <p>Looking at the agenda for tonight, after I finish the introduction, Colonel Kevin Norgaard, the director of the Site Activation Command for GMD in Alaska, will describe the GMD flight test activities. Then Mr. David Hasley, the Chief of the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, National Environmental Policy Act Compliance Branch, will describe the process called for in the National Environmental Policy Act. He will also present the environmental analysis and results of the Draft EIS.</p> <p>The last item on the agenda, the public comment portion, is really the most important. Remember that the Draft EIS is just that -- a draft. This is your opportunity to tell the GMD Project Office how it can improve the analysis of the potential environmental impacts before the document is finalized and before a decision is made on whether or not to proceed with the proposed action.</p> <p>Now a few administrative points on making comments tonight. If you've already signed up to speak, that's great. I have four cards so far. If you've not already filled out a card and would like to speak tonight, please go to the registration table and sign up. Everyone is welcome to speak. It just makes the process run more smoothly if I can call on people from a list. We've also reserved as I said the first row up here for upcoming speakers so we can move through the process efficiently, and I'll let you know when it's time to come up.</p> <p>Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of four minutes and may speak only once. You may not combine or yield speaking times to other people. Elected officials will be given the courtesy of speaking first. And all other speakers will be called on in the order in which they signed up. There's a court reporter here today who is seated to my left. She'll be making a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all of your oral comments will be recorded accurately. As a part of preparing that transcript, an audio and video recording is being made of tonight's hearing as well.</p> <p>If you are uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also provide verbal comments by telephone. There is a toll-free number indicated on the handout that you received when you came in tonight. Looks like this. In fact, if you didn't get one of these, make sure you do. It has a lot of very important information on how to participate in this process.</p> <p>You may also submit written comments, and there are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Public Hearing 02-24-03, Kodiak, AK</p>	

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

KODIAK, ALASKA

COMMENT
NUMBER

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

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

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

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

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

GMD JPO REP COL. NORGAARD: Good evening. My name is Colonel Kevin Norgaard and I live here in Alaska as the Director for Site Activation Command for the GMD program. The Missile Defense Agency, formerly known as the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, is the Department of Defense agency responsible for developing and testing a Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the following charts, I will briefly describe the GMD Extended Test Range, provide an overview of GMD and how it works, and address the decisions to be made. But before I do, I'd like to describe the overall Ballistic Missile Defense System under development and explain the different segments of the System.

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

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

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

Public Hearing
02-24-03, Kodiak, AK

3

COMMENT
NUMBER

includes the same components.

The conceptual GMD element would consist of the components shown on this slide. The components are: the Ground-Based Interceptor; existing early warning radars and satellites; X-Band Radar; Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System; Battle Management Command and Control, that is the central communication and control point; and, finally, the In-Flight Interceptor Communications System, which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor while it's in flight. The GMD Extended Test Range may not include all of these elements.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Hearing
02-24-03, Kodiak, AK

4

COMMENT
NUMBER

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

KODIAK, ALASKA

COMMENT NUMBER

Three conceptual SBX performance regions have been identified to accomplish effective radar coverage for flight-testing. The SBX would operate within the confines of one of these three performance regions based on the needs of the particular flight test scenario. Potential primary support bases have been identified based in part on their proximity to these performance regions. Approximately 10 to 12 days before GMD operational tests, the SBX would leave the Primary Support Base to travel to its performance region in the Pacific Ocean.

The SBX would be stationed at its primary support base between flight test missions. The SBX would have a deep draft, which would restrict it from many harbors. The SBX may dock to a deep draft pier if it is available between missions. If a pier is not available, the SBX would most likely be moored 3 to 10 miles offshore while at the primary support base. Potential locations for the primary support base analyzed in the Draft EIS were the Port of Valdez and Adak, Alaska; Naval Base Ventura County/San Nicolas Island near Oxnard, California; Naval Station Everett in Washington; the Reagan Test Site; and Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii.

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

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

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

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

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

Public Hearing
02-24-03, Kodiak, AK

5

COMMENT NUMBER

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

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

Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD Extended Test Range would not be established and interceptor and target launch scenarios could not be tested under more operationally realistic conditions. The SBX would not be developed. Testing at the existing GMD test ranges using existing launch areas would continue. The decision to be made is whether to enhance the current GMD flight test capability by selecting from the list of alternatives presented, including the No Action Alternative.

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

The Federal Aviation Administration, or FAA, which is a cooperating agency for this Draft EIS, will also rely on this analysis to make its environmental determination for a launch site operator's license at Kodiak Launch Complex. The FAA's alternatives to be evaluated include renewing the current launch site operator's license with no modification; issuing a license for the list of activities as identified in Alternative 1; issuing a license for the list of activities as identified in Alternative 2; and the FAA's No Action Alternative, which would be to not issue a license renewal for the Kodiak Launch Complex.

At the conclusion of this environmental review process, the FAA will issue a separate decision document to support its licensing determination. The FAA will draw its own conclusions from the analysis presented in the Final EIS and relevant information contained in the FAA's earlier *Environmental Assessment of the Kodiak Launch Complex*, and will assume responsibility for its decision and any related mitigation measures.

This concludes the program overview. Now I'd like to introduce Mr. David Hasley, who will describe the Environmental Analysis Process.

USASMDC REPRESENTATIVE MR. HASLEY: Good evening. I'm David Hasley and I'm with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. And my office is responsible for preparing the EIS on behalf of the Missile Defense Agency. So tonight I'll briefly discuss the EIS process and also describe the results of our analysis in the Draft EIS.

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

As you may be aware, the first phase in preparation of an EIS is to conduct what is called scoping to identify environmental and safety issues that should be addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping meetings were held in Kodiak, in Anchorage, Adak, and Valdez, Alaska, as well as Oxnard and Lompoc, California, Honolulu, Hawaii, and Seattle, Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal and

Public Hearing
02-24-03, Kodiak, AK

6

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

KODIAK, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>state agencies and as well as Native Alaskan groups were held to obtain their views concerning the proposed action, its alternatives, and potential environmental effects within their areas of expertise or which are of particular concern to them.</p> <p>Following scoping, the next step was to further refine the possible alternatives being considered for GMD Extended Range Testing. The Draft EIS was then prepared to address the reasonable alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, reasonably foreseeable future actions, and information on cumulative effects. The Draft EIS has been made available to the federal and state agencies and to the general public for your review and comment for a period of 45 days. Now, during this comment period, public hearings like the one tonight are being held to receive public input.</p> <p>All comments received will be reviewed and considered in preparing the Final EIS. The Final EIS will then be made available to the public for a period of 30 days, and no sooner than the 30 days after release of the Final EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will make public its decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Extended Test Range activities.</p> <p>The Missile Defense Agency has identified 15 environmental resource areas that normally require some level of consideration in an EIS. The Draft EIS is focused on those areas with the most potential for environmental impacts. Each resource area was addressed at each location unless it was determined that through initial analysis that the proposed activities would not result in an environmental impact to that resource.</p> <p>The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with implementing the Proposed Action or its alternatives. And in addition, the Draft EIS analyzed environmental issues associated with licenses or permits required to implement the proposed action at each of the potential extended test range sites. As an example, the FAA will use the Extended Test Range EIS to support its licensing decision regarding the proposal to renew the launch site operator's license for the Kodiak Launch Complex.</p> <p>The Draft EIS has also incorporated by reference several existing environmental analyses associated with current Ballistic Missile Defense System test assets that include the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also incorporated by reference is the analysis of environmental impacts contained in the GMD Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>The Draft EIS also analyzed potential for cumulative impacts from other Department of Defense, Government, and commercial activities in areas where GMD actions are proposed.</p> <p>The potential environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIS are presented in the next several slides. And for your convenience, this information has been reproduced as a fact sheet, which was available at the registration table for your review tonight. I would like to highlight just a few of the resource areas that may be important to you. And as you will see, minimal impacts were identified from implementation of the proposed action because most of the proposed actions are a continuation of existing activities at the various locations.</p> <p>At the Kodiak Launch Complex, air quality impacts would be minimal for the short-term increases in air emissions from the construction activities as well as the launches. The launches would be part of the activities currently licensed for the site. It is not likely that the Proposed Action of up to five launches in conjunction with other currently planned or anticipated launches at the Kodiak Launch Complex would exceed this level of activity. Overall impacts to regional air quality are not expected to be adverse and would remain within the national and state Ambient Air Quality Standards.</p> <p>Public Hearing 02-24-03, Kodiak, AK</p>	7	<p>Likewise, the impacts to biological resources would be similar to those from ongoing activities. Wildlife monitoring by the Kodiak Launch Complex concluded that there would be temporary short term effects on wildlife near the launch complex. However, we expect no adverse impacts to wildlife or threatened or endangered species.</p> <p>As part of the Geology and Soils Impact analysis, we looked at whether facilities built at the Kodiak Launch Complex complied with the current building code requirements. In fact the 1994 building code, which was in effect when the current facilities were built, is more stringent than the current International Building Code of 2000. In addition, we expect no adverse effects to the soil chemistry in the area.</p> <p>With respect to the Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes, quantities generated would not exceed the amount anticipated for normal operations at Kodiak Launch Complex. And the Kodiak Launch Complex would manage this under their current plan.</p> <p>Under Health and Safety, the Proposed Action would not increase the risk to workers and the general public over their current operations. Notices of launches would continue to be announced in advance, and launch activities would be within the launch site operator's license for the Kodiak Launch Complex.</p> <p>As well, access to Fossil Beach and other nearby public areas would continue to be limited only during the hazardous operations or in the interest of national security as has been done previously at the Kodiak Launch Complex.</p> <p>There could be a potential lodging shortage during tourist season due to the launch activities. But to reduce the potential for a lodging shortage, the Missile Defense Agency is considering construction of an addition to the Narrow Cape Lodge and/or construction of an additional man camp.</p> <p>With regard to Subsistence, there would be a slight decrease in the amount of land available for subsistence uses because of additional security fencing at the Kodiak Launch Complex. However, the areas proposed for fencing are not significant subsistence use areas in the region.</p> <p>At the Port of Valdez, the small quantities of potentially hazardous materials used during construction activities would result in the generation of added waste that would be accommodated in accordance with existing protocol and regulations. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would follow the U.S. Navy requirements that, to the maximum extent practical, its ships should retain hazardous waste aboard for shore disposal.</p> <p>In compliance with Uniform National Discharge Standards, the Sea Based Test X-Band Radar vessel would incorporate marine pollution control devices, such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues, and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices. Handling and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in accordance with the State of Alaska, Department of Transportation, and Department of Defense policies and procedures.</p> <p>Also Implementation of SBX operational safety procedures, including establishment of controlled areas and limitations in the areas subject to illumination by the radar units, would preclude any potential safety hazard to either the public or the workforce. An Electromagnetic Radiation/Electromagnetic Interference survey and analysis would be required as part of the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process.</p> <p>Public Hearing 02-24-03, Kodiak, AK</p>	8

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

KODIAK, ALASKA

COMMENT NUMBER

COMMENT NUMBER

Coordination would be required with the U.S. Coast Guard to lessen requirements for channel (Valdez Narrows) closure and preclude potential delays of any oil tankers and/or cruise ships using the area, as well as to establish any required security zone at the mooring site.

And for Adak, as would be expected, the impacts for these three resource areas are the same as just described for the Port of Valdez.

This slide shows the other sites proposed for primary support bases which are analyzed in the Draft EIS and the resource areas that were determined to have a potential for environmental concern. Impacts at the Naval Base Ventura County, Naval Station Everett, and Pearl Harbor are expected to be minimal as described for those at the Port of Valdez.

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

Likewise the impacts to biological resources would be similar to those from ongoing activities and, therefore, we expect no adverse impacts to threaten or endanger species.

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

Once the Final EIS is complete, we will mail it to everyone who requested a copy. And if you're not on our mailing list, you can request a copy by writing to the street address or e-mail address given in the handout, or by filling out one of the cards at the registration table. That concludes the environmental analysis portion, and I'll turn it back over to Mr. Michaelson for continuation.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for your attention and courtesy during the presentation. We're going to take a 5 minute recess to rearrange the podium and the microphones so we can begin taking your comments. If you'd like to make verbal comments and you haven't already completed the card, if you'd please go to the registration table during those five minutes and fill one in, I'd appreciate it. And remember again, no decision is being made tonight. The main purpose is for government representatives here tonight to learn first hand of your concerns and suggestions. So I'll be back in five minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay, if I could ask you to take your seats again, please, we're ready to start calling out the names of those ___ if I could ask people to quit their conversations, please, we'd like to get started. I need it quiet for the court reporter, please.

We're ready to start calling out the names of those of you who indicated you'd like to make comments tonight. We have a reserved area up here with five seats. As I call out your names if you'd come sit up here, it'll make the process go more smoothly.

I'll be calling on you in the order in which you signed up. Because we want to record your comments

Public Hearing
02-24-03, Kodiak, AK

9

fully and accurately, we ask that you speak clearly into the microphone. Because of the acoustics in this room, it will be especially important that you speak clearly and make sure that the court reporter can capture everything that you say. Also at the beginning of your speaking time, please state your name for the court reporter.

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

To aid you in knowing when your four minutes are up, I have a simple method for indicating times. After three minutes, I'll raise my index finger like this, indicating that you have one minute left. When all four minutes (sic) are left, I'll raise up my closed hand like this indicating that it's time for you to wrap up your comments.

It's important for you to look up occasionally from your comments if you're reading them so that you'll see the signal. I have one other request and that is, speaking in public can be very intimidating for people, and that is why I'd ask that you withhold any expressions either against or in favor of what the speaker has to say until the speaker is finished. This will also ensure that the court reporter can capture all of your comments. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

And remember, if you choose not to make oral comments here tonight, remember that you can also provide those comments in writing, either written, e-mail or by regular mail. And again, those comments are given the same consideration as oral comments given here tonight.

The speakers that I have signed up to speak so far in order are: Carolyn Heitman, and I apologize in advance if I mispronounce any of these, Mike Sirofchuck, Brad Stevens, and Wayne Stevens. If the four of you would please come up and sit up in these chairs up here. And the first speaker, Carolyn Heitman, you can go right to the podium if you'd like. Wait till everyone sits down. Pull that ___ the middle mike that has -- that's the one.

MS. HEITMAN: Is that good?

MR. MICHAELSON: That's good. Try and get as close as you can so we can hear you real well. And again if you would please state the name for the court reporter when you begin, I appreciate it.

MS. HEITMAN: My name is Carolyn Heitman. Just trying to run through this in four minutes, I'll get what I can done. One of my concerns was from the 1996 EA for the KLC. There's been some great changes. One of them now as I'm looking at the Draft EIS, it's up to 11 launch vehicles. We've got five launch vehicles, four targets, and one interceptor, that's 11. Kodiak is the only launch site proposed to launch all 11. And that's been ___ I think the original had like four.

Another thing is the radars, the X-Band. I'd like to see more information on the X-Band radar, its transmission. We see in the Draft EIS that any transmission 11 miles out can be a hazard to aircraft. I want to know what the impacts will be onto our migratory birds that fly through the path of the radar when it's transmitting the high power. The radar I assume is going to be traveling from Valdez to Adak and then the North Pacific area so which means I'd assume it would pass by Kodiak.

There was an article in the Wall Street Journal August of 2002 which was talking about the portable X-Band on the platform. It said that ___ in this article it says it's being built by Boeing and Raytheon. And that the radar would be linked to as many as 10 Ground-Based Interceptors in Alaska. And that it

Public Hearing
02-24-03, Kodiak, AK

10

P-T-0023

1

2

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

KODIAK, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>would also monitor or guide test interceptors located on Kodiak Island. Where are these interceptors going to be? You can't test launch from Fort Greely if this is your deployed area.</p> <p>Right now I know we're not discussing treaty issues, but we have the INF Treaty and Memorandum of Understanding which says that if you launch interceptors, you ___ they have to be launched from a fixed ___ have to be fixed and above ground, which would eliminate Kodiak from missile silos unless the treaty is dropped.</p> <p>I also ___ the other radars, you've listed a Pillar Mountain monitoring radar. I didn't see the King Salmon radar. There's an electromagnetic wave radar in King Salmon. There's also one out here in Chiniak on the Island. It's been in operation since 1999. The Air Force is doing high powered microwave research and they consider that directed energy weapon system. This radar I cannot believe was left out of this Draft EIS. If you're going to be launching missiles, that radar is a very important radar to have listed here.</p> <p>Also, I'd like to know what kind of interceptor. I didn't see an interceptor listed in the list that showed the launch vehicles. It said one interceptor but it didn't name what kind of an interceptor. I think for the X_Band, the DD form 1494, which will be the military communications electronics board, will be ___ that has to be filed with that board. I think that should have been done since you already know the X-Band is going to be used here in Alaska. I think that should have been done already to tell us what the transmission hazards are. And I think probably that's just about it. You'll get more in writing.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Carolyn, when you said it didn't specify the interceptor, were you talking about the presentation or the document itself?</p> <p>MS. HEITMAN: No, in the Draft EIS.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.</p> <p>MS. HEITMAN: It showed that there were five launch vehicles, some of them which were included in the 1996 EA.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: I see.</p> <p>MS. HEITMAN: But you've added many more. There's 11. That's too much of an impact on Narrow Cape for going ___ and I read also that two and a half months before a launch you'll have people preparing for the launches and then up to two weeks after. And when you have hazardous materials ___ all these years you people have been telling us no liquid fuel, no liquid fuel. AADC, MDA, everybody, no liquid fuel. Now we see, guess what, liquid fuel is going to be stored at the KLC and oxidizers. Those are highly flammable. I can't imagine the public going through the explosive ___ you have a quantity explosive ___ safety quantity distance of 1400 feet.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Right.</p> <p>MS. HEITMAN: There's no way we can access Narrow Cape or Fossil Beach without going through that safety zone area.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: So that's an area you'd like to see clarified, okay.</p> <p>MS. HEITMAN: I would like to see it clarified.</p> <p>Public Hearing 02-24-03, Kodiak, AK</p>	3 4 5 6 7 8	<p>MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.</p> <p>MS. HEITMAN: Mm-hmm.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Our next speaker is Mike Sirofchuck.</p> <p>MR. SIROFCHUCK: Thank you. I'd like to recommend that the GMD....</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Could you state your name, please.</p> <p>MR. SIROFCHUCK: I'm sorry. My name is Mike Sirofchuck. I thought you heard it when he said that. I would recommend that you pursue the No Action Alternative as described in the Executive Summary in Section ES1.11.1 on page ES-9. A statement was made earlier that wasn't exactly incorrect, but it left out some important information; that is, why did the Department of Defense decide to do an Environmental Impact Statement for the Kodiak Launch Complex.</p> <p>The Department of Defense did not want to do an Environmental Impact Statement. And I'd just like to remind the officials here this evening and the public that a coalition of Alaska grass roots groups joined with the National Resources Defense Council and filed suit against the Department of Defense. And the settlement of that court action was the Environmental Impact Statement for Kodiak Launch Complex. So that decision did not come freely from DOD and certainly not willingly.</p> <p>What is suspect is the entire credibility of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement as it relates to the Kodiak Launch Complex. It is based on highly questionable information, much of it provided by the Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation. We know how many launches there have been out there in the past year, that AADC really needs business. But asking the AADC to provide environmental information is sort of like asking the fox to determine if the hen house is safe from predators.</p> <p>For example, in the lake directly beneath the ridge where silos are proposed to be built, there's currently an active beaver lodge and beaver activity occurring all along the Fossil Beach Road. Nowhere in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is there any mention of this activity. Now, you might say, well, these silos aren't going to hurt a couple of beavers down there. The question is what else has been missed. This is just one detail right there literally within sight of where you would stand at the silos, you can't miss it. So what else has been missed in the many environmental assessments and surveys out there. Quite a bit I would expect.</p> <p>One of my main concerns is land use. I sat through quite a few meetings during the 18 months that the Pasagshak Comprehensive Plan was being created. One thing that was very clear was that the community of Kodiak wanted Narrow Cape preserved for recreational purposes. Almost all the land on road system that borders the road system is privately owned except for the state owned land at Narrow Cape. Carolyn has already addressed the access problem.</p> <p>Constructing a man camp for 60 people and adding to the "Narrow Cape Lodge" with an additional facility for 60 people means that there would be anywhere from 120 to 200 people living out in that area. The impacts on sportfishing, hiking, hunting, both subsistence and sport, are hard to even imagine with that number out there. It would greatly impact that area and totally contradict the wishes of the community in terms of the use of that area. This needs to be studied much more closely. And I would recommend that GMD take a good look at that Pasagshak plan and take into account the wishes of the community as they were expressed in an 18 month public process. Thank you.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Next speaker is Brad Stevens.</p> <p>Public Hearing 02-24-03, Kodiak, AK</p>	P-T-0024 1 2 3 4

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

KODIAK, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>MR. STEVENS: Good evening. My name is Brad Stevens. I have so many comments, I don't know where to start, but I think that the conclusion that there will be few or no impacts to this process is largely based on information that is either incorrect, inappropriate, incomplete, or of dubious nature. And I'd like to point out some examples of that.</p> <p>There's a blanket statement that there will be no environmental impacts to the aquatic resources, and this is based on some work conducted by the University of Alaska for the KLC. I've read all those documents, and I find them to be highly questionable for a number of reasons. They did not use appropriate and accepted sampling designs. They used inadequate techniques. They changed the methods in mid study without calibration. They didn't obtain replicate samples. They did not sample control sites, and they made no statistical comparisons.</p> <p>Yet despite this, they say that there are no impacts, although the data that they show does indicate that there were elevated levels of aluminum and reduced stream macrophyte (ph) indices surrounding or associated with one particular launch. I would highly recommend that continued sampling of aluminum and pH levels be conducted in streams around the KLC including control streams that are outside the influence of rocket exhausts. And this sampling should be conducted in fish and other subsistence resources within the nearby streams.</p> <p>There are many places in this document referring to where access would be restricted, other people have spoken to that. I'd like to say that I think ADC and the military organizations involved should outline to the community exactly the number of __ the dates, the number of opportunities and the length of any planned closures. The reasons that those closures might occur that are given include just about anything under the sun, including launches, construction, storage of fuels, rocket transporter storage, and security_related activities, whatever those are.</p> <p>Carolyn pointed out the fact that the fuels are intended to be stored there have a safety distance of 1425 feet, yet the storage sites are within 500 feet of the road. That's just unacceptable. How can you do that. It would require you closing the road or closing access or would require people from the community to drive through the safety zone which is really not a safety zone of the storage areas to get to Fossil Beach. That's got to be changed.</p> <p>Finally, I want to address subsistence uses. The document suggests that there are essentially no subsistence uses of Fossil Beach. And as far as I can tell there was __ they didn't make any effort to find out what the subsistence uses are. In fact, the Department of Fish & Game did an extensive survey in the early '90s. And I reviewed that information and I learned that in a typical year, 25,000 pounds of subsistence resources are taken from intertidal areas alone.</p> <p>And there aren't very many of those on the road system that people have access to as Mike pointed out. So it's hard to believe that none of that came from the Narrow Cape. Whether those resources are impacted by pollution or not or whether people have the conclusion that they're impacted is going to affect how they use those resources or don't use those resources and will create pressures on other areas along the road as well. Thank you.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Wayne Stevens. Speakers after him if you would please come sit in the reserved area here are Mike Milligan, Pam Foreman, and Dr. Gary Carver. And again if you'd begin with your name.</p> <p>MR. STEVENS: Good evening. My name is Wayne Stevens. I'm the Executive Director of the Kodiak Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for being here this evening and holding this public hearing. Just</p> <p>Public Hearing 02-24-03, Kodiak, AK</p>	P-T-0025	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Mike Milligan.</p> <p>MR. MILLIGAN: My name is Mike Milligan and I'm representing myself. It was less than three years ago that President Clinton was proposing to put a hundred missiles in Alaska. I think the process has gone through some good examinations and we're starting to filter down to a system which I feel is more liveable. I would challenge people that are opposed to missile defense to put that proposal on a global perspective and explain to me how the world would be safer if Israel were to dismantle the Aero system which they just deployed their first anti ballistic missile system last October. From my way of thinking, the world would not be safer if Israel were to undeploy the system that they just deployed.</p> <p>But having said that, I do have some concerns. I share some of the environmental concerns that you're hearing tonight and that you'll continue to hear. The first concern I have is with the Aero system is that I am __ want to continue to support missile defense. I do support it, but that support is a qualified support. And that qualified support is based on a pursuit of hit to kill technology. I don't see that skimming the document. I haven't had time to read it. I don't see that reflected over and over in the document that I would like to see. I would like to see the document say we're pursuing hit to kill technology. If we choose to not pursue hit to kill technology, then we're going to reissue another EIS. And as you know, the Aero is not a hit to kill system. It's an explosive system. So if we go to a different kind of system, I want to see that reflected in the document.</p> <p>I would also like to see a commitment in the document to use solid fuel rocketry. You've heard some concerns about liquid fuels. Now, what I take from the document in reference to those liquid fuels is that those are propellants, hydrazine in particular, for the satellites. I can accept that. We're talking about, you know, maybe 50 gallons of extremely dangerous but highly expensive and very serious materials is different than liquid fueled rockets. I would like to see a commitment in the statement saying we at this time have no intention to use liquid fuel rockets.</p> <p>I appreciate as someone who's concerned for peace the fact that we are using existing assets. We're using Minuteman missiles. We used a missile that was formerly stationed on Great Britain at the launch complex. We got rid of that asset. That asset was formerly deployed with a nuclear missile under it. So we used that for something else. Using it for targets is certainly good, but I don't see it addressed __ thank you __ I don't see it addressed in the document what we're going to use for launch vehicles following the using up of these assets. And I think that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>And in closing, I just want to reiterate what you're going to hear from others, is that the access is extremely important to me. I think the access has been improved to some extent with the road work that's been done for the facility, but I want to see a commitment in the document to maintain the access for the public. Thank you.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Pam Foreman.</p> <p>MS. FOREMAN: Hi, my name is Pam Foreman and I'm with the Kodiak Island Convention & Visitors Bureau. My comment is also in regard to the possible construction of additional facilities at the Narrow Cape Lodge or an additional man_camp at the launch complex. I encourage you to maximize the use of</p> <p>Public Hearing 02-24-03, Kodiak, AK</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>P-T-0027</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>P-T-0028</p> <p>1</p>
	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	P-T-0026		

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

KODIAK, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>our current local facilities prior to building any additional facilities out there or considering building additional facilities out there. We currently have many months during the year where our local facilities are underused and occupancy rates are low. There are a few months during the summer months I will grant you that it will be a bit of a squeeze to try to get additional people in. But I encourage you to maximize the use of those facilities first.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. The last speaker I have a card from so far is Dr. Gary Carver. Why don't you pull that mike up. Thanks.</p> <p>DR. CARVER: Thank you. My name is Dr. Gary Carver. I am a geologist and I specialize in seismic hazard assessment and seismic geology. First, I would like to say that in reading the Draft EIS, I noted that the section on geologic hazards I think rather adequately but in a very general way identifies the nature of the seismic hazards at the Narrow Cape area.</p> <p>However, I'm concerned about one of the points made in your slide presentation under geology where you allege that the current facilities as they are constructed and designed exceed the present codes. This is based on the material that's presented in Appendix D of the Draft EIS, and is based on a comparison between the 1994 UBC that was used at the time of the design and construction of the present facilities with the present codes that have been adopted in Alaska, the 2000 IBC.</p> <p>Of concern to me are two input parameters into the calculations for the IBC numbers. The first of these is the site class which the consultants at ASCG (ph) used a site class A which is a very firm rock site class. It's based on the shear weight velocity of the rock.</p> <p>I phoned the ASCG people and talked with the preparer of the worksheets that are presented in Appendix D, and he explained to me that he had no specific information about the rocks under the Kodiak Launch facility. And he used instead a general number for the bedrock that's widely found on most of the rest of Kodiak Island. As it turns out, Narrow Cape is underlain by very soft sandstones with relatively lower seismic shear weight velocities, and I think that the seismic class A is inappropriate; that probably a seismic class B would be required.</p> <p>The consequence of this is a different multiplier or parameter that goes into the calculations. Secondly, is a seismic use group. The consultant that prepared this used a seismic use group 2. This refers to the use of the facility. And in the IBC manual and codes it specifies that facilities used for critical defense reasons, for critical national defense purposes, should use a seismic use group 4. This also results in a substantially different coefficient being entered into the calculations. I worked through the calculations with these two different coefficients in them and found that indeed the numbers were quite different. That the 1994 UBC codes to which the facility is presently built are far from what is required under the 2000 codes.</p> <p>This may be a moot point because of the seismic use group. Those facilities do not care what the use is. They care about what the ground motions are. And secondly, the UBC codes do not take into account surface fault rupture. And yet in the seismic hazards section of this document, you correctly identify several faults which are capable of surface fault rupture at the site. And the research that I've done there and others suggest that there are yet to be identified the active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture through the facility.</p> <p>Public Hearing 02-24-03, Kodiak, AK</p>	P-T-0029	<p>So I dispute the conclusion that was presented and would like to see it reviewed. Thank you.</p> <p>MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. That exhausts the number of speaker cards that I have. Is there anyone else who has been inspired to add comments to that who's not already spoken?</p> <p>If not, we are going to adjourn this meeting to the first room that you were in to make available the opportunity for the staff that are here to answer any other questions that you may have. And keep in mind that anything that you say in there is no longer on the record, but again anything that you have additionally that you would like to say can be provided either on the 800 number or provided in writing in several different ways. With that, we will adjourn the meeting at 7:33. Good night.</p> <p>(Off record)</p> <p>Public Hearing 02-24-03, Kodiak, AK</p>	
	1		
	2		

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

KODIAK, ALASKA

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ALASKA)
) ss.
THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT)

I, Jacqueline K. Herter hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken electronically before me.

That the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 14 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the Public Hearing regarding the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range Draft EIS held on February 24, 2003, transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability from one electronically-recorded tape recorded by me.

That I am not related to any of the parties in these proceedings, and that I am not financially interested in said proceedings or the outcome thereof.

DATED at Kodiak, Alaska, this 2nd day of March, 2003.

SIGNED AND CERTIFIED TO BY:

Jacqueline K. Herter
Court Reporter and
Notary Public
My commission expires: 06-09-06

Public Hearing
02-24-03, Kodiak, AK

17

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 PUBLIC HEARING</p> <p>2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA</p> <p>3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE EXTENDED TEST RANGE</p> <p>6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 Hearing Held</p> <p>15 February 25, 2003</p> <p>16 6:30 p.m.</p> <p>17 At</p> <p>18 Lompoc city Hall - City Council Chamber</p> <p>19 100 Civic Center Plaza</p> <p>20 Lompoc, California</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 File #7843</p> <p>1</p>		<p>1 APPEARANCES:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 JULIA ELLIOTT</p> <p>4 Hearing Moderator</p> <p>5 U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 COMMANDER ROBERT DEES, Technical Advisor</p> <p>8 GMD X-Band Radar Project Office</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 SHARON MITCHELL, Program Manager</p> <p>11 Missile Defense Agency</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 ALSO PRESENT:</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 MS. SHERYL STUBBS, Marketing Representative</p> <p>16 Teledyne Solutions, Inc.</p> <p>17 5000 Bradford Drive, Suite 200</p> <p>18 Huntsville, Alabama 35805</p> <p>19 (256) 603-5973</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 DAN PEREZ</p> <p>22 CST</p> <p>23 300 Voyager Way</p> <p>24 Huntsville, Alabama 35806</p> <p>25 (256) 313-9511</p> <p>2</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
1 APPEARANCES (continued):		1 I N D E X	
2		2	
3 FROM THE PUBLIC:		3	
4 Sheila Baker		4 SPEAKER PAGE	
5 MacGregor Eddy		5	
6 Elden"Bud" Boothe		6 MS. JULIA ELLIOTT, Hearing Moderator 5, 27	
7 James Carucci		7	
8 Hobert Parker		8 COMMANDER ROBERT DEES, GMD JPO Representative 9	
9 Justin Ruhge		9	
10 Lorin Bronson		10 MS. SHARON MITCHELL, USASMDC Representative 18	
11		11	
12		12 SHEILA BAKER, Public Commentary 29	
13		13	
14 REPORTED BY: Diana L. Solis, CSR No. 9715		14 MACGREGOR EDDY, Public Commentary 31	
15 Certified Shorthand Reporter		15	
16 of the State of California		16 ELDEN"BUD" BOOTHE, Public Commentary 34	
17 Santa Barbara Court Reporting Company		17	
18 1060 Monte Drive		18 JAMES CARUCCI, Public Commentary 35	
19 Santa Barbara, California 93110		19	
20 (805) 687-6118		20 HOBERT PARKER, Public Commentary 37	
21		21	
22		22 JUSTIN RUHGE, Public Commentary 39	
23		23	
24		24 LORIN BRONSON, Public Commentary 41	
25		25	
3		4	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2003</p> <p>2 6:30 P.M.</p> <p>3 ---o0o---</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 (SLIDE NO. 1 - PUBLIC HEARING TITLE PAGE)</p> <p>6 MS. ELLIOTT: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.</p> <p>7 Thank you for coming tonight. I am Julia Elliott, and I am</p> <p>8 with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I</p> <p>9 have been asked by the Missile Defense Agency to serve as</p> <p>10 the moderator for tonight's hearing. This is one of seven</p> <p>11 Public Hearings being held on the Ground-Based Midcourse</p> <p>12 Defense Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact</p> <p>13 Statement. During tonight's hearing, we will refer to the</p> <p>14 Ground-Based Midcourse Defense as GMD, and we will refer to</p> <p>15 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.</p> <p>16 This public hearing is being held in accordance</p> <p>17 with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and</p> <p>18 implementing regulations. The act requires federal agencies</p> <p>19 to consider the potential environmental impacts of their</p> <p>20 activities in the decision-making process.</p> <p>21 The purpose of tonight's hearing is to provide you</p> <p>22 with information on the GMD Program and proposed GMD</p> <p>23 Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize the</p> <p>24 findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your</p> <p>25 comments on the Draft EIS.</p> <p>5</p>		<p>1 (SLIDE NO. 2 - PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA)</p> <p>2 Let's look at the agenda for tonight. After I</p> <p>3 finish the introduction, Commander Robert Dees, of the</p> <p>4 Ground-Based Midcourse Defense X-Band Radar Project Office</p> <p>5 will describe the proposed GMD flight test activities. Then</p> <p>6 Mrs. Sharon Mitchell, Program Manager for the EIS, will</p> <p>7 describe the process called for in the National</p> <p>8 Environmental Policy Act. She will also present the</p> <p>9 environmental analysis and results of the Draft EIS.</p> <p>10 The last item on the agenda, the public comment</p> <p>11 portion, is really the most important. Remember that the</p> <p>12 Draft EIS is just that, a draft. This is your opportunity</p> <p>13 to tell the GMD Project office how it can improve its</p> <p>14 analysis of potential environmental impacts before the</p> <p>15 document is finalized, and before a decision is made on</p> <p>16 whether or not to proceed with the proposed action.</p> <p>17 (SLIDE NO. 3 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS)</p> <p>18 Now a few administrative points on making comments</p> <p>19 tonight. If you have already signed up to speak, that's</p> <p>20 good. I have approximately 4 sign up cards already. If you</p> <p>21 have not already filled out a card and would like to speak</p> <p>22 tonight, please go to the registration table and sign up.</p> <p>23 Everyone is welcome to speak, but it makes the process run</p> <p>24 more smoothly if I can call on people from a sign-up list.</p> <p>25 We will also have a reserved seat area up here up here in</p> <p>6</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 front that will be for upcoming speakers, so we can move</p> <p>2 through the process efficiently.</p> <p>3 Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of 4</p> <p>4 minutes, and may speak only once. You may not combine or</p> <p>5 yield speaking times to other people. Elected officials</p> <p>6 will be given the courtesy of speaking first. All other</p> <p>7 speakers will be called in the order in which they signed</p> <p>8 up. There is a court reporter here tonight seated to my far</p> <p>9 left making a verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all</p> <p>10 of your oral comments will be recorded accurately. As part</p> <p>11 of preparing that transcript, an audio and video recording</p> <p>12 is being made of tonight's hearing as well. If you are</p> <p>13 uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also provide</p> <p>14 verbal comments by telephone. There is a toll-free</p> <p>15 telephone number indicated on the handout that you may use</p> <p>16 for recording those comments.</p> <p>17 (SLIDE NO. 4 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS - continued)</p> <p>18 You may also submit written comments. There are 4</p> <p>19 ways to do that. First, you may hand in written comments</p> <p>20 that you brought with you tonight, either to me or to a</p> <p>21 person at the registration table. Second, you may use the</p> <p>22 written comment sheets that are available at the</p> <p>23 registration table to write down any comments that you wish</p> <p>24 to make and turn them in tonight. Third, you may mail</p> <p>25 written comments to the name and address that appear on the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p>		<p>1 comment sheet. Or last of all, you may e-mail comments to</p> <p>2 the address listed on the handout for tonight's hearing.</p> <p>3 Your comments will be entered into the formal</p> <p>4 record of public comments on the Draft EIS, and they will be</p> <p>5 given the same consideration as oral comments offered here</p> <p>6 tonight.</p> <p>7 If you choose to mail in comments, please note</p> <p>8 that they must be postmarked by March 24th, 2003, to be</p> <p>9 considered in the final EIS.</p> <p>10 (SLIDE NO. 5 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS - continued)</p> <p>11 Also, if you would like to receive a copy of the</p> <p>12 final EIS when it becomes available, there are several ways</p> <p>13 you can do that. If you have already received a Draft EIS</p> <p>14 in the mail, you are already on the mailing list and will</p> <p>15 automatically receive the final EIS, unless you tell us</p> <p>16 otherwise. If you provide either oral or written comments,</p> <p>17 you will be sent a copy of the final EIS. If you are not on</p> <p>18 the mailing list, you may fill out a request at the</p> <p>19 registration table.</p> <p>20 You can also request a copy by sending an e-mail</p> <p>21 to the address listed on the handout. Also, copies of the</p> <p>22 final EIS will be placed in area libraries. A list of those</p> <p>23 libraries is available at the registration table and can</p> <p>24 also be found in the Draft EIS.</p> <p>25 The final EIS will also be put on the Missile</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 Defense Agency website listed on the handout.</p> <p>2 Finally, it is important for you to understand</p> <p>3 that the government representatives are not here tonight to</p> <p>4 make any decision. Their main purpose in being here is to</p> <p>5 listen first hand to your suggestions and concerns. With</p> <p>6 that, we will begin with Commander Dees' presentation.</p> <p>7 Commander?</p> <p>8 (SLIDE NO. 6 - GMD PROGRAM OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE)</p> <p>9 CMR. DEES: Good evening, my name is Commander Robert</p> <p>10 Dees, and I am technical a advisor for the GMD X-Band Radar</p> <p>11 Project Office. The Missile Defense Agency, formerly known</p> <p>12 as the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, is the</p> <p>13 Department of Defense Agency responsible for developing the</p> <p>14 testing of ballistic missile defense systems. In the</p> <p>15 following charts, I will briefly describe the GMD Extended</p> <p>16 Test Range, provide an overview of the GMD and how it works,</p> <p>17 and address the decisions to be made. But before I do, I</p> <p>18 would like to describe the overall concept for the Ballistic</p> <p>19 Missile Defense System under development, and explain the</p> <p>20 different segments of the system.</p> <p>21 (SLIDE NO. 7 - BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM)</p> <p>22 This chart represents the flight of a ballistic</p> <p>23 missile. A ballistic missile flight path has three basic</p> <p>24 parts, which we call segments. The segments are the boost</p> <p>25 segment, when the missile is thrusting and leaving the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9</p>		<p>1 atmosphere; the mid-course segment, the middle or ballistic</p> <p>2 phase; and the terminal segment, where the missile re-enters</p> <p>3 the Earth's atmosphere. Within each of these segments in</p> <p>4 our missile program has to this point been characterized by</p> <p>5 discreet, independent programs, which we call elements.</p> <p>6 Each element worked to shoot down ballistic missiles in a</p> <p>7 particular segment of flight.</p> <p>8 Now the Missile Defense Agency is now moving</p> <p>9 toward an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense System.</p> <p>10 Instead of having discreet stand-alone elements, we plan to</p> <p>11 eventually tie the programs for the various elements</p> <p>12 together so we can shoot down missiles in all segments of</p> <p>13 flight.</p> <p>14 Each segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense</p> <p>15 System could include several elements, which are different</p> <p>16 ways of providing a defense against a threat missile during</p> <p>17 the second phase of this plan. All segments and elements</p> <p>18 are designed to work together as each element is developed.</p> <p>19 At the same time, each element could provide an effective</p> <p>20 stand alone defense against a specific type of threat. The</p> <p>21 GMD element is part of the missile -- is part of the</p> <p>22 midcourse defense segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense</p> <p>23 System. The GMD element is the successor to national</p> <p>24 missile defense and includes the same components.</p> <p>25 (SLIDE NO. 8 - REPRESENTATIVE GMD CONCEPT)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">10</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 The conceptual GMD element would consist of the</p> <p>2 components shown on the slide. These components are the</p> <p>3 Ground-Based Interceptor; existing early warning radars and</p> <p>4 satellites; the X-Band Radar, which performs tracking,</p> <p>5 discrimination, and assessment of the incoming missile; the</p> <p>6 Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System; the</p> <p>7 Battle Management Command and Control, which is the central</p> <p>8 communications and control point; and finally, the In-Flight</p> <p>9 Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal, which --</p> <p>10 which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor</p> <p>11 while the interceptor is in flight.</p> <p>12 (SLIDE NO. 9 - PROPOSED GMD ETR SITES AND COMPONENTS)</p> <p>13 The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to</p> <p>14 conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD</p> <p>15 element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This slide</p> <p>16 indicates the proposed locations for the various components</p> <p>17 in the Extended Test Range.</p> <p>18 Of particular interest here, locally, down at the</p> <p>19 bottom of the screen, you'll see the Vandenberg, with the</p> <p>20 IDT, which is the In-Flight Interceptor Communications Data</p> <p>21 Terminal, which alter the interceptors shown as GBI,</p> <p>22 Ground-Based Interceptor, and targets. Targets are already</p> <p>23 being launched for the program at Vandenberg. Nearby, the</p> <p>24 Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar and IDT, one potential home port</p> <p>25 for the SBX is San Nicholas Island down off Port Hueneme.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">11</p>		<p>1 The GMD testing would be of two types. One type</p> <p>2 of testing would involve increasingly robust Ground-Based</p> <p>3 Interceptor flight testing in the Pacific region in</p> <p>4 scenarios that are as operationally realistic as possible.</p> <p>5 The other type would involve validation of the operational</p> <p>6 concept through integrated ground tests using GMD</p> <p>7 components. These are tests using Fort Greely and other</p> <p>8 locations analyzed in the GMD Validation of Operational</p> <p>9 Concept Environmental Assessment. These ground tests do not</p> <p>10 involve missile flights or intercepts.</p> <p>11 The Draft EIS, which is the subject of this</p> <p>12 hearing, evaluates the first type of GMD testing involving</p> <p>13 interceptor flight-testing. This interceptor flight-testing</p> <p>14 will be the focus of our discussion tonight.</p> <p>15 (SLIDE NO. 10 - CURRENT GMD TEST RANGE)</p> <p>16 As you can see from this slide, the existing</p> <p>17 interceptor test capability includes use of the Kodiak</p> <p>18 Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, the Pacific</p> <p>19 Missile Range Facility, and the Reagan Test Site at</p> <p>20 Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. Current testing</p> <p>21 includes launching target missiles from Vandenberg Air Force</p> <p>22 Base, and launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the</p> <p>23 Reagan Test Site, with intercepts occurring over the broad</p> <p>24 ocean area. The ground-based radar prototype at the Reagan</p> <p>25 Test Site is used to track, discriminate and provide updates</p> <p style="text-align: center;">12</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 to the interceptor during flight, while a radar on Oahu is</p> <p>2 used as a tracking sensor. For some tests, target missiles</p> <p>3 are also launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex and viewed</p> <p>4 by the Early Warning Radar at Beale Air Force Base. Current</p> <p>5 capability does not exist to launch target missiles from the</p> <p>6 Pacific missile -- excuse me -- the current capability does</p> <p>7 exist to launch target missiles from the Pacific Missile</p> <p>8 Range Facility as well. These scenarios present a very</p> <p>9 limited capability to demonstrate the effectiveness of the</p> <p>10 GMD element because the Ground-Based Interceptor can only be</p> <p>11 launched from the Reagan Test Site. This limits our ability</p> <p>12 to test the system in an operationally realistic</p> <p>13 environment.</p> <p>14 (SLIDE NO. 11 - CONCEPTUAL EXTENSION OF GMD TEST RANGE)</p> <p>15 The extension of the existing GMD test range would</p> <p>16 increase the realism of GMD testing by using multiple</p> <p>17 engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometries, distances,</p> <p>18 speeds of targets, and interceptors to closely resemble an</p> <p>19 operational scenario involving attack by one or more threat</p> <p>20 missiles. We are proposing to add dual launch -- dual</p> <p>21 target and Ground-Based Interceptor launch capability at</p> <p>22 Kodiak Launch Complex and/or at Vandenberg Air Force Base.</p> <p>23 Also proposed are mobile target launch capability and</p> <p>24 shipborne radars. The extended test range would provide</p> <p>25 more operationally realistic flight testing, as President</p> <p>13</p>		<p>1 Bush and Congress have directed.</p> <p>2 (SLIDE NO. 12 - CONCEPTUAL SEA-BASED TEST X-BAND RADAR)</p> <p>3 A Sea-Based -- a Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar, or</p> <p>4 SBX, is proposed to support the embedded test Range</p> <p>5 flight-testing. This SBX is a multi-function radar that</p> <p>6 performs tracking, discrimination, and intercept assessment</p> <p>7 of incoming target missiles. The SBX would be assembled at</p> <p>8 an existing shipyard on the United States Gulf Coast.</p> <p>9 (SLIDE NO. 13 - POTENTIAL SUPPORT BASES AND</p> <p>10 CONCEPTUAL SBX PERFORMANCE REGIONS)</p> <p>11 Three conceptual SBX performance regions have been</p> <p>12 identified to accomplish effective radar coverage for flight</p> <p>13 testing. The SBX would operate within the confines of one</p> <p>14 of the three performance regions based on the needs of the</p> <p>15 particular flight-test scenario. Potential primary support</p> <p>16 bases have been identified, based in part on their proximity</p> <p>17 to these performance regions. Approximately 10 to 12 days</p> <p>18 before GMD operational tests, the SBX would leave the</p> <p>19 Primary Support Base to travel to its performance region in</p> <p>20 the Pacific Ocean.</p> <p>21 The SBX would be stationed at its primary support</p> <p>22 base between flight test missions. The SBX would have a</p> <p>23 deep draft, which would restrict it from many harbors. The</p> <p>24 SBX may dock at a deep draft pier if it is available between</p> <p>25 missions. If a pier is not available -- is not available</p> <p>14</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 the SBX would most like be moored 3 to 10 miles off shore</p> <p>2 while at the primary support base. Potential locations for</p> <p>3 the primary support base analyzed in the Draft EIS were the</p> <p>4 Port of Valdez and Adak in Alaska; Naval Base Ventura</p> <p>5 County/San Nicolas Island, near Oxnard, California; Pearl</p> <p>6 Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii; Naval Station Everett, Washington;</p> <p>7 and Reagan Test Site, Republic of the Marshall Islands.</p> <p>8 Daily activities provided by the support base might include</p> <p>9 logistics, re-supply, maintenance and repair. Radar</p> <p>10 operations in the vicinity of the primary support base may</p> <p>11 include tracking of satellites and calibration devices.</p> <p>12 Vessels from the primary support base would re-supply the</p> <p>13 SBX. During transit between the primary support base and</p> <p>14 test location, periodic radar operation for satellite and</p> <p>15 calibration device tracking, including joints -- joint</p> <p>16 satellite tracks with GMD sensors and other pre-mission</p> <p>17 activities may also occur.</p> <p>18 (SLIDE NO. 14 - PROPOSED TEST ACTIVITIES)</p> <p>19 Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS which may</p> <p>20 meet some of the enhanced test objectives include launching</p> <p>21 targets and/or intercept -- interceptor missiles from the</p> <p>22 Kodiak Launch Complex at an interceptor missile launcher</p> <p>23 from Vandenberg Air Force Base and launching target missiles</p> <p>24 from mobile platforms over the broad ocean area. The target</p> <p>25 interceptor missiles could be launched in sets of two under</p> <p style="text-align: center;">15</p>		<p>1 some testing scenarios, from either Kodiak Launch Complex,</p> <p>2 the Reagan Test Site or Vandenberg Air Force Base.</p> <p>3 In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data</p> <p>4 Terminals would be constructed in close proximity to the</p> <p>5 proposed Ground-Based Interceptor launch sites and expected</p> <p>6 to intercept area. Existing launch sites and test resources</p> <p>7 would continue to be used in enhanced test scenarios.</p> <p>8 Launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the Kodiak Launch</p> <p>9 Complex may require up to two additional small mobile radars</p> <p>10 and telemetry stations in South Central or Southwest Alaska</p> <p>11 for telemetry and flight safety.</p> <p>12 Existing shipborne sensors would be used for</p> <p>13 midcourse tracking of the target missile during ground-based</p> <p>14 interceptor launches, from both the Kodiak Launch Complex</p> <p>15 and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Sea-Based Test X-Band</p> <p>16 Radar would be constructed and used in tests to perform</p> <p>17 tracking, discrimination and assessment of target missiles.</p> <p>18 (SLIDE NO. 15 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 1)</p> <p>19 The Draft EIS analyzed 3 alternatives from the GMD</p> <p>20 Extended Test Range testing. For Alternative 1, we would</p> <p>21 propose the following components: First, single and dual</p> <p>22 Ground-Based Interceptor launches from the Kodiak Launch</p> <p>23 Complex and the Reagan Test Site. Second, single and dual</p> <p>24 target launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg</p> <p>25 Air Force Base and the Reagan Test Site. And third, single</p> <p style="text-align: center;">16</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 target launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and</p> <p>2 mobile target launch platform. Construction of two</p> <p>3 ground-based interceptor silos, an additional target launch</p> <p>4 pad and associated support facilities would be needed at the</p> <p>5 Kodiak Launch Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight</p> <p>6 Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the</p> <p>7 Kodiak Launch Complex, and at a location in the</p> <p>8 mid-Pacific. The SBX would be used in tests for tracking,</p> <p>9 discrimination, and assessment of target missiles.</p> <p>10 (SLIDE NO. 16 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 2)</p> <p>11 Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1,</p> <p>12 with the exception that Ground-Based Interceptor launches</p> <p>13 would be from Vandenberg Air Force Base instead of from the</p> <p>14 Kodiak Launch Complex. The Ground-Based Interceptor launch</p> <p>15 would require construction of an In-Flight Interceptor</p> <p>16 Communications System Data Terminal and modification of</p> <p>17 existing support facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base.</p> <p>18 (SLIDE NO. 17 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 3)</p> <p>19 Alternative 3 would combine activities proposed</p> <p>20 for Alternatives 1 and 2, and would include ground-based</p> <p>21 interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch Complex and</p> <p>22 Vandenberg Air Force Base, and construction of the required</p> <p>23 support facilities.</p> <p>24 (SLIDE NO. 18 - NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)</p> <p>25 Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD Extended</p> <p>17</p>		<p>1 Test Range would not be established and interceptor and</p> <p>2 target launch scenarios could not be tested under more</p> <p>3 operationally realistic conditions. The SBX would not be</p> <p>4 developed. Testing of the existing GMD Test Ranges using</p> <p>5 existing launch areas would continue.</p> <p>6 (SLIDE NO. 19 - MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY'S</p> <p>7 DECISION TO BE MADE)</p> <p>8 The decision to be made is whether to enhance the</p> <p>9 current GMD Flight Test capability by selecting from the</p> <p>10 list of alternatives presented, including the No Action</p> <p>11 Alternative.</p> <p>12 The Missile Defense Agency is still evaluating the</p> <p>13 feasibility, safety, and utility to the GMD Testing Program</p> <p>14 of conducting a limited number of checkout Ground-Based</p> <p>15 Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely. The possibility</p> <p>16 of such flights is too speculative to be analyzed at this</p> <p>17 time. The Missile Defense Agency will perform an EIS if and</p> <p>18 when it proposes to conduct Ground-Based Interceptor flight</p> <p>19 tests from Fort Greely.</p> <p>20 This concludes the Program Overview. Now I'd like</p> <p>21 to introduce Ms. Sharon Mitchell, who will describe the</p> <p>22 Environmental Analysis Process.</p> <p>23 (SLIDE NO. 20 - GMD ENVIRONMENTAL REPRESENTATIVE)</p> <p>24 MS. MITCHELL: Hello, my name is Sharon Mitchell, I'm</p> <p>25 with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I'm</p> <p>19</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 the Program Manager for the preparation of the EIS on behalf</p> <p>2 of the Missile Defense Agency.</p> <p>3 (SLIDE NO. 21 - DRAFT EIS PROCESS)</p> <p>4 As you maybe aware, the first phase in the</p> <p>5 preparation of an EIS is to conduct what is called scoping,</p> <p>6 to identify environmental and safety issues that should be</p> <p>7 addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping meetings were</p> <p>8 held in Kodiak, Anchorage, Adak and Valdez Alaska; Oxnard</p> <p>9 and Lompoc, California; Honolulu, Hawaii; and Seattle,</p> <p>10 Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal</p> <p>11 and state agencies were held to obtain your views concerning</p> <p>12 the proposed action, its alternatives and the potential</p> <p>13 environmental effects within their areas of expertise, or</p> <p>14 which are of particular concern to them. Following scoping,</p> <p>15 the next step was to further refine the possible</p> <p>16 alternatives being considered for the GMD Extended Range</p> <p>17 Testing. The Draft EIS was then prepared to address</p> <p>18 reasonable alternatives, including the No Action</p> <p>19 Alternative, reasonably foreseeable future actions, and</p> <p>20 information on cumulative effects. The Draft EIS has been</p> <p>21 made available to federal and state agencies and to the</p> <p>22 general public for review and comment for a period of 45</p> <p>23 days. During this comment period, public hearings are being</p> <p>24 held to receive public input. That brings us to this</p> <p>25 hearing tonight.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">19</p>		<p>1 (SLIDE NO. 22 - FINAL EIS PROCESS)</p> <p>2 All of the comments received will be reviewed and</p> <p>3 considered in preparing the final EIS. The final EIS will</p> <p>4 then be made available to the public for a period of 30</p> <p>5 days. No sooner than 30 days after the release of the final</p> <p>6 EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will make public its</p> <p>7 decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Extended Test</p> <p>8 Range activities.</p> <p>9 (SLIDE NO. 23 - ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS CONSIDERED)</p> <p>10 The Missile Defense Agency identified 15</p> <p>11 environmental resource areas that normally require some</p> <p>12 level of analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on</p> <p>13 those areas with the most potential for environmental</p> <p>14 impacts. Each resource area was -- was addressed at each</p> <p>15 location unless it was determined through initial analysis</p> <p>16 that the proposed activities would not result in an</p> <p>17 environmental impact to that resource.</p> <p>18 (SLIDE NO. 24 - SCOPE OF THE DRAFT EIS)</p> <p>19 The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues</p> <p>20 associated with implementing the proposed action or its</p> <p>21 alternatives. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed the</p> <p>22 environmental issues associated with licenses or permits</p> <p>23 required to implement the proposed action at each of the</p> <p>24 potential extended test range sites.</p> <p>25 The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference</p> <p style="text-align: right;">20</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

COMMENT
NUMBERCOMMENT
NUMBER

1 several existing environmental analyses associated with
 2 current Ballistic Missile Defense System test assets that
 3 include the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, the
 4 Pacific Missile Range Facility, and Vandenberg Air Force
 5 Base. Also incorporated by reference is the analysis of
 6 environmental impacts contained in the GMD Validation of
 7 Operational Concept Environmental Assessment.

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

12 (SLIDE NO. 25 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS -
 13 VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE)

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

24 At Vandenberg Air Force Base, air quality impacts
 25 would be minimal from short-term increases in air emissions

21

1 from construction activities and launches. The launches
 2 would be a part of activities currently occurring at the
 3 base. Overall impacts to regional air quality are not
 4 expected to be adverse and would remain within National and
 5 state Ambient Air Quality Standards.

6 Likewise, impacts to biological resources would be
 7 similar to those from ongoing activities. We concluded
 8 there could be temporary short-term effects on wildlife near
 9 the launch complex. We expect no adverse impacts to
 10 threatened or endangered species.

11 Modification to -- modification and construction
 12 activities at Vandenberg Air Force Base would result in
 13 negligible adverse impacts to cultural resources. If during
 14 the course of any ground-disturbing activity, cultural
 15 resources are found, the activity in the area would cease,
 16 and the proper authorities would be notified. Subsequent
 17 actions would follow the guidance provided to comply with
 18 Historic Preservation Laws.

19 (SLIDE NO. 26 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

20 - continued- VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE)

21 With respect to Hazardous Materials and Hazardous
 22 Waste, they would be handled using normal Vandenberg Air
 23 Force Base management procedures and would be well within
 24 their capacity to manage these quantities and kinds of
 25 wastes.

22

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 Under Health and Safety, the Proposed Action will</p> <p>2 not increase the risk to workers and the general public of</p> <p>3 current operations. Notices of launches will continue to be</p> <p>4 announced in advance. Launch activities would be within the</p> <p>5 current level of activities.</p> <p>6 Minimal impacts of land use would occur as a</p> <p>7 result of site preparation of new construction. All of the</p> <p>8 proposed activities would be in accordance with Coastal Zone</p> <p>9 Consistency requirements.</p> <p>10 (SLIDE NO. 27 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</p> <p>11 - continued- KODIAK LAUNCH COMPLEX, PMRF and RTS)</p> <p>12 Kodiak Launch Complex, the Pacific Missile Range</p> <p>13 Facility and the Reagan Test Site, like Vandenberg Air Force</p> <p>14 Base, all have ongoing missile operation. Impacts to air</p> <p>15 quality, hazardous material, and health and safety would be</p> <p>16 minimal from continuing -- from the continuation of existing</p> <p>17 launch activities.</p> <p>18 Likewise, the impacts to biological resources</p> <p>19 would be similar to those from ongoing activities. We</p> <p>20 expect no adverse impacts to threatened or endangered</p> <p>21 species.</p> <p>22 In particular, at the Kodiak Launch Complex,</p> <p>23 socioeconomic impacts could be expected because of the</p> <p>24 potential lodging shortage during tourist season due to</p> <p>25 launch activities. To reduce the potential for -- for a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">23</p>		<p>1 lodging shortage, the Missile Defense Agency is considering</p> <p>2 the construction of an addition to the Narrow Cape Lodge</p> <p>3 and/or construction of an additional mancamp.</p> <p>4 (SLIDE NO. 28 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</p> <p>5 - continued- NAVAL BASE VENTURA COUNTY,</p> <p>6 NAVAL STATION EVERETT, ADAK, VALDEZ, AND PEARL HARBOR)</p> <p>7 At the Naval Base Ventura County, near Oxnard,</p> <p>8 California, an Electromagnetic Radiation/Electromagnetic</p> <p>9 Interference survey and analysis would be conducted as a</p> <p>10 part of the spectrum certification and frequency allocation</p> <p>11 process. The results of the survey would be used to define</p> <p>12 the safe operating area for the SBX. This area would not</p> <p>13 interfere with airspace operations and would allow for a</p> <p>14 safe operating environment.</p> <p>15 The small quantities of potentially hazardous</p> <p>16 materials used during construction activities would result</p> <p>17 in generation of added wastes that would be handled by Naval</p> <p>18 Base Ventura County under their normal waste management</p> <p>19 procedures. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would follow</p> <p>20 U.S. Navy requirements that, to the maximum extent</p> <p>21 practical, ships shall retain hazardous waste aboard ship</p> <p>22 for shore disposal. In compliance with Uniform National</p> <p>23 Discharge Standards, the Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar vessel</p> <p>24 would incorporate marine pollution control devices, such as</p> <p>25 keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residue</p> <p style="text-align: right;">24</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices, in</p> <p>2 design or routine operation. Handling and disposal of</p> <p>3 hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in</p> <p>4 accordance with the State of California, Department of</p> <p>5 Transportation and Department of Defense policies and</p> <p>6 procedures. Implementation of SBX operational safety</p> <p>7 procedures, including establishment of control areas, and</p> <p>8 limitations in the areas subject to illumination by radar</p> <p>9 units, would preclude any potential safety hazard to either</p> <p>10 the public or workforce.</p> <p>11 As you can see, the Draft EIS analyzed these</p> <p>12 resource areas for other potential primary support bases at</p> <p>13 Naval Station Everett, Washington; Adak and Port of Valdez,</p> <p>14 Alaska; and Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Impacts at each of those</p> <p>15 sites are expected to be minimal.</p> <p>16 In closing, please keep in mind that our goal is</p> <p>17 to provide the decision makers with accurate information on</p> <p>18 the environmental consequences of this proposal. To do</p> <p>19 this, we are soliciting comments on the proposed GMD</p> <p>20 Extended Test Range Testing. This feedback will support</p> <p>21 informed decision-making.</p> <p>22 (SLIDE NO. 29 - PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND ADDRESS)</p> <p>23 In addition to tonight's hearing, written comments</p> <p>24 on the Draft EIS will continue to be accepted until March</p> <p>25 24th, 2003, at the address shown on the slide. After the</p> <p>25</p>		<p>1 comment period is over, we will consider all comments as we</p> <p>2 conduct the analysis. Again, equal consideration will be</p> <p>3 given to all comments, whether they are presented here</p> <p>4 tonight, e-mailed, or submitted by regular mail to us.</p> <p>5 Once the final EIS is complete, we will mail it to</p> <p>6 all the individuals who requested a copy. If you are not on</p> <p>7 our mailing list, you can request a copy by writing to the</p> <p>8 street address or e-mail address given in the handout, or by</p> <p>9 filling out a card at the registration table.</p> <p>10 I will now turn the hearing back over to</p> <p>11 Ms. Elliott.</p> <p>12 MS. ELLIOTT: We will now break for a 5-minute recess,</p> <p>13 and then we will begin taking your comments.</p> <p>14 If you would like to make verbal comments, please</p> <p>15 complete the verbal comments card provided at the</p> <p>16 registration table and turn it in to a person at the</p> <p>17 registration table.</p> <p>18 Please remember that no decision is being made</p> <p>19 tonight. The main purpose for the government</p> <p>20 representatives' presence here tonight is to learn firsthand</p> <p>21 of your concerns and suggestions.</p> <p>22 Thank you for your comments and your courtesy</p> <p>23 during the evening.</p> <p>24 (RECESS TAKEN.)</p> <p>25 MS. ELLIOTT: We are ready to start calling out the</p> <p>26</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

COMMENT
NUMBER

1 names of those of you who indicated you would like to make
2 comments tonight. As I mentioned earlier, elected officials
3 will be given the courtesy of speaking first. Are there any
4 elected officials here tonight who, even though you did not
5 sign a registration card, would like to speak? I don't have
6 any handed to me. Okay, we have a reserved area here in the
7 front. This front row across is the reserved area for those
8 who wish to make comments tonight. I will be calling on you
9 in the order in which you signed up. I will start out by
10 calling the first several names so you can get ready to come
11 up front here to use the podium. Because we want to record
12 your comments fully and accurately, we ask that you speak
13 clearly into the microphone. Because of the acoustics in
14 this room, it will be especially important that you speak
15 clearly in order to make certain that the court reporter can
16 capture everything you say. Also, at the beginning of your
17 speaking time, please state your full name for the court
18 reporter.

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

23 To aid you in knowing when the four minutes are
24 up, I have a simple method for indicating times. After
25 three minutes I will raise my index finger, indicating that

27

COMMENT
NUMBER

1 you have one minute left. This -- this should help you find
2 a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. At the end of
3 four minutes, I will raise my closed hand indicating it is
4 time to finish your comments. So it is important to look up
5 from your paper occasionally to see if you are being given a
6 signal.

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

17 We also greatly appreciate your cooperation and
18 understanding in observing the four minute limit. Also keep
19 in mind that oral comments are only one way to share your
20 thoughts and concerns regarding the Draft EIS. You can also
21 hand in written comments tonight, e-mail them, or submit
22 them by regular mail by March 24, 2003.

23 As I mentioned, written comments are given the
24 same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight.

25 With that in mind, we will begin.

28

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 Our first speaker is Sheila Baker, and Sheila will</p> <p>2 be followed by MacGregor Eddy, Elden Bud Boothe, James</p> <p>3 Carucci, and Hobert Parker.</p> <p>4 Those persons would come and sit in the front row</p> <p>5 up here. Thank you.</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 SHEILA BAKER,</p> <p>8 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>9 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 MS. BAKER: Hello, my name is Sheila Baker, and I'm</p> <p>12 from San Luis Obispo County, and I would like to thank you</p> <p>13 for offering this opportunity for us to comment and also say</p> <p>14 no thank you for this whole system. I'm against this</p> <p>15 system. There are several reasons, expensive, very, very</p> <p>16 expensive, and I think at a time when our counties and our</p> <p>17 state and our country is really suffering financial burdens,</p> <p>18 it's ridiculous.</p> <p>19 Regarding the environment, it kind of hurts my</p> <p>20 heart to hear that San Nicholas Island is being involved in</p> <p>21 this. It's a beautiful place. The ocean around it is</p> <p>22 beautiful.</p> <p>23 There was a -- there have been a couple of rocket</p> <p>24 explosions, missile explosions. One of them was, I believe,</p> <p>25 was the fifth NMD, that when it exploded down, they had to</p> <p>29</p>	<p>P-T-0041</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>1 close a couple of beaches. Remembering the Columbia</p> <p>2 explosion, and that's a tragedy, it was hydrazine and</p> <p>3 dinitrogen tetroxide that was a worry as far as the toxic</p> <p>4 debris. These are hyperbolics that are found in each and</p> <p>5 every launch, and monu perchlorate (phonetic spelling) is a</p> <p>6 concern not only here, but everywhere that rockets and</p> <p>7 missiles, propellants are made. Colorado river is deeply</p> <p>8 injured by it. Tungsten (phonetic spelling) is something</p> <p>9 that is part of rocket launch -- excuse me -- part of rocket</p> <p>10 materials and it's found -- found in naval air station and</p> <p>11 also the children who have -- who have had cancer and the</p> <p>12 area around it, the citizens and their urine, as well as in</p> <p>13 Sacramento area, and so there's just a load of problems.</p> <p>14 I think Boeing is being cited for problems with</p> <p>15 their Delta by Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control</p> <p>16 District. There's an invest excel program, that is supposed</p> <p>17 to lower the toxic emissions in the air from 50 tons to 40</p> <p>18 tons per year; that's, that's totally unacceptable.</p> <p>19 There is nothing good about this program. I would</p> <p>20 say the No Action Alternative, but stop testing</p> <p>21 immediately. Make this program go away, it's an awful</p> <p>22 program. Thanks.</p> <p>23 MS. ELLIOTT: MacGregor Eddy.</p> <p>24 ///</p> <p>25 ///</p> <p>30</p>	<p>3</p>

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 MACGREGOR EDDY,</p> <p>2 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MS. EDDY: Hello, my name is he MacGregor Eddy, I'm a</p> <p>6 registered nurse, and I'm particularly interested in the</p> <p>7 health and safety consequences of any public program using</p> <p>8 our tax dollars.</p> <p>9 There's 3 things that I am think are unsaid behind</p> <p>10 what is being presented here today. The first is, is that</p> <p>11 this program is necessary because the initial program was a</p> <p>12 colossal and publicly embarrassing waste of money and --</p> <p>13 internationally and nationally, and there is no guarantee</p> <p>14 that the second one will not be that. Certainly it will be</p> <p>15 a colossal amount of money.</p> <p>16 As to what we get for it, we need to take a look.</p> <p>17 What are we -- what are we spending our money on? I pick up</p> <p>18 this newspaper, it's every newspaper in California right now</p> <p>19 is talking about, for lack of eight billion dollars, which</p> <p>20 is a minuscule part of what's being spent here, gang</p> <p>21 prevention programs in L.A., fire programs, parks and</p> <p>22 recreations, all being cut. So that's the first thing is</p> <p>23 the money.</p> <p>24 The second thing is that the main environmental</p> <p>25 justification in the program that is used the most often is</p> <p>31</p>	<p>P-T-0042</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>	<p>1 that there will be no impact because what damage being done</p> <p>2 to the environment is already being done by currently</p> <p>3 existing programs and launches, therefore there will be no</p> <p>4 increase. From an environmental point of view, on a fragile</p> <p>5 planet, where we, the human beings, are the endangered</p> <p>6 species, I don't think that is an adequate or complete</p> <p>7 response.</p> <p>8 The third concern that I have about this program</p> <p>9 is the health and safety of all of us in -- on the planet.</p> <p>10 We don't have interests that are different from the rest of</p> <p>11 the people that we share this globe with. And the heavens,</p> <p>12 the skies above us, are what will we all look up to to dream</p> <p>13 for the future, and they should not full of reconnaissance,</p> <p>14 surveillance, targeting, lasers, and weaponry. The sky</p> <p>15 belongs to us all, so -- just as the land belongs to us</p> <p>16 all.</p> <p>17 So I wanted to say, the 3 points I want to make is</p> <p>18 number 1, this is a colossal amount of money, it's a huge</p> <p>19 amount of money and very small parts of it, this amount of</p> <p>20 money, would make big differences in the health and safety</p> <p>21 of all of us;</p> <p>22 And number 2, that the environment is already</p> <p>23 being damaged by massive military spending that does not</p> <p>24 protect us from the danger of, for example, box cutters.</p> <p>25 Has no protection from such dangers; and then the third</p> <p>32</p>	<p>4</p>

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 concern -- and the money could be better used for production</p> <p>2 -- for protection against, for example, gangs in Los</p> <p>3 Angeles;</p> <p>4 And then the third concern that I have is that the</p> <p>5 example that we set for the rest of the world as the world's</p> <p>6 wealthiest nation and the world's, now, only super power,</p> <p>7 the victors in the cold war, the example that we set for the</p> <p>8 priorities for poorer nations to spend their wealth on</p> <p>9 weapons rather than the health and well being and the future</p> <p>10 of all the children.</p> <p>11 So someone once said about the initial space</p> <p>12 program, that it's not that we set foot on the moon, it's</p> <p>13 that we set eye on the earth. That we looked at the earth</p> <p>14 and realized that this is our planet and we're all</p> <p>15 responsible for it.</p> <p>16 So would like to say that the best action would</p> <p>17 not only be no expansion of this Missile Defense Program,</p> <p>18 but to stop the currently operating ones. That's what would</p> <p>19 be environmentally sensitive.</p> <p>20 Thank you very much for your time.</p> <p>21 MS. ELLIOTT: Elden Bud Boothe.</p> <p>22 ///</p> <p>23 ///</p> <p>24 ///</p> <p>25 ///</p> <p>33</p>		<p>1 ELDEN BOOTHE,</p> <p>2 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MR. BOOTHE: My name is Elden Boothe. I view this EIS</p> <p>6 as an exercise in futility. The military industrial complex</p> <p>7 will get whatever money to do with whatever they want from</p> <p>8 the supine congress that is in control of our country.</p> <p>9 Now this system is designed, they say, to protect</p> <p>10 us from a nonexistent threat, from a nonexistent enemy.</p> <p>11 Therefore, it can never be proven to be a failure, since it</p> <p>12 will never be used. The cold war MAD system that will we</p> <p>13 have, Mutual Assured Destruction, has served us well.</p> <p>14 Now, we very carefully point out, our leaders very</p> <p>15 carefully point out, that this system is not designed to</p> <p>16 protect us from Russia and China, the only two countries</p> <p>17 that could shoot a nuclear tip missile at this country. But</p> <p>18 they say, those are our friends, so, therefore, we don't --</p> <p>19 we don't design this system to protect from them.</p> <p>20 It's a win-win situation for the Military</p> <p>21 Industrial Complex, because since it will never be used, it</p> <p>22 can never be proven that it does not work. Although,</p> <p>23 leading scientists have said it can be overcome in very many</p> <p>24 different ways if any country was desired to attack us; that</p> <p>25 will never happen.</p> <p>34</p>	<p>P-T-0043</p> <p>1</p>

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 But down the road, there is something that truly</p> <p>2 does bother me. That is the upcoming Star Wars Program as</p> <p>3 pointed out by the Space Command's Vision For 2020, in which</p> <p>4 Earth's circling satellites with high intensity lasers,</p> <p>5 fueled by nuclear reactors, encircling the globe, will be</p> <p>6 able to destroy anything on earth. If that -- if that was</p> <p>7 to come to pass -- and incidentally, that is -- the term for</p> <p>8 that is Visions For 2020. That's not vision 20/20 that's</p> <p>9 the year 2020. And if that -- if that was to come to pass,</p> <p>10 our control of the earth would be complete, but in the</p> <p>11 process, we could in fact be destroying the earth.</p> <p>12 Thank you very much.</p> <p>13 MS. ELLIOTT: James Carucci.</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 JAMES CARUCCI,</p> <p>16 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>17 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 MR. CARUCCI: The regulations for implementing NEPA are</p> <p>20 found in 40 CFR -- excuse me -- Part 1501.7 says, about</p> <p>21 scoping, says that an agency shall revise their scoping. If</p> <p>22 -- I want to read the quote correctly.</p> <p>23 "If substantial changes are made later in the</p> <p>24 Proposed Action, or if significant new circumstances or</p> <p>25 information arise, which bear on the proposal or its</p> <p style="text-align: right;">35</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">P-T-0044</p>	<p>1 impacts."</p> <p>2 Clearly President Bush's announcements to involve</p> <p>3 Vandenberg in the placement of the weapons system has a</p> <p>4 connection to this study and to the Extended Range. Not</p> <p>5 stopping now and rescoping is just not smart, as well as, I</p> <p>6 think, against the regulations. I would strongly urge Space</p> <p>7 Command, the Army, the contractors, to rethink their</p> <p>8 position on this and rescope. There's a connection between</p> <p>9 the two.</p> <p>10 40 CFR 1508.8 defines effects as, "ecological,</p> <p>11 aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social or health,</p> <p>12 whether direct, indirect, or cumulative."</p> <p>13 How is the Extended Test Range, which then brings</p> <p>14 the placement of four or five G- -- Ground-Based Interceptor</p> <p>15 silos to Vandenberg, how is that not an indirect impact,</p> <p>16 having the test range first and the full system later?</p> <p>17 Earlier, Commander Dees, is it? Said, quote,</p> <p>18 "targets are already being launched at Vandenberg,"</p> <p>19 unquote. Soon you'll be able to say GBI is already being</p> <p>20 launched from Vandenberg, unquote.</p> <p>21 It seems to me there's a plan to make this EIS</p> <p>22 proxy, or a preview, prequel document to the placement of</p> <p>23 the weapons system. Vandenberg has not had active weapons</p> <p>24 since the Atlas was stood down around 1965. So from '58 to</p> <p>25 '65, we had nuclear weapons at Vandenberg. The first</p> <p style="text-align: right;">36</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 nuclear weapons stood on alert at Vandenberg. Now you're</p> <p>2 bringing us active weapons. Don't call them defensive</p> <p>3 weapons, they're active. You make a choice to launch them.</p> <p>4 It seems, again, that whether this effect is</p> <p>5 direct or indirect, there's clearly a connection between the</p> <p>6 Extended Test Range and the four GBI weapons to be implaced</p> <p>7 at Vandenberg. I would urge the Army and the Air Force to</p> <p>8 rethink this EIS and to bring it all together in one</p> <p>9 document. Thank you.</p> <p>10 MS. ELLIOTT: Hobert Parker.</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 HOBERT PARKER,</p> <p>13 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>14 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 MR. PARKER: My name is Hobert Parker, and it's a</p> <p>17 mystery to me why these public hearings are even held.</p> <p>18 They're a waste of the taxpayers' money, because this</p> <p>19 conclusion to this environmental business, it was already</p> <p>20 decided and this is all a waste of time. It's just a</p> <p>21 charade.</p> <p>22 But I have doubts about the credibility and the</p> <p>23 integrity of the military officials, the different agencies</p> <p>24 that might be involved in this. I can tell you from</p> <p>25 personal experience that the Air Force, several or many of</p> <p style="text-align: right;">37</p>	<p>4</p> <p>P-T-0045</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1 the people there, from the Commander of Air Force Space</p> <p>2 Command on down, would prefer to climb a tree to tell a lie</p> <p>3 than stand on the ground and say the truth.</p> <p>4 And in the 1960's, near the Dugway Proving</p> <p>5 Grounds, or down in them, 4,000 sheep dropped over dead, and</p> <p>6 the Army denied responsibility. We all know what happened</p> <p>7 about Pearl Harbor, how Admiral Kimball and General Short</p> <p>8 were made scapegoats.</p> <p>9 So if there is an accident, we're not -- we can't</p> <p>10 -- these people will tell you will a lie, straight-faced,</p> <p>11 look you right in the eye and tell you a damn lie, and if</p> <p>12 this sincerity, or if the concern to safety is sincere and</p> <p>13 genuine, what should be done is issue cyanide pills to every</p> <p>14 man, woman, and child that might be anywhere near this when</p> <p>15 there's an accident, and there will be an accident. Then</p> <p>16 these people will avoid an agonizing death. Cause there's</p> <p>17 gonna to be blunders. And if the people who are pushing</p> <p>18 this system are really sincere, they should go and live in</p> <p>19 and near these areas and prove their sincerity, as to</p> <p>20 whether the possibility of an accident. Thank you.</p> <p>21 MS. ELLIOTT: Justin Ruhge.</p> <p>22 ///</p> <p>23 ///</p> <p>24 ///</p> <p>25 ///</p> <p style="text-align: right;">38</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

1 JUSTIN RUHGE,
2 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range
3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:
4
5 MR. RUHGE: Yes, Justin Ruhge, and I would like to
6 comment on the EIS and in support of what I have seen so
7 far. I think we have to reflect on the fact that we've been
8 testing vehicles here at Vandenberg for many, many years.
9 There is a proven environmental credibility here which can
10 be used to apply to any new activities, and there has never
11 been any proven detrimental effect on people or the
12 environment, based on the testing that's had -- has gone on
13 before. And I think it's not a great leap of faith to say
14 that we can go ahead with further testing of the type
15 presented here.
16 I think we have to work on good engineering,
17 environmental data and take it from there. That's the
18 history of engineering development, and this is a good
19 viable program, as far as environmental considerations are
20 concerned.
21 I support this program. I think we have to look
22 at the fact that for the last 50 years we have had no
23 deterrents whatsoever except a nuclear deterrent, and the
24 missile and missile technology being developed here will be
25 useful in the future to apply it to other scenarios and

39

1 other situations; whether it's applied here exactly or not.
2 The fact is we need this technology.
3 I can only point out again, as I pointed out at
4 this last scoping meeting here, is that 12 years ago we had
5 a nut running around in Iraq named Saddam Hussein, and he
6 started shooting his SCUDS at everybody in the region, and
7 as a part of his activity he killed 26 Americans, and -- by
8 one of the SCUDS that was shot down early on, but the
9 warhead continued to tumble into the area around Saudi
10 Arabia.
11 This missile system we're proposing here is meant
12 to get the missiles early so that that type of thing doesn't
13 happen, and we only improve our protection in the world from
14 people like Saddam Hussein, who should be put out of his
15 misery sooner than later, by developing systems like this
16 and being ready. Not waiting until somebody drops a bomb on
17 you before you start thinking about it.
18 So I hope that you'll be able to conclude what
19 you're doing here in the development of this EIR and put out
20 the final version of it, of the EIS, and it will not deter
21 in any way your plans to get this system developed. Thank
22 you.
23 MS. ELLIOTT: That is all the cards that I have. Is
24 there anyone who did not turn in a card and would like to
25 make comments?

40

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 LORIN BRONSON,</p> <p>2 offered public testimony on the Draft GMD Extended Test</p> <p>3 Range Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MR. BRONSON: My name is Lorin Bronson and I live in</p> <p>6 Lompoc. North Korea can nuke us now. We have a moral</p> <p>7 obligation to defend ourselves. You opponents are the same</p> <p>8 people who were wrong about communism and our policy in</p> <p>9 Southeast Asia. You were at that time, and still are,</p> <p>10 unwilling to accept responsibility for helping murder</p> <p>11 2,000,000 Cambodians.</p> <p>12 As for the environment, free countries have the</p> <p>13 best environment. It's the dictatorships that have the</p> <p>14 worst environment.</p> <p>15 MS. ELLIOTT: Sir?</p> <p>16 MR. BRONSON: Yes.</p> <p>17 MS. ELLIOTT: May I request you to fill out this card</p> <p>18 for me, please. Thank you.</p> <p>19 MR. PARKER: I have a question for you. How can you --</p> <p>20 hey, sir --</p> <p>21 MR. BRONSON: You're out of order.</p> <p>22 MR. PARKER: I am not.</p> <p>23 MR. BRONSON: Yes, you are.</p> <p>24 MS. ELLIOTT: Yes, sir. Is there anyone else who have</p> <p>25 not spoken that --</p> <p>41</p>		<p>1 MR. PARKER: He was out of order when we made</p> <p>2 presumptive statements about our attitudes and what our</p> <p>3 history was. He doesn't know a damn thing about it. He was</p> <p>4 out of order.</p> <p>5 MS. ELLIOTT: Is there anyone else who have not spoken</p> <p>6 and would like to speak?</p> <p>7 Thank you all very kindly for your courtesy</p> <p>8 tonight. Thank you for your interest, and thank you for</p> <p>9 your participation. Good night.</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 (The proceedings concluded at 7:24 p.m.)</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p>42</p>	

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

LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<div><div>1REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE</div><div>2PUBLIC HEARING</div><div>3GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE EXTENDED TEST RANGE</div><div>4ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT</div><div>5</div><div>6State of California)</div><div>7) ss.</div><div>8County of Santa Barbara)</div><div>9</div><div>10I DIANA L. SOLIS, CSR 9715, Certified Shorthand</div><div>11Reporter of the State of California, for the County of Santa</div><div>12Barbara, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a</div><div>13true and correct transcript of the proceedings held on</div><div>14February 25, 2003, in the above-entitled cause.</div><div>15</div><div>16DATED: Santa Maria, California, this 26th day of March,</div><div>172003.</div><div>18</div><div>19</div><div>20DIANA L. SOLIS, CSR 9715</div><div>21Certified Shorthand Reporter</div><div>22</div><div>23</div><div>24</div><div>25</div><div>43</div></div>		<div>THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK</div>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

		COMMENT NUMBER			COMMENT NUMBER
1	PUBLIC HEARING		1	APPEARANCES:	
2	ON THE		2		
3	GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE		3	JULIA ELLIOTT	
4	EXTENDED TEST RANGE		4	Hearing Moderator	
5	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT		5	U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command	
6			6		
7			7	COMMANDER ROBERT DEES	
8			8	Ground-Based Midcourse Defense X-Band Radar	
9			9	Project Office	
10	Hearing Held		10		
11	February 24, 2003		11	SHARON MITCHELL	
12	6:30 p.m.		12	U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command	
13	at		13		
14	Oxnard Public Library		14		
15	251 South A Street		15		
16	Oxnard, California		16		
17			17		
18			18		
19			19		
20			20		
21			21		
22	REPORTED BY: Kristy R. Keener, CSR No. 6422		22		
23	Santa Barbara Court Reporting Company		23		
24	1060 Monte Drive		24		
25	Santa Barbara, California 93110 (805) 687-6118		25		
	1			2	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

1	I N D E X	
2		PAGE
3	INTRODUCTION - Ms. Julia Elliott	4
4	GMD PROGRAM OVERVIEW - Commander Robert Dees	8
5	ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS - Ms. Sharon Mitchell	18
6	PUBLIC COMMENTS	
7	Judy Mikels	28
8	Brian Miller	29
9	Charlotte Craven	31
10	Robert Lagomarsino	32
11	Frank Schillo	33
12	Anthony Volante	35
13	Kathy Long	36
14	Alex Herrera	38
15	Devon Chaffee	40
16	Bob Conroy	42
17	Wayne Davey	43
18	David Faubion	45
19	Gordon Birr	46
20	Bill Conneen	49
21	Jack Dodd	50
22	Norman Eagle	53
23	Henry Norten	55
24	Gloria Roman	55
25		
		3

1 OXNARD, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2003

2 6:30 P.M.

3 ---oOo---

4

5 (SLIDE NO. 1 - PUBLIC HEARING TITLE PAGE)

6 MS. ELLIOTT: Good evening, ladies and

7 gentlemen. Thank you for coming tonight. I am

8 Julia Elliott, and I am with the U.S. Army Space and

9 Missile Defense Command. I have been asked by the

10 Missile Defense Agency to serve as the moderator for

11 tonight's hearing. This is one of seven Public Hearings

12 being held on the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense

13 Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact

14 Statement. During tonight's hearing, we will refer to

15 the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense as GMD, and we will

16 refer to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as the

17 Draft EIS.

18 This public hearing is being held in accordance

19 with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act

20 and implementing regulations. This act requires federal

21 agencies to consider the potential environmental impacts

22 of their activities in the decision-making process.

23 The purpose of tonight's hearing is to provide

24 you with information on the GMD program and proposed GMD

25 Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 the findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your</p> <p>2 comments on the Draft EIS.</p> <p>3 (SLIDE NO. 2 - AGENDA)</p> <p>4 Let's look at the agenda for tonight. After I</p> <p>5 finish the introduction, Commander Robert Dees of the</p> <p>6 Ground-Based Midcourse Defense X-Band Radar Project</p> <p>7 Office will describe the proposed GMD flight test</p> <p>8 activities. Then Ms. Sharon Mitchell, Program Manager</p> <p>9 for the EIS, will describe the process called for in the</p> <p>10 National Environmental Policy Act. She will also</p> <p>11 present the environmental analysis and results of the</p> <p>12 Draft EIS.</p> <p>13 The last item on the agenda, the public comment</p> <p>14 portion, is really the most important. Remember that</p> <p>15 the Draft EIS is just that -- a draft. This is your</p> <p>16 opportunity to tell the GMD Project Office how it can</p> <p>17 improve its analysis of potential environmental impacts</p> <p>18 before the document is finalized and before a decision</p> <p>19 is made on whether or not to proceed with the proposed</p> <p>20 action.</p> <p>21 (SLIDE NO. 3 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS)</p> <p>22 Now a few administrative points on making</p> <p>23 comments tonight. If you have already signed up to</p> <p>24 speak, that's good. I have approximately 14 sign-up</p> <p>25 cards already. If you have not already filled out a</p> <p>5</p>		<p>1 card and would like to speak tonight, please go to the</p> <p>2 registration table and sign up. Everyone is welcome to</p> <p>3 speak, but it makes the process run more smoothly if I</p> <p>4 can call on people from a sign-up list. We will also</p> <p>5 have a reserved area up here of six seats that will be</p> <p>6 for upcoming speakers so we can move through the process</p> <p>7 efficiently.</p> <p>8 Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of four</p> <p>9 minutes and may speak only once. You may not combine or</p> <p>10 yield speaking times to other people. Elected officials</p> <p>11 will be given the courtesy of speaking first. All other</p> <p>12 speakers will be called in the order in which they</p> <p>13 signed up. There is a court reporter here today, seated</p> <p>14 to my left, making a verbatim transcript of the hearing</p> <p>15 so that all of your oral comments will be recorded</p> <p>16 accurately. As part of preparing that transcript, an</p> <p>17 audio and video recording is being made of tonight's</p> <p>18 hearing as well.</p> <p>19 If you are uncomfortable with public speaking,</p> <p>20 you may also provide verbal comments by telephone.</p> <p>21 There is a toll-free telephone number indicated on the</p> <p>22 handout that you may use for recording those comments.</p> <p>23 (SLIDE NO. 4 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS - continued)</p> <p>24 You may also submit written comments. There</p> <p>25 are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in</p> <p>6</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 written comments that you brought with you tonight,</p> <p>2 either to me or to a person at the registration table.</p> <p>3 Second, you may use the written comment sheets that are</p> <p>4 available at the registration table to write down any</p> <p>5 comments that you wish to make and turn them in</p> <p>6 tonight. Third, you may mail written comments to the</p> <p>7 name and address that appear on the comment sheet. Or,</p> <p>8 last of all, you may e-mail comments to the address</p> <p>9 listed on the handout for tonight's hearing.</p> <p>10 Your comments will be entered into the formal</p> <p>11 record, and they will be given the same consideration as</p> <p>12 oral comments offered here tonight.</p> <p>13 If you choose to mail in comments, please note</p> <p>14 that they must be postmarked by March 24, 2003, to be</p> <p>15 considered in the Final EIS.</p> <p>16 (SLIDE NO. 5 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS - continued)</p> <p>17 Also, if you would like to receive a copy of</p> <p>18 the Final EIS when it becomes available, there are</p> <p>19 several ways you can do that. If you have already</p> <p>20 received a Draft EIS in the mail, you are already on the</p> <p>21 mailing list and will automatically receive the Final</p> <p>22 EIS unless you tell us otherwise. If you provide either</p> <p>23 oral or written comments, you will be sent a copy of the</p> <p>24 Final EIS. If you are not on the mailing list, you may</p> <p>25 fill out a request at the registration table. You can</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p>		<p>1 also request a copy by sending an e-mail to the address</p> <p>2 listed on the handout. Also, copies of the Final EIS</p> <p>3 will be placed in area libraries. A list of those</p> <p>4 libraries is available at the registration table and can</p> <p>5 also be found in the Draft EIS. The Final EIS will also</p> <p>6 be put on the Missile Defense Agency Web site listed on</p> <p>7 the handout.</p> <p>8 Finally, it is important for you to understand</p> <p>9 that the Government representatives are not here tonight</p> <p>10 to make any decision. Their main purpose in being here</p> <p>11 is to listen firsthand to your suggestions and</p> <p>12 concerns.</p> <p>13 And with that, we will begin with Commander</p> <p>14 Dees' presentation.</p> <p>15 (SLIDE NO. 6 - GMD PROGRAM OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE)</p> <p>16 COMDR. DEES: Good evening. My name is</p> <p>17 Commander Robert Dees, and I'm a technical adviser for</p> <p>18 the GMD X-Band Radar Project Office. The Missile</p> <p>19 Defense Agency, formerly known as the Ballistic Missile</p> <p>20 Defense Organization, is the Department of Defense</p> <p>21 agency responsible for developing and testing a</p> <p>22 Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the following</p> <p>23 charts, I'll briefly describe the GMD Extended Test</p> <p>24 Range, provide an overview of the GMD and how it works,</p> <p>25 and address the decisions to be made. Before I do, I</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 would like to describe the overall concept of the</p> <p>2 Ballistic Missile Defense System under development and</p> <p>3 explain the different segments of the System.</p> <p>4 (SLIDE NO. 7 - BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM)</p> <p>5 This chart represents the flight of a ballistic</p> <p>6 missile. A ballistic missile flight path has three</p> <p>7 basic parts which we call segments. Those segments are</p> <p>8 the boost segment, when the missile is thrusting and</p> <p>9 leaving the atmosphere; the midcourse segment, or the</p> <p>10 middle or ballistic phase; and the terminal segment,</p> <p>11 where the missile re-enters the earth's atmosphere.</p> <p>12 Within each of these segments, our missile program has</p> <p>13 to this point been characterized by discrete,</p> <p>14 independent programs, which we call elements. Each</p> <p>15 element worked to shoot down ballistic missiles in a</p> <p>16 particular segment of flight.</p> <p>17 Now, however, the Missile Defense Agency is now</p> <p>18 moving towards an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense</p> <p>19 System. Instead of having discrete, stand-alone</p> <p>20 elements, we plan to eventually tie the programs for the</p> <p>21 various elements together so we can shoot down missiles</p> <p>22 in all segments of flight. Each segment of the</p> <p>23 Ballistic Missile Defense System could include several</p> <p>24 elements, which are different ways of providing a</p> <p>25 defense against the threat missile during the same phase</p> <p>9</p>		<p>1 of its flight. All segments and elements are designed</p> <p>2 to work together as each element is developed. At the</p> <p>3 same time, each element could provide an effective</p> <p>4 stand-alone defense against a specific type of threat.</p> <p>5 The GMD element is the Midcourse Defense</p> <p>6 Segment of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. The</p> <p>7 GMD element is the successor to National Missile Defense</p> <p>8 and includes the same components.</p> <p>9 (SLIDE NO. 8 - REPRESENTATIVE GMD CONCEPT)</p> <p>10 The conceptual GMD element would consist of the</p> <p>11 components shown on the slide. These components are the</p> <p>12 Ground-Based Interceptor; existing early warning radars</p> <p>13 and satellites; the X-Band Radar, which performs</p> <p>14 tracking discrimination and assessment of the incoming</p> <p>15 missile; the Defense Support Program for Space-based</p> <p>16 Infrared System; the Battle Management Command and</p> <p>17 Control, which is the central communications and control</p> <p>18 point; and, finally, the In-Flight Interceptor</p> <p>19 Communications System Data Terminal, which transmits</p> <p>20 commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor while the</p> <p>21 interceptor is in flight.</p> <p>22 (SLIDE NO. 9 - PROPOSED GMD ETR SITES AND COMPONENTS)</p> <p>23 The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to</p> <p>24 conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD</p> <p>25 element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This</p> <p>10</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 slide indicates the proposed locations for the various</p> <p>2 components in the Extended Test Range.</p> <p>3 Two elements are of particular concern for us</p> <p>4 in this area. One is the Sea-Based Test XBR and IDT</p> <p>5 pictured down here. We've also got Vandenberg Air Force</p> <p>6 Base, just down the road, which has targets,</p> <p>7 interceptors, and IDT.</p> <p>8 The GMD testing would be of two types. One</p> <p>9 type of testing would involve increasingly robust</p> <p>10 Ground-Based Interceptor flight testing in the Pacific</p> <p>11 region in scenarios that are as operationally realistic</p> <p>12 as possible. The other type would involve validation of</p> <p>13 the operational concept through integrated ground tests</p> <p>14 using GMD components. These are tests using Fort Greely</p> <p>15 and other locations analyzed in the GMD Validation of</p> <p>16 Operational Concept Environmental Assessment. These</p> <p>17 ground tests do not involve missile flights or</p> <p>18 intercepts.</p> <p>19 The Draft EIS, which is the subject of this</p> <p>20 hearing, evaluates the first type of GMD testing</p> <p>21 involving interceptor flight testing. This interceptor</p> <p>22 flight testing will be the focus of our discussion</p> <p>23 tonight.</p> <p>24 (SLIDE NO. 10 - CURRENT GMD TEST RANGE)</p> <p>25 As you can see from this slide, the existing</p> <p style="text-align: right;">11</p>		<p>1 interceptor test capability includes the use of Kodiak</p> <p>2 Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, the Pacific</p> <p>3 Missile Range Facility, and the Reagan Test Site at</p> <p>4 Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. Current</p> <p>5 testing includes launching target missiles from</p> <p>6 Vandenberg Air Force Base, and launching Ground-Based</p> <p>7 Interceptors from the Reagan Test Site, with</p> <p>8 interceptors occurring over the broad ocean area. The</p> <p>9 ground-based radar prototype at the Reagan Test Site is</p> <p>10 used to track, discriminate, and provide updates to the</p> <p>11 interceptor during flight, while a radar on Oahu is used</p> <p>12 as a tracking sensor.</p> <p>13 For some tests target missiles are also</p> <p>14 launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex and viewed by</p> <p>15 the Early Warning Radar at Beale Air Force Base.</p> <p>16 Current capability does exist to launch target missiles</p> <p>17 from the Pacific Missile Range Facility as well. These</p> <p>18 scenarios present a very limited capability to</p> <p>19 demonstrate the effectiveness of the GMD element because</p> <p>20 the Ground-Based Interceptor can be launched only from</p> <p>21 the Reagan Test site. This limits our ability to test</p> <p>22 the system in an operationally realistic environment.</p> <p>23 (SLIDE NO. 11 - CONCEPTUAL EXTENSION OF GMD TEST RANGE)</p> <p>24 The extension of the existing GMD test range</p> <p>25 would increase the realism of GMD testing by using</p> <p style="text-align: right;">12</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 multiple engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometries, 2 distances, speeds of targets, and interceptors to 3 closely resemble an operational scenario involving 4 attack by one or more threat missiles. We are proposing 5 to add dual target and Ground-Based Interceptor launch 6 capability at the Kodiak Launch Complex and/or at 7 Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also proposed are mobile 8 target launch capability and shipborne radars. The 9 proposed Extended Test Range would provide more 10 operationally realistic flight testing as President Bush 11 and Congress have directed.</p> <p>12 (SLIDE NO. 12 - CONCEPTUAL SEA-BASED TEST X-BAND RADAR)</p> <p>13 A Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar, or SBX, is 14 proposed to support Extended Test Range flight testing. 15 This SBX is a multi-function radar that performs 16 tracking, discrimination, and intercept assessment of 17 incoming target missiles. The SBX would be assembled at 18 an assisting shipyard on the United States Gulf Coast.</p> <p>19 (SLIDE NO. 13 - POTENTIAL SUPPORT BASES 20 AND CONCEPTUAL SBX PERFORMANCE REGIONS)</p> <p>21 Three conceptual SBX performance regions have 22 been identified to accomplish effective radar coverage 23 for flight testing. The SBX would operate within the 24 confines of one of three performance regions based on 25 the needs of the particular flight-test scenario.</p> <p>13</p>		<p>1 Potential primary support bases have been identified 2 based in part on their proximity to these performance 3 regions. Approximately 10 to 12 days before GMD 4 operational tests, the SBX would leave the Primary 5 Support Base to travel to its performance region in the 6 Pacific Ocean.</p> <p>7 The SBX would be stationed at its primary 8 support base between flight test missions. The SBX 9 would have deep draft, which would restrict it from many 10 harbors. SBX may dock to a deep draft pier if it is 11 available between missions. If a pier is not available, 12 the SBX would most likely be moored three to ten miles 13 offshore while at the primary support base. Potential 14 locations for the primary support base analyzed in the 15 Draft EIS were Port of Valdez and Adak, Alaska; Naval 16 Base Ventura County/San Nicolas Island, near Oxnard, 17 California; Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii; Naval 18 Station Everett, Washington; and Reagan Test Site, 19 Republic of the Marshall Islands.</p> <p>20 Daily activities provided by the support base 21 might include logistics, resupply, and maintenance and 22 repair. Radar operations in the vicinity of the Primary 23 Support Base may include tracking of satellites and 24 calibration devices. Vessels from the primary support 25 base would resupply the SBX. During transit between the</p> <p>14</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 primary support base and the test location, periodic</p> <p>2 radar operation for satellite and calibration device</p> <p>3 tracking including joint satellite tracks with GMD</p> <p>4 sensors and other pre-mission activities may also</p> <p>5 occur.</p> <p>6 (SLIDE NO. 14 - PROPOSED TEST ACTIVITIES)</p> <p>7 Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS, which may</p> <p>8 meet some of the enhanced test objectives include</p> <p>9 launching target and/or interceptor missiles from the</p> <p>10 Kodiak Launch Complex, adding interceptor launch</p> <p>11 missiles from Vandenberg Air Force Base, and launching</p> <p>12 target missiles from mobile platforms over the broad</p> <p>13 ocean area. The target and interceptor missiles could</p> <p>14 be launched in sets of two under some testing scenarios</p> <p>15 from either the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test</p> <p>16 Site, or Vandenberg Air Force Base.</p> <p>17 In-Flight Interceptor Communications System</p> <p>18 Data Terminals would be constructed in close proximity</p> <p>19 to the proposed Ground-Based Interceptor launch sites</p> <p>20 and expected intercept area. Existing Launch sites and</p> <p>21 test resources would continue to be used in enhanced</p> <p>22 test scenarios. Launching Ground-Based Interceptors</p> <p>23 from the Kodiak Launch Complex may require up to two</p> <p>24 additional small mobile radars and telemetry stations in</p> <p>25 South Central or Southwest Alaska for telemetry and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">15</p>		<p>1 flight safety.</p> <p>2 Existing shipborne sensors would be used for</p> <p>3 mid-course tracking of the target missile during</p> <p>4 Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak</p> <p>5 Launch Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The</p> <p>6 Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would be constructed and</p> <p>7 used in tests to perform tracking, discrimination, and</p> <p>8 assessment of target missiles.</p> <p>9 (SLIDE NO. 15 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 1)</p> <p>10 The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for</p> <p>11 the GMD extended test range testing. For Alternative 1</p> <p>12 we would propose the following components: First,</p> <p>13 single and dual launched Ground-Based Interceptor</p> <p>14 launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex and the Reagan</p> <p>15 Test Site; second, single and dual target launches from</p> <p>16 the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base,</p> <p>17 and the Reagan Test Site; and third, single target</p> <p>18 launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and a</p> <p>19 mobile target launch platform.</p> <p>20 Construction of two Ground-Based Interceptor</p> <p>21 silos and an additional target launch pad and associated</p> <p>22 support facilities would be needed at the Kodiak Launch</p> <p>23 Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight</p> <p>24 Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the</p> <p>25 Kodiak Launch Complex and at a location in the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">16</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 mid-Pacific. The SEX would be used in tests for</p> <p>2 tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target</p> <p>3 missiles.</p> <p>4 (SLIDE NO. 16 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 2)</p> <p>5 Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative</p> <p>6 1, with the exception that the Ground-Based Interceptor</p> <p>7 launches would be from Vandenberg Air Force instead of</p> <p>8 from the Kodiak Launch Complex. The Ground-Based</p> <p>9 Interceptor launch would require construction of an</p> <p>10 In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data</p> <p>11 Terminal and modification of existing support facilities</p> <p>12 at Vandenberg Air Force Base.</p> <p>13 (SLIDE NO. 17 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 3)</p> <p>14 Alternative 3 would combine activities proposed</p> <p>15 for Alternative 1 and 2 and would include Ground-Based</p> <p>16 Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch Complex</p> <p>17 and Vandenberg Air Force Base and construction of the</p> <p>18 required support facilities.</p> <p>19 (SLIDE NO. 18 - NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)</p> <p>20 Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD</p> <p>21 Extended Test Range would not be established, and</p> <p>22 interceptor and target launch scenarios could not be</p> <p>23 tested under more operationally realistic conditions.</p> <p>24 The SEX would not be developed. Testing at the existing</p> <p>25 GMD test ranges using existing launch areas would</p> <p>17</p>		<p>1 continue.</p> <p>2 (SLIDE NO. 19 - MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY'S</p> <p>3 DECISION TO BE MADE)</p> <p>4 The decision to be made is whether to enhance</p> <p>5 the current GMD flight test capability by selecting from</p> <p>6 the list of alternatives presented, including the No</p> <p>7 Action Alternative.</p> <p>8 The Missile Defense Agency is still evaluating</p> <p>9 the feasibility, safety, and utility of the GMD testing</p> <p>10 program of conducting a limited number of checkout</p> <p>11 Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely.</p> <p>12 The possibility of such flights is too speculative to be</p> <p>13 analyzed at this time. The Missile Defense Agency will</p> <p>14 perform an EIS if and when it proposes to conduct</p> <p>15 Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely.</p> <p>16 This concludes the Program Overview. I would</p> <p>17 like to introduce Ms. Sharon Mitchell, who will describe</p> <p>18 the Environmental Analysis Process.</p> <p>19 MS. MITCHELL: Hello, my name is Sharon</p> <p>20 Mitchell. I'm with the U.S. Army Space and Missile</p> <p>21 Defense Command. I'm the program manager in regards the</p> <p>22 preparation of the EIS on behalf of the Missile Defense</p> <p>23 Agency.</p> <p>24 (SLIDE NO. 21 - DRAFT EIS PROCESS)</p> <p>25 The National Environmental Policy Act requires</p> <p>18</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 that federal agencies consider environmental</p> <p>2 consequences of their proposed actions in their</p> <p>3 decision-making process. The Missile Defense Agency has</p> <p>4 decided to prepare an EIS under the National</p> <p>5 Environmental Policy Act to analyze the environmental</p> <p>6 effects of extending the current GMD Test Range.</p> <p>7 As you may be aware, the first phase in the</p> <p>8 preparation of an EIS is to conduct what is called</p> <p>9 scoping to identify environmental and safety issues that</p> <p>10 should be addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping</p> <p>11 meetings were held in Kodiak, Anchorage, Adak, and</p> <p>12 Valdez, Alaska; Oxnard and Lompoc, California; Honolulu,</p> <p>13 Hawaii; and Seattle, Washington. Other informal scoping</p> <p>14 sessions with federal and state agencies were held to</p> <p>15 obtain their views concerning the proposed action, its</p> <p>16 alternatives, and potential environmental effects within</p> <p>17 their area of expertise or which are of a particular</p> <p>18 concern to them.</p> <p>19 Following scoping, the next step was to further</p> <p>20 refine the possible alternatives being considered for</p> <p>21 the GMD Extended Range testing. The Draft EIS was then</p> <p>22 prepared to address the reasonable alternatives,</p> <p>23 including the no-action alternative, reasonably</p> <p>24 foreseeable actions, and information on cumulative</p> <p>25 effects. The Draft EIS has been made available to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">19</p>		<p>1 federal and state agencies and to the general public for</p> <p>2 review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this</p> <p>3 comment period, public hearings are being held to</p> <p>4 receive public input. That brings us to this hearing</p> <p>5 tonight.</p> <p>6 (SLIDE NO. 22 - FINAL EIS PROCESS)</p> <p>7 All of the comments received will be reviewed</p> <p>8 and considered in preparing the Final EIS. The Final</p> <p>9 EIS will then be made available to the public for a</p> <p>10 period of 30 days. No sooner than 30 days after the</p> <p>11 release of the Final EIS, the Missile Defense Agency</p> <p>12 will make public its decision on whether to proceed with</p> <p>13 the GMD Test Range activities.</p> <p>14 (SLIDE NO. 23 - ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS CONSIDERED)</p> <p>15 The Missile Defense Agency identified 15</p> <p>16 resource areas that normally require some level of</p> <p>17 analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on those</p> <p>18 areas with the most potential for environmental</p> <p>19 impacts. Each resource area was addressed at each</p> <p>20 location unless it was determined through initial</p> <p>21 analysis that the proposed activities would not result</p> <p>22 in an environmental impact to that resource.</p> <p>23 (SLIDE NO. 24 - SCOPE OF THE DRAFT EIS)</p> <p>24 The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues</p> <p>25 associated with implementing the Proposed Action or its</p> <p style="text-align: right;">20</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 alternative. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed</p> <p>2 environmental issues associated with licenses or permits</p> <p>3 required to implement the proposed action at each of the</p> <p>4 potential extended test range sites.</p> <p>5 The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference</p> <p>6 several existing environmental analyses associated with</p> <p>7 current Ballistic Missile Defense System test assets</p> <p>8 that include Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test</p> <p>9 Site, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and Vandenberg</p> <p>10 Air Force Base. Also incorporated by reference is the</p> <p>11 analysis of environmental impacts contained in the GMD</p> <p>12 Validation of Operational Concept Environmental</p> <p>13 Assessment.</p> <p>14 The Draft EIS also analyzed the potential for</p> <p>15 cumulative impacts from other Department of Defense,</p> <p>16 Government, and commercial activities in areas where the</p> <p>17 GMD actions are proposed.</p> <p>18 (SLIDE NO. 25 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS -</p> <p>19 NAVAL BASE VENTURA COUNTY)</p> <p>20 The potential environmental impacts identified</p> <p>21 in the Draft EIS are presented in the next several</p> <p>22 slides. For your convenience, this information has been</p> <p>23 reproduced as a fact sheet, which is available at the</p> <p>24 registration table, for your review. I would like to</p> <p>25 highlight a few resource areas that may be important to</p> <p>21</p>		<p>1 you. As you can see, minimal impacts were identified</p> <p>2 from implementation of the proposed action. Most of the</p> <p>3 impacts are minimal because the proposed actions are a</p> <p>4 continuation of existing activities at the various</p> <p>5 locations.</p> <p>6 At the Naval Base Ventura County, an</p> <p>7 Electromagnetic Radiation/Electromagnetic Interference</p> <p>8 survey and analysis would be conducted as a part of the</p> <p>9 spectrum certification and frequency allocation</p> <p>10 process. The results of the survey would be used to</p> <p>11 define a safe operating area for the SBX. This area</p> <p>12 would not interfere with airspace operations and would</p> <p>13 allow for a safe operating environment.</p> <p>14 Small quantities of potentially hazardous</p> <p>15 materials used during the construction activities would</p> <p>16 result in generation of added wastes that would be</p> <p>17 handled by Naval Base Ventura County under their normal</p> <p>18 waste management procedures. The Sea-Based Test X-Band</p> <p>19 Radar would follow U.S. Navy requirements that, to the</p> <p>20 maximum extent practicable, ships shall retain hazardous</p> <p>21 waste aboard ship for shore disposal. In compliance</p> <p>22 with the Uniform National Discharge Standards, the</p> <p>23 Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar vessel would incorporate</p> <p>24 marine pollution control devices, such as keeping their</p> <p>25 decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues, and</p> <p>22</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices in</p> <p>2 design or routine operation. Handling and disposal of</p> <p>3 hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in</p> <p>4 accordance with the State of California, Department of</p> <p>5 Transportation, and Department of Defense policies and</p> <p>6 procedures.</p> <p>7 Implementation of SBX operational safety</p> <p>8 procedures, including the establishment of controlled</p> <p>9 areas and limitations in the areas subject to</p> <p>10 illumination by the radar units, would preclude any</p> <p>11 potential safety hazard to either the public or work</p> <p>12 force.</p> <p>13 (SLIDE NO. 26 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS -</p> <p>14 NAVAL STATION EVERETT, ADAK, VALDEZ, AND PEARL HARBOR)</p> <p>15 As you can see, the Draft EIS analyzed these</p> <p>16 resource areas for other primary support bases at Naval</p> <p>17 Station Everett, Washington; Adak and Port of Valdez,</p> <p>18 Alaska; and Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Impacts at each of</p> <p>19 those sites were expected to be minimal.</p> <p>20 (SLIDE NO. 27 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS -</p> <p>21 KODIAK LAUNCH COMPLEX, PMRF, RTS, AND VANDENBERG AFB)</p> <p>22 Kodiak Launch Complex, the Pacific Missile</p> <p>23 Range Facility, the Reagan Test Site, and Vandenberg Air</p> <p>24 Force Base all have ongoing missile operations. Impacts</p> <p>25 to air quality, hazardous materials, and health and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">23</p>		<p>1 safety will be minimal from continuation of launch</p> <p>2 activities.</p> <p>3 Likewise, impacts to biological resources would</p> <p>4 be similar from those from ongoing activities. We</p> <p>5 expect no adverse impacts to threatened or endangered</p> <p>6 species.</p> <p>7 In particular, at the Kodiak Launch Complex</p> <p>8 socio-economic impacts could be expected because of the</p> <p>9 potential lodging shortage during tourist season due to</p> <p>10 launch activities. To reduce the potential for a</p> <p>11 lodging shortage, the Missile Defense Agency is</p> <p>12 considering construction of an addition to the Narrow</p> <p>13 Cape Lodge or construction of an additional man camp.</p> <p>14 In closing, please keep in mind that our goal</p> <p>15 is to provide the decision makers with accurate</p> <p>16 information on the environmental consequences of this</p> <p>17 proposal. To do this, we are soliciting comments on the</p> <p>18 proposed GMD Extended Test Range Testing. This feedback</p> <p>19 will support informed decision making.</p> <p>20 (SLIDE NO. 28 - PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND ADDRESS)</p> <p>21 In addition to tonight's hearing, written</p> <p>22 comments on the Draft EIS will continue to be accepted</p> <p>23 until March 24, 2003, at the address shown on the</p> <p>24 slide. After the comment period is over, we will</p> <p>25 consider all the comments as we conduct the analysis.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">24</p>	

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

COMMENT
NUMBER

1 Again, equal consideration will be given to all
 2 comments, whether they are presented here tonight,
 3 e-mailed, or submitted by regular mail to us.

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

10 I will now turn the hearing back over to
 11 Ms. Elliott.

12 MS. ELLIOTT: We will now break for a
 13 five-minute recess, and then we will begin taking your
 14 comments.

15 If you would like to make verbal comments,
 16 please complete the verbal comments card provided at the
 17 registration table and turn it in to a person at the
 18 registration table.

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

23 Thank you for your comments and your courtesy
 24 during the evening.

25 (Brief recess.)

25

COMMENT
NUMBER

1 MS. ELLIOTT: We're ready to begin. We are
 2 ready to start calling out the names of those of you who
 3 indicated you would like to make comments tonight. As I
 4 mentioned earlier, elected officials will be given the
 5 courtesy of speaking first. We have a reserved area,
 6 which are the first six seats up here, and those are the
 7 six seats over here to my left. I would appreciate it
 8 if those elected officials who plan on speaking would
 9 begin making their way up here and occupying those
 10 seats. We have in order Judy Mikels, Brian Miller,
 11 Charlotte Craven, Robert Lagomarsino, Frank Schillo,
 12 Anthony Volante, Kathy Long, and Alex Herrera.

13 Is that correct?

14 I have a list of people signed up so far. I
 15 will be calling on you in the order in which you signed
 16 up. I will start out by calling the first several names
 17 so you can get ready to come up front here to use the
 18 microphone. And because we want to record your comments
 19 fully and accurately, we ask that you speak clearly into
 20 the microphone. Because of the acoustics in this room
 21 it will be especially important that you speak clearly
 22 in order to make certain that the court reporter can
 23 capture everything you say. Also, at the beginning of
 24 your speaking time, please state your name for the court
 25 reporter.

26

COMMENT
NUMBER

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 We kindly request that you observe the</p> <p>2 four-minute time limit for oral comments. We use the</p> <p>3 four-minute limit at these hearings to give everyone a</p> <p>4 fair and equal chance to make their comments.</p> <p>5 To aid you in knowing when the four minutes are</p> <p>6 up, I have a simple method for indicating times. After</p> <p>7 three minutes, I will raise my index finger indicating</p> <p>8 that you have one minute left. This should help you</p> <p>9 find a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. At</p> <p>10 the end of four minutes, I will raise my closed hand</p> <p>11 indicating it is time to finish your comments. So it is</p> <p>12 important to look up from your paper occasionally to see</p> <p>13 if you are being given a signal.</p> <p>14 I have one other request that will need to be</p> <p>15 enforced for the sake of the court reporter, and that is</p> <p>16 you must withhold any expressions either against or in</p> <p>17 favor of the speaker until the speaker is finished.</p> <p>18 Otherwise there is no way that the court reporter can</p> <p>19 get all of the comments. So while you may be agreeing</p> <p>20 with the speaker by clapping or speaking out, you are</p> <p>21 probably making certain we are not capturing the</p> <p>22 comments on the record. Please hold all of your</p> <p>23 expressions until the speaker is finished, and thank you</p> <p>24 in advance for your cooperation.</p> <p>25 We also greatly appreciate your cooperation and</p> <p>27</p>		<p>1 understanding in observing the four-minute limit. Also,</p> <p>2 keep in mind that oral comments are only one way to</p> <p>3 share your thoughts and concerns regarding the Draft</p> <p>4 EIS. You can also hand in written comments tonight,</p> <p>5 e-mail them, or submit them by regular mail by March 24,</p> <p>6 2003. As I mentioned, written comments are given the</p> <p>7 same consideration as oral comments offered here</p> <p>8 tonight.</p> <p>9 So with that our first speaker, Judy Mikels.</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 JUDY MIKELS</p> <p>12 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>13 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 MS. MIKELS: Thank you very much and welcome</p> <p>16 once again.</p> <p>17 Are we on? I don't think so.</p> <p>18 I can yell real loud if it's just the court</p> <p>19 reporter you're worried about.</p> <p>20 Okay. Very quickly. We have -- I have</p> <p>21 submitted a letter as a formal written comment. So I</p> <p>22 will be very, very brief.</p> <p>23 Welcome to Ventura County. I'm really here.</p> <p>24 My name is Judy Mikels. I'm a Ventura County</p> <p>25 supervisor. I currently serve as chair of the board,</p> <p>28</p>	P-T-0004

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 and I'm also co-chair of Regional Defense Partnership</p> <p>2 21st Century, which is a base support group, and I'm</p> <p>3 merely here to tell you how supportive we are of our</p> <p>4 Navy partners, how happy we are to have Naval Base</p> <p>5 Ventura County and its employees here.</p> <p>6 We have been briefed on the Sea-Based X-Band</p> <p>7 Radar Test platform. We would look forward to having it</p> <p>8 here, and we would certainly welcome the personnel to</p> <p>9 our county who would be involved in this very important</p> <p>10 defense testing. You are always welcome here. I am</p> <p>11 available at any time. I have left my card for any</p> <p>12 technical comments. We'd be happy to do that.</p> <p>13 We've reviewed -- I have reviewed at least the</p> <p>14 executive summary of the EIR. I will admit that I will</p> <p>15 never read the full EIR. I can't do that because you</p> <p>16 never read all of those things. I don't understand</p> <p>17 them. But it looks like to me that you have done the</p> <p>18 right and looked in the right corners, turned over the</p> <p>19 right rocks, and the information that at least I have</p> <p>20 seen in the draft I am very comfortable with, and I</p> <p>21 thank you for being here this evening and giving not</p> <p>22 only myself but all of the citizens of this area an</p> <p>23 opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS.</p> <p>24 Thank you.</p> <p>25 MS. ELLIOTT: Brian Miller.</p> <p>29</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>1 BRIAN MILLER</p> <p>2 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MR. MILLER: Thank you again for the</p> <p>6 opportunity to comment. My name is Brian Miller. I am</p> <p>7 the district chief of staff for Congressman Elton</p> <p>8 Gallegly. The congressman regrets not being here</p> <p>9 tonight, but would like to add his strong support for</p> <p>10 the siting of the Missile Defense Agency's Sea-Based</p> <p>11 X-Band Radar in San Nicolas Island. He too submitted a</p> <p>12 letter at your earlier scoping meeting for the written</p> <p>13 comment.</p> <p>14 San Nicolas Island, which is located 60 miles</p> <p>15 off the coast of Point Mugu and is part of Point Mugu's</p> <p>16 36,000-square-mile sea test range, would be an ideal</p> <p>17 location for the X-Band for two reasons.</p> <p>18 First, the range can be expanded north to Big</p> <p>19 Sur, south to the U.S.-Mexican border, and west into the</p> <p>20 Pacific Ocean, to include 196,000 square miles which</p> <p>21 would be ample room for testing. Additionally, San</p> <p>22 Nicolas Island has a 10,000-square-foot runway and</p> <p>23 offers an unobstructed area over which the Navy and many</p> <p>24 DoD activities currently test their weapon systems.</p> <p>25 Second, the island is supported by an array of</p> <p>30</p>	<p>P-T-0005</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 mainland facilities located at Naval Base Ventura</p> <p>2 County. Those include a naval-operated port, airlift</p> <p>3 capabilities, Laguna Peak which rises 1,500 feet above</p> <p>4 the ocean and hosts an instrumented extended</p> <p>5 line-of-site coverage over the sea range and San Nicolas</p> <p>6 Island, all of which is fiber optically connected to a</p> <p>7 wide variety of laboratories and command centers.</p> <p>8 The Navy, Congress, and U.S. taxpayers have</p> <p>9 contributed greatly to the unique capabilities that</p> <p>10 currently exist at Point Mugu, and these assets could be</p> <p>11 easily leveraged to provide facilities required for the</p> <p>12 extended test range without duplicating expensive</p> <p>13 infrastructure.</p> <p>14 Thank you.</p> <p>15 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>16 Charlotte Craven.</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 CHARLOTTE CRAVEN</p> <p>19 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>20 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 MS. CRAVEN: Thank you for the opportunity to</p> <p>23 speak here tonight. My name is Charlotte Craven. I'm</p> <p>24 mayor of the city of Camarillo, California, and I'm vice</p> <p>25 chairman of the Regional Defense Partnership for the</p> <p>31</p>	<p>5</p> <p>P-T-0006</p>	<p>1 21st Century. I'm here to speak in favor of the</p> <p>2 approval of the EIS to extend the GMD Test Range for</p> <p>3 several reasons.</p> <p>4 The missile activity is just a continuation of</p> <p>5 ongoing activities. The local portion would be 60 miles</p> <p>6 offshore at San Nicolas Island. The radars would be off</p> <p>7 the surface of the water away from marine life, and the</p> <p>8 study found no new environmental issues. So I'm here to</p> <p>9 state community support mainly for the Extended Test</p> <p>10 Range using the San Nicolas Island facility as</p> <p>11 appropriate in the testing.</p> <p>12 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>13 Robert Lagomarsino.</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 ROBERT LAGOMARSINO</p> <p>16 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>17 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 MR. LAGOMARSINO: Very good. My name is Robert</p> <p>20 Lagomarsino, and I am a former member of the U.S. House</p> <p>21 of Representatives for some 19 years. Prior to that I</p> <p>22 served 12 years in the California State Senate, and</p> <p>23 before that I was on the City Council and mayor for the</p> <p>24 City of Ojai.</p> <p>25 I want to endorse and strongly go with the</p> <p>32</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>P-T-0007</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 remarks of the three previous speakers. I think they</p> <p>2 have laid out the reason why San Nicolas Island would be</p> <p>3 a good choice for this proposal. The sea range is</p> <p>4 there. It's controlled. The air is under the control</p> <p>5 of FAA. There is very little encroachment compared to</p> <p>6 other areas in the United States, and there is the</p> <p>7 advantage of an integrated naval base system with a</p> <p>8 harbor, with Air Force, with a railroad.</p> <p>9 So thank you for coming. We support the Navy</p> <p>10 here -- most of us do -- very strongly, and I hope that</p> <p>11 the decision will be the way we would like it to be.</p> <p>12 Thank you.</p> <p>13 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>14 Frank Schillo.</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 FRANK SCHILLO</p> <p>17 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>18 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 MR. SCHILLO: My name is Frank Schillo. I'm a</p> <p>21 retired county supervisor as of last month, and I</p> <p>22 support the X-Band Radar at San Nicolas Island, and I</p> <p>23 want to thank you very much for providing me with the</p> <p>24 executive summary of the EIS that was sent in the mail.</p> <p>25 I had an opportunity to review it before since I had</p> <p>33</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>P-T-0008</p>	<p>1 spoken last time.</p> <p>2 And to put some advantages on the San Nicolas</p> <p>3 site, it's centrally located in the Pacific. There's no</p> <p>4 impact on commercial flights. I think this makes it</p> <p>5 fairly unique among the sites that you're looking for.</p> <p>6 We already have the capabilities for support of it</p> <p>7 through the Pacific Missile Range and from Naval Base</p> <p>8 Ventura County, and I think it's more realistic to have</p> <p>9 a radar, X-Band Radar defending the continental United</p> <p>10 States right close off the offshore.</p> <p>11 And in looking at the Draft EIS on page 33,</p> <p>12 with the Impact and Mitigation Summary, Naval Base</p> <p>13 Ventura County, Port Hueneme, the air quality, airspace,</p> <p>14 biological resources, hazardous materials, health and</p> <p>15 safety, utilities, and visual and aesthetic resources</p> <p>16 basically have no impact. And I think this is a sound</p> <p>17 decision, you're on the way to making a decision that</p> <p>18 will reflect easily to choose the San Nicolas site for</p> <p>19 the X-Band Radar.</p> <p>20 Thank you very much.</p> <p>21 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>22 Anthony Volante.</p> <p>23 / / /</p> <p>24 / / /</p> <p>25 / / /</p> <p>34</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 ANTHONY VOLANTE</p> <p>2 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MR. VOLANTE: Good evening. My name is Anthony</p> <p>6 Volante. I am a councilmember from the City of Port</p> <p>7 Hueneme, California. I am a retired colonel, United</p> <p>8 States Air Force, with the relative rank of brigadier</p> <p>9 general, the State of California. I'm also a member of</p> <p>10 the Regional Defense Partnership 21, which supports our</p> <p>11 military installations here in Ventura County.</p> <p>12 I came before you on October 22, 2002,</p> <p>13 supporting the placing of the Sea-Based X-Band Radar</p> <p>14 component of the Extended Test Range Project at San</p> <p>15 Nicolas Island. I come before you this evening to tell</p> <p>16 you that my city strongly supports the placing of this</p> <p>17 project at San Nicolas Island. I will also have a</p> <p>18 letter requesting unanimous support from the City</p> <p>19 Council strongly urging your support of locating SEX on</p> <p>20 San Nicolas Island and Naval Base Ventura County as the</p> <p>21 primary support base.</p> <p>22 Enhanced testing capacity provided by SEX and</p> <p>23 ETR project is vital to maintaining an aggressive</p> <p>24 posture on national security. Naval Base Ventura County</p> <p>25 and San Nicolas Island provide excellent harbor</p> <p style="text-align: right;">35</p>	<p>P-T-0009</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>	<p>1 facilities, communications, security, and logistic</p> <p>2 support facilities. They are all key elements to a</p> <p>3 successful ETR project and a Sea-Based X-Band Radar.</p> <p>4 I thank you, Commander Dees, and your team for</p> <p>5 the opportunity to come before you this evening to show</p> <p>6 my strong support and also thank you and your staff for</p> <p>7 an outstanding presentation and an excellent Draft EIS.</p> <p>8 Thank you very much.</p> <p>9 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>10 Kathy Long.</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 KATHY LONG</p> <p>13 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>14 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 MS. LONG: Thank you and good evening and thank</p> <p>17 you for providing this opportunity in this community for</p> <p>18 a public hearing to take place on this important</p> <p>19 contribution to the community. I am too a member of the</p> <p>20 RDP 21. My name is Kathy Long, Ventura County</p> <p>21 Supervisor; and the Port of Hueneme, part of the Naval</p> <p>22 Base Ventura County, is in part of my district. And the</p> <p>23 letter I have provided tonight is to provide for the</p> <p>24 public record the support for the operation of GMD</p> <p>25 testing activities at Port Hueneme.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">36</p>	<p>P-T-0010</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 In reviewing the scope of the EIS, it would</p> <p>2 appear that the draft document sufficiently covers the</p> <p>3 intent of the project. Naval Base Ventura County</p> <p>4 located on Port Hueneme is uniquely suited and</p> <p>5 positioned to provide an outstanding site free of</p> <p>6 excessive encroachment and compatible with existing</p> <p>7 programs and capable of expanding facility and personnel</p> <p>8 vital to the project. The base has space, range, and</p> <p>9 resource options at the disposal of this proposed</p> <p>10 project. The deep water port is both essential and</p> <p>11 available to this project. The large ocean range with</p> <p>12 the extended San Nicolas Island base of operations 60</p> <p>13 miles from close public encroachment make the site</p> <p>14 well-suited to significant defense testing with minimal</p> <p>15 negative impact.</p> <p>16 NEVC has been a leader in environmental</p> <p>17 stewardship of San Nicolas Island and has a track record</p> <p>18 of accommodation among its military partners that</p> <p>19 provides the necessary expanded operations required for</p> <p>20 this project. The robust testing and analysis</p> <p>21 considered part of this project must be undertaken under</p> <p>22 the safest conditions possible. Port Hueneme's open sea</p> <p>23 range with proximity to air and naval command is</p> <p>24 powerful and guarantees the least risky test</p> <p>25 environment.</p> <p>37</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	<p>1 The County of Ventura stands ready to work in</p> <p>2 partnership with our military partners and those engaged</p> <p>3 in the continued environmental impact study. We</p> <p>4 appreciate you being here this evening.</p> <p>5 Thank you.</p> <p>6 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>7 Alex Herrera.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 ALEX HERRERA</p> <p>10 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>11 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 MR. HERRERA: Good evening. My name is Alex</p> <p>14 Herrera, and I'm with the City of San Buenaventura, and</p> <p>15 I'm here to show the City of San Buenaventura's support</p> <p>16 for this project as expressed by the mayor's two</p> <p>17 previous letters that are already part of the record.</p> <p>18 Also, I'm here to represent Councilmember Neil Andrews</p> <p>19 and his support for this project. He asked that I read</p> <p>20 a statement for the record.</p> <p>21 "As a city councilmember from the City of San</p> <p>22 Buenaventura, I have every confidence based on the</p> <p>23 materials provided to date in the Draft EIS that this</p> <p>24 project could be developed in and offshore of the County</p> <p>25 of Ventura with minimal unmitigatable environmental</p> <p>38</p>	<p>5</p> <p>P-T-0011</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 impacts. While I cannot speak for the entire City</p> <p>2 Council on this matter at this time, I am the designated</p> <p>3 representative of the city's Regional Defense</p> <p>4 Partnership for the 21st Century, and as such I'm</p> <p>5 charged by my colleagues with the task of remaining</p> <p>6 informed of the events and developments involving</p> <p>7 military installations and activities in this geographic</p> <p>8 area that could impact our city. I believe that upon</p> <p>9 completion of the review provided, any environmental</p> <p>10 impacts identified in the review are vigorously</p> <p>11 mitigated to the extent feasible. This project will</p> <p>12 have the enthusiastic support of our citizens."</p> <p>13 I'd like to make this part of the record for</p> <p>14 Councilman Andrews. And again, we would like to show,</p> <p>15 the City of San Buenaventura would like to show its</p> <p>16 support for this project, and we welcome the GMD testing</p> <p>17 in this area.</p> <p>18 Thank you.</p> <p>19 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>20 Are there any other elected officials who would</p> <p>21 like to speak and did not sign up yet?</p> <p>22 If not, we will begin with the rest of you.</p> <p>23 Our first speaker Devon Chaffee, and the next one will</p> <p>24 be Bob Conroy.</p> <p>25 / / /</p> <p style="text-align: right;">39</p>		<p>1 DEVON CHAFFEE</p> <p>2 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MS. CHAFFEE: Thank you. My name is Devon</p> <p>6 Chaffee, and I'm the research and advocacy coordinator</p> <p>7 of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, an international</p> <p>8 nongovernmental, nonprofit organization that works on</p> <p>9 issues of international law and security. We are based</p> <p>10 in the city of Santa Barbara, and we have an extensive</p> <p>11 membership in the Santa Barbara and Ventura areas.</p> <p>12 I'm here to voice the Foundation's strong</p> <p>13 opposition to the stationing of the Sea-Based X-Band</p> <p>14 Laser at Port Hueneme as part of the Ground-Based</p> <p>15 Missile Defense Testing Extended Test Range.</p> <p>16 In general, the Foundation opposes the Missile</p> <p>17 Defense Agency's pursuit of a national missile defense</p> <p>18 system. The Foundation considers this pursuit to have a</p> <p>19 destabilizing effect on the international security</p> <p>20 environment, impeding arms reduction efforts, and making</p> <p>21 cooperative approaches to security more difficult. It</p> <p>22 is the Foundation's belief that ballistic missile</p> <p>23 defense programs also divert the taxpayers' funds away</p> <p>24 from effective homeland security measures while having</p> <p>25 little potential value for increasing our national</p> <p style="text-align: right;">40</p>	<p>P-T-0012</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 security.</p> <p>2 Furthermore, the Foundation believes that the</p> <p>3 current missile defense development is not subjected to</p> <p>4 sufficient congressional oversight, and the Foundation</p> <p>5 is concerned about the tendency of MDA projects to run</p> <p>6 over budget and over deadlines.</p> <p>7 The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation is not an</p> <p>8 environmental organization and does not itself have the</p> <p>9 expertise to evaluate the Agency's assessment of the</p> <p>10 radar's effect on the marine life of Port Hueneme. The</p> <p>11 Foundation does, however, believe that any of the</p> <p>12 possible negative ramifications listed in the EIS, such</p> <p>13 as disruption to local bird populations and</p> <p>14 complications in the local air flight patterns, are</p> <p>15 unacceptable given the lack of need for expanding the</p> <p>16 test bed.</p> <p>17 Also, given my correspondence with</p> <p>18 environmentalists following missile defense developments</p> <p>19 in Alaska, I am concerned that the Draft EIS may be</p> <p>20 underestimating the impact of the X-Band Radar on local</p> <p>21 marine life populations, the bird population, in</p> <p>22 particular.</p> <p>23 For these reasons the Foundation opposes the</p> <p>24 stationing of a Sea-Based X-Band Radar in Port Hueneme.</p> <p>25 Through and moving beyond the missile defense project, a</p> <p>41</p>	<p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p>	<p>1 joint initiative with the International Network of</p> <p>2 Engineers and Scientists against proliferation, the</p> <p>3 Nuclear Age Peace Foundation supports the development of</p> <p>4 nonproliferation, disarmament, and missile control</p> <p>5 alternatives to missile defense.</p> <p>6 We plan to continue urging members of the Santa</p> <p>7 Barbara and Ventura county communities to join us in</p> <p>8 opposing missile defense operations in our region. The</p> <p>9 Foundation will be issuing further public comments in</p> <p>10 written form.</p> <p>11 Thank you.</p> <p>12 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>13 Bob Conroy. And the next speaker will be Wayne</p> <p>14 Davey.</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 BOB CONROY</p> <p>17 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>18 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 MR. CONROY: Good evening. My name is Bob</p> <p>21 Conroy. I'm a private citizen. I live in Camarillo.</p> <p>22 I would like to show my strong support for the</p> <p>23 X-Band Radar siting at San Nicolas Island. Taking</p> <p>24 advantage of the Pacific Missile Range</p> <p>25 36,000-square-mile instrumented range is very</p> <p>42</p>	<p>9</p> <p>P-T-00013</p> <p>1</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 intelligent from the MDA standpoint. As you know, it's</p> <p>2 the largest instrumented testing training range in the</p> <p>3 world. I think the opportunity to site your radar there</p> <p>4 would be a good selection.</p> <p>5 The County of Ventura strongly supports the</p> <p>6 Navy -- it has for many years -- at all three bases,</p> <p>7 Port Hueneme, Point Mugu, and the Air National Guard</p> <p>8 Base.</p> <p>9 I have reviewed the EIS. I see no downside</p> <p>10 from the standpoint of the MDA; and I, therefore,</p> <p>11 encourage the selection of that site.</p> <p>12 Thank you.</p> <p>13 MS. ELLIOTT: Following the next one will be</p> <p>14 David Faubion.</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 WAYNE DAVEY</p> <p>17 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>18 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 MR. DAVEY: Hello. My name is Wayne Davey. I</p> <p>21 am currently vice president and chief financial officer</p> <p>22 at Rockwell Scientific Company. Rockwell Scientific is</p> <p>23 a privately owned company located in Thousand Oaks and</p> <p>24 Camarillo. I am here tonight speaking on behalf of my</p> <p>25 company Rockwell Scientific. I am also speaking tonight</p> <p style="text-align: right;">43</p>	<p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>P-T-00014</p>	<p>1 as a business supporter of basing the Sea-Based X-Band</p> <p>2 Radar System at Naval Base Ventura County.</p> <p>3 This program is a strategic opportunity for our</p> <p>4 region and Department of Defense, Naval Base Ventura</p> <p>5 County, and San Nicolas Island is the most logical</p> <p>6 location for this program, based on our region's</p> <p>7 existing infrastructure and accessibility.</p> <p>8 This program is also strongly supported by the</p> <p>9 business community in this region. The company I</p> <p>10 represent, Rockwell Scientific, is one of many examples</p> <p>11 of the supporters. Rockwell Scientific has been based</p> <p>12 in this region for over 40 years. We are a nationally</p> <p>13 recognized research and development company doing work</p> <p>14 for the U.S. Government, numerous defense contractors,</p> <p>15 several long-term strategic customers, and many</p> <p>16 commercial customers. Our full-time and contract head</p> <p>17 count totals in excess of 500 well-paying jobs. We have</p> <p>18 approximately 140 Ph.D. scientists on our staff, and</p> <p>19 many of them will be working on this program.</p> <p>20 We also play a major role in designing imaging</p> <p>21 sensors for several national missile defense programs,</p> <p>22 and so we're really aware of this program. Rockwell</p> <p>23 Scientific will also design and develop several</p> <p>24 high-speed electronics and power components which will</p> <p>25 be used in the Sea-Based X-Band Radar System. Many</p> <p style="text-align: right;">44</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 other local and regional companies are also well</p> <p>2 positioned to support this major program being based in</p> <p>3 Naval Base Ventura County. It is our belief that all of</p> <p>4 the health, environmental, and safety issues associated</p> <p>5 with this program will be adequately addressed.</p> <p>6 Thank you very much for the opportunity to</p> <p>7 speak here tonight in support of this important</p> <p>8 project.</p> <p>9 Thank you.</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 DAVID FAUBION</p> <p>12 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>13 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 MR. FAUBION: My name is David Faubion, city of</p> <p>16 Ventura. I came unprepared without a speech, but just</p> <p>17 based on what I'm hearing and just the sheer audacity of</p> <p>18 this, it's a legend that SCI is unworkable, that it's</p> <p>19 extremely too costly, and it's extremely unnecessary.</p> <p>20 So where is the logic in the paradise of Ventura County,</p> <p>21 albeit one that's heavily militarized? So what? It's</p> <p>22 by default an environmental hazard because it's</p> <p>23 unnecessary, it's unworkable, and it's extremely too</p> <p>24 costly. So, therefore, it shouldn't be done because any</p> <p>25 impact that it has environmentally is too much. There's</p> <p>45</p>	<p>3</p> <p>P-T-0015</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1 nothing more to say about it.</p> <p>2 Thank you.</p> <p>3 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>4 Gordon Birt and then William Conneen.</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 GORDON BIRR</p> <p>7 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>8 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 MR. BIRR: My name is Gordon Birt. I'm a</p> <p>11 resident of the Channel Islands beach area. I'm also a</p> <p>12 technical analyst for the Beacon Foundation. We will be</p> <p>13 submitting our report in writing.</p> <p>14 And I attended your scoping meeting, I believe</p> <p>15 it was in December, and I see the presentation today has</p> <p>16 changed considerably from the scoping presentation in</p> <p>17 that I did not see any mention today of San Nicolas</p> <p>18 Island being a contender for the Sea-Based Radar docking</p> <p>19 or mooring. I noticed on your graphics you had three</p> <p>20 circles that were strictly mid-Pacific sea basing. So</p> <p>21 I'm wondering if that's still a viable alternative.</p> <p>22 Back to the process, when I received the</p> <p>23 mailing for tonight's meeting here, it came by Priority</p> <p>24 Mail, and it cost you guys \$4.95 to mail it. I think a</p> <p>25 first-class stamp would have been just as appropriate.</p> <p>46</p>	<p>P-T-0016</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 And also, as far as the process is concerned, I</p> <p>2 notice that the only library in the area that has the</p> <p>3 EIS on file is here at the Oxnard library. The City of</p> <p>4 Port Hueneme, its library or any of the other Ventura</p> <p>5 County libraries did not receive a copy. I checked with</p> <p>6 them, and they were not on the mailing list, and I think</p> <p>7 you should include at least the City of Port Hueneme's</p> <p>8 public library on the Final EIS so everyone in the area</p> <p>9 will have a chance to review it, primarily since they're</p> <p>10 the closest neighbor to the Port Hueneme Harbor, and I</p> <p>11 believe they should be as apprised as anyone else in the</p> <p>12 area, especially since now within the Naval Base Ventura</p> <p>13 County and Port Hueneme you have it listed as the</p> <p>14 primary support base and mooring for the sea-based</p> <p>15 radar.</p> <p>16 I don't know if that's in the EIS as such or</p> <p>17 what its ramifications are, but there is a bottom line</p> <p>18 statement here that says no impact of visual resources</p> <p>19 are anticipated. And this thing is ten times as tall as</p> <p>20 the tallest house in my neighborhood. So there is a</p> <p>21 visual impact, believe me, and the device is so large,</p> <p>22 it won't even fit through the Panama Canal, and I don't</p> <p>23 think it will fit inside the Port of Hueneme either, and</p> <p>24 if it's going to be moored, it's going to have to be</p> <p>25 moored off of Port Hueneme somewhere, if they're</p> <p>47</p>	<p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p>	<p>1 anticipating mooring it for maintenance or testing</p> <p>2 primarily.</p> <p>3 In regards to the testing aspects, going</p> <p>4 through here briefly, you talked about the Department of</p> <p>5 Defense safety procedures. We've always had this</p> <p>6 contention with the SWEF facility there at Port Hueneme</p> <p>7 Base, and its facility has also adhered to the</p> <p>8 Department of Defense. However, they're in a civilian</p> <p>9 area. They should be adhering to the FCC requirements,</p> <p>10 and the FCC requirements, especially in the X-Band Radar</p> <p>11 area, the 9, 10, 12 GHz, is where they deviate</p> <p>12 considerably. Believe me. In an uncontrolled area it's</p> <p>13 almost like ten times the radiation exposure permitted</p> <p>14 with the Department of Defense versus that of the FCC.</p> <p>15 So that should be looked at and try to adhere to the FCC</p> <p>16 requirements.</p> <p>17 And when you talk about the mitigation</p> <p>18 summaries, you usually refer to you're going to track</p> <p>19 and examine these issues prior to setup; and what you</p> <p>20 should do is mitigate these prior to setup. You know,</p> <p>21 just don't track and comment on them. They should be</p> <p>22 mitigated totally.</p> <p>23 I believe that's the extent of my comments for</p> <p>24 now, and I'll reserve the rest for later.</p> <p>25 Thank you.</p> <p>48</p>	<p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 BILL CONNEEN</p> <p>2 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MR. CONNEEN: My name is Bill Conneen. I've</p> <p>6 been a resident of Camarillo for 25 years. I'm a Navy</p> <p>7 veteran, and I actually retired here because it's such a</p> <p>8 lovely place to live and also because the bases here</p> <p>9 provide a way to really accomplish things, and I came</p> <p>10 out here from Washington, D.C., which is really a</p> <p>11 difficult place to get anything done. Actually during</p> <p>12 my time in the Navy, I served as a vice commander of the</p> <p>13 Pacific Missile Test Center, which is a predecessor to</p> <p>14 the current organization. As such, I had an opportunity</p> <p>15 to fly in and out of San Nicolas Island a lot, and it's</p> <p>16 a really isolated location. It's far off the coast, 60</p> <p>17 miles, but it seems like a lot farther than that when</p> <p>18 you're trying to operate projects which is what we did</p> <p>19 out there.</p> <p>20 San Nicolas Island has been a base for a lot of</p> <p>21 different Navy projects that also respect the habitat of</p> <p>22 some endangered species out there. So that's a very</p> <p>23 important consideration, and the Navy's taken that into</p> <p>24 account and I think has done a wonderful job over the</p> <p>25 years of respecting the environment.</p> <p>49</p>	P-T-0017	<p>1 I strongly support the selection of San Nicolas</p> <p>2 Island as a taxpayer seeking the most cost-effective</p> <p>3 solution to the Ballistic Missile Defense challenges</p> <p>4 that you're trying to deal with. I believe that it's</p> <p>5 probably one of the lower cost solutions that you're</p> <p>6 looking at. Having reviewed the Draft EIS, I see no</p> <p>7 reason for concern for the environment or the California</p> <p>8 ecology.</p> <p>9 Thank you.</p> <p>10 MS. ELLIOTT: Nicki Alexander.</p> <p>11 MS. ALEXANDER: I pass.</p> <p>12 MS. ELLIOTT: Okay. Jack Dodd.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 JACK DODD</p> <p>15 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>16 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 MR. DODD: Ms. Elliott, Commander Dees,</p> <p>19 Ms. Mitchell, how are you doing? Good evening and</p> <p>20 welcome to Ventura County. My name is Jack Dodd, and</p> <p>21 I'm a private citizen that lives in the city of</p> <p>22 Camarillo. I'm here tonight to express my support for</p> <p>23 the GMD Extended Test Range EIS and specifically the</p> <p>24 basing of the X-Band Radar at San Nicolas Island. I</p> <p>25 know that perhaps there's been some confusion in maybe</p> <p>50</p>	<p>1</p> <p>P-T-00018</p> <p>1</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 some of the materials or presentations, but the folks</p> <p>2 that I've talked to that have been studying this</p> <p>3 understand that you're talking about putting the X-Band</p> <p>4 Radar at San Nicolas Island, not in the city of or the</p> <p>5 port of Port Hueneme, and that makes a difference in</p> <p>6 environmental effects and the scenery off the coast of</p> <p>7 Port Hueneme. We understand that.</p> <p>8 San Nicolas Island itself, of course, is</p> <p>9 located 60 miles off the coast. It offers unlimited</p> <p>10 access to the Navy sea range, which also provides</p> <p>11 control of radio frequency emissions, it provides</p> <p>12 control of the airspace, it provides control over</p> <p>13 vessels on the sea surface, on the range and around San</p> <p>14 Nicolas Island. And, of course, being off the -- 60</p> <p>15 miles off the coast, it certainly minimizes the effects</p> <p>16 on the mainland of Southern California.</p> <p>17 Additionally, having the Sea-Based Test X-Band</p> <p>18 Radar at San Nicolas Island operating on the Point Mugu</p> <p>19 sea range leverages the existing environmental approvals</p> <p>20 through the sea ranges on the environmental impact</p> <p>21 statement and leverages the environmental effect that</p> <p>22 Mr. Conneen commented on whereby the Navy is a very good</p> <p>23 steward of the environment. In fact, a lot of</p> <p>24 endangered species flock to the Navy locations because</p> <p>25 they're much more friendly than the surrounding areas.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">51</p>	<p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	<p>1 Additionally, operating on the sea range</p> <p>2 leverages the existing operational linkages with</p> <p>3 Vandenberg Air Force Base which is part of the extended</p> <p>4 test range in proposing both target launches and missile</p> <p>5 interceptors. It benefits from both the -- from the</p> <p>6 logistics connectivity with both the Port of Hueneme</p> <p>7 through surface craft and the airfield at Point Mugu,</p> <p>8 both of which are owned and controlled by the Navy and</p> <p>9 can provide you dedicated service should you decide to</p> <p>10 base the X-Band Radar at San Nick.</p> <p>11 As you've seen from the meeting tonight,</p> <p>12 including all the elected officials and both current and</p> <p>13 former and their representatives, there's a widespread</p> <p>14 support in Ventura County for all the military</p> <p>15 activities, specifically taking their time to come here</p> <p>16 tonight to express their support for basing the X-Band</p> <p>17 Radar at San Nick. You certainly will be welcome here,</p> <p>18 and if you have any questions for us, certainly let us</p> <p>19 know, and we'll be happy to answer them, but we're</p> <p>20 hopeful that in your decisions, we know you have a lot</p> <p>21 of data to look at, all the locations that are around</p> <p>22 the Pacific, but we hope you'll be favorably impressed</p> <p>23 both with population, the geography, and the technical</p> <p>24 capabilities of Ventura County in general, and Naval</p> <p>25 Base Ventura County in particular, and San Nicolas</p> <p style="text-align: right;">52</p>	<p>5</p> <p>6</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 Island as your primary support base for the X-Band</p> <p>2 Radar.</p> <p>3 Thank you.</p> <p>4 MS. ELLIOTT: That is all of the comment cards</p> <p>5 that I have. Is there anyone who has not spoken and</p> <p>6 would like to speak?</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 NORMAN EAGLE</p> <p>9 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>10 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 MR. EAGLE: My name is Norman Eagle. I'm a</p> <p>13 resident of Oxnard, and I was a naval engineering</p> <p>14 officer in World War II.</p> <p>15 I tried to read through the two volumes of the</p> <p>16 impact statement that was deposited here in the library,</p> <p>17 and I could not get very far with it, frankly. The</p> <p>18 technical requirements are way, way above my head right</p> <p>19 now, and I am concerned that we are getting evaluations</p> <p>20 of the impact statement from individuals who don't have</p> <p>21 the proper qualifications to make judgments on it. I</p> <p>22 think the statement speaks for itself. It's two volumes</p> <p>23 that I saw, and I believe that there are two other</p> <p>24 volumes somewhere. I may be wrong about that.</p> <p>25 But it's obvious that there were thousands of</p> <p>53</p>	<p>P-T-0019</p> <p>1</p>	<p>1 man-hours that went into the studies that now comprise</p> <p>2 this impact statement. I'm concerned about the process</p> <p>3 of making an impact evaluation, impact statement because</p> <p>4 we have -- what we have is a Defense Department project</p> <p>5 that is being put forward by the Defense Department. We</p> <p>6 have an agency within the same Defense Department doing</p> <p>7 the impact evaluations.</p> <p>8 I think that there is a conflict of interest</p> <p>9 there, quite obvious. What residents of this area</p> <p>10 require is an independent assessment, an independent</p> <p>11 evaluation. We need to have experts unbiased, unbiased,</p> <p>12 that is, not paid by the Defense Department, not paid by</p> <p>13 any specific interest group, but an objective public</p> <p>14 evaluation unit. Other than that, what we're going to</p> <p>15 have is Ken Lay appointing an evaluation or auditing</p> <p>16 committee for Eron Corporation.</p> <p>17 Thank you.</p> <p>18 MS. ELLIOTT: Also, sir, will you please fill</p> <p>19 out a card. Well, I don't have one here. Get one from</p> <p>20 the registration table, and someone's going to get one</p> <p>21 for you.</p> <p>22 Thank you.</p> <p>23 Anyone else?</p> <p>24 / / /</p> <p>25 / / /</p> <p>54</p>	<p>2</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>1 HENRY NORTEN</p> <p>2 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 MR. NORTEN: My name is Henry Norten. I'm a</p> <p>6 resident of Oak View. I speak for myself. I didn't</p> <p>7 come here prepared to talk, but I needed to add a couple</p> <p>8 of comments. I'm strongly in favor of locating the</p> <p>9 X-Band Radar at San Nicolas Island. One thing I'd like</p> <p>10 you to have to consider is that the convex nature of the</p> <p>11 coast of the western United States causes air traffic</p> <p>12 flying north and south to fly inland and causes ship</p> <p>13 traffic to (inaudible). It's just natural for that.</p> <p>14 Looking out beyond San Nicolas Island, there is really</p> <p>15 nothing out there. And so also because of the deep</p> <p>16 ocean aspect of the fall-off, the shelf of San Nicolas</p> <p>17 Island, there is really less biological issues to be</p> <p>18 addressed than nearer inland to the coast. And I look</p> <p>19 at that as a unique advantage beyond other areas around</p> <p>20 the Pacific Rim.</p> <p>21 Thank you.</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 GLORIA ROMAN</p> <p>24 offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range</p> <p>25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:</p> <p>55</p>	<p>P-T-0020</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>1 MS. ROMAN: Good evening. My name is Gloria</p> <p>2 Roman. I am also a resident of Oxnard, and I am</p> <p>3 concerned about the hazardous waste. Our elected</p> <p>4 officials don't seem to -- one lady mentioned she don't</p> <p>5 even understand what she read, and she's not concerned</p> <p>6 about the hazardous waste, what kind of waste? I'm</p> <p>7 concerned about that. What is the waste, hazardous</p> <p>8 waste that you mention on your slides up there? And you</p> <p>9 know, what happened to the missile Columbus? We ought</p> <p>10 to be concerned about this here too.</p> <p>11 MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.</p> <p>12 Anyone else?</p> <p>13 Thank you all for your courtesy, your interest,</p> <p>14 and your participation tonight. Thank you kindly.</p> <p>15 (Proceedings concluded at 8:00 p.m.)</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p>56</p>	<p>P-T-0021</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

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

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

COMMENT
NUMBERCOMMENT
NUMBER

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2 COUNTY OF VENTURA
3
4
5 I, KRISTY R. KEENER, CSR NO. 6422, Certified
6 Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby
7 certify that the foregoing pages are a true and correct
8 transcript of the proceedings held on February 24, 2003,
9 in the above-entitled cause.

10
11 DATED: Newbury Park, California, this 10th day of
12 March, 2003.

13
14 KRISTY R. KEENER, CSR NO. 6422
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

57

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

VALDEZ, ALASKA

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK

1 PUBLIC HEARING - GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE
2 EXTENDED TEST RANGE
3 DRAFT ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
4
5

6 MR FULLER: Good evening, and thank you for coming tonight. I am David
7 Fuller, and I've been asked by the Missile Defense Agency to serve as the moderator for
8 tonight's hearing. This is one of seven Public Hearings being held on the Ground- Based
9 Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement. During
10 tonight's hearing, we will refer to the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense and GMD and
11 we will refer to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.
12

13 This public hearing is being held in accordance with provisions of the National
14 Environmental Policy Act and implementing regulations. The act requires federal
15 agencies to consider the potential environmental impacts of their activities in the
16 decision-making process.
17

18 The purpose of tonight's hearing is to provide you with information on the GMD
19 program and proposed GMD Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize the
20 findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your comments on the Draft.
21

22 Lets look at tonight's agenda. After I finish the introduction, Colonel Kevin
23 Norgaard, the director of the Site Activation Command for GMD in Alaska, will describe
24 the proposed GMD flight test activities. Then Mr. Wes Norris, who is a Senior
25 Environmental Planner with EDAW, will describe the process called for the National
26 Environmental Policy Act. He will also present the environmental analysis and results of
27 the Draft EIS.
28

29 The last item on the agenda, the public comment portion, is really the most
30 important. Remember the Draft EIS is just that – a draft. This is your opportunity to tell
31 the GMD Project Office how it can improve its analysis of potential environmental
32 impact before the document is finalized and before a decision is made on whether or not
33 to proceed with the proposed action.
34

35 A few administrative points on making comments tonight. If you have already
36 signed up to speak, that's great. I have two cards so far. If you have not already filled out
37 a card and would like to speak tonight, please go to the registration table and sign up.
38 Everyone is welcome to speak, but it makes the process run more smoothly if I can call
39 on people from a sign-up list.
40

41 Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of four minutes and may speak only
42 once. You may not combine or yield speaking times to other people. Elected officials will
43 be given the courtesy of speaking first. All other speakers will be called up in the order in
44 which they signed up. There is a court reporter here today, seated to my left making a
45 verbatim transcript of the hearing so that all of your oral comments will be recorded

Alaska Court Transcribing
6108 MacKay St. #101 Anchorage, AK 99518

1

MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK

46 accurately. As part of preparing that transcript, an audio and visual recording is being
47 made of tonight's hearing. If you are uncomfortable with public speaking, you may also
48 provide verbal comments by telephone. There is a toll-free telephone number indicated
49 on the on the handout that you may use for recording those comments.
50

51 You may also submit written comments. There are four ways to do that. First, you
52 may hand in written comments that you brought with you tonight, either to me or a
53 person at the registration table. Second, you may use the written comment sheets that are
54 available at the registration table to write down any comments you wish to make and turn
55 them in tonight. Third, you may mail written comments to the name and address that
56 appear on the comment sheet. Or last of all, you may e-mail comments to the address
57 listed on the handout for tonight's hearing.
58

59 Your comments will be entered into the formal record of public comments on the
60 Draft EIS, and they will be given the same consideration as oral comments offered here
61 tonight.
62

63 If you choose to mail in comments, please note that they must be postmarked by
64 March 24, 2003 to be considered in the Final EIS.
65

66 Also, if you would like to receive a copy of the Final EIS when it becomes
67 available there are several ways you can do that. If you have already received a Draft EIS
68 in the mail, you are already on the mailing list and will automatically receive the Final
69 EIS, unless you tell us otherwise. If you provide either oral or written comments, you will
70 be sent a copy of the Final EIS. If you are not on the mailing list, you may fill out a
71 request at the registration table. You can also request a copy by sending an e-mail to the
72 address listed on the handout. Also, copies of the Final EIS will be placed in the library
73 here in Valdez in the city library. A list of those libraries and other locations are at the
74 registration table.
75

76 Finally, it's important for you to understand the Government representatives are
77 not here tonight to make any decision. Their main purpose in being here is to listen
78 firsthand to your suggestions and concerns. With that we will begin with Colonel
79 Norgaard's presentation.
80

81 COLONEL NORGAARD: Thanks, good evening. I am Colonel Kevin Norgaard.
82 I think I've met all of you by now. I am stationed in Anchorage as the programs Director
83 for Site Activation Command for GMD program. The Missile Defense Agency, formerly
84 known as the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, is the Department of Defense
85 agency responsible for developing and testing a Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the
86 following charts, I will briefly describe the GMD Extended Test Range, provide an
87 overview of the GMD and how it works, and address the decisions to be made. But
88 before I do, I would like to describe the overall concept for the Ballistic Missile Defense
89 System under development and explain the different segments of the System.
90

Alaska Court Transcribing
6108 MacKay St. #101 Anchorage, AK 99518

2

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

VALDEZ, ALASKA

COMMENT
NUMBERMISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK

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

98
99 Now, however, the Missile Defense Agency is now moving towards an integrated
100 Ballistic Missile Defense System. Instead of having discrete, stand alone elements, we
101 plan to eventually tie the programs for the various elements together so we can shoot
102 down missiles in all segments of flight.

103
104 Each segment of Ballistic Missile Defense System could include several
105 elements, which are different ways of providing a defense against the threat missile
106 during the same segment of flight. All segments and elements are designed to work
107 together as each element is developed. At the same time, each element could provide an
108 effective stand-alone defense against a specific type of threat.

109
110 The GMD Element is part of the Midcourse Defense Segment of the Ballistic
111 Missile Defense System. The GMD element is the successor to National Missile Defense
112 and includes the same components.

113
114 The conceptual GMD element would consist of the components shown on the
115 slide. These components are the Ground-Based Interceptor, existing early warning radars
116 and satellites; the X-Band Radar, which performs tracking, discrimination, and
117 assessment of the incoming missile; the Defense Support Program or Space-Based
118 Infrared System; the Battle Management Command and Control, which is the central
119 communication and control point; and finally, the In-Flight Interceptor Communications
120 System Data Terminal, which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor
121 while the interceptor is in flight. The GMD Extended Test Range may not include all of
122 these elements.

123
124 The GMD Joint Program Office is proposing to conduct more operationally
125 realistic testing of the GMD element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This slide
126 indicates the proposed locations for the various components in the Extended Test Range.
127 As you can see the extended test range could include components in the Lower 48
128 throughout the Pacific and here in Alaska.

129
130 The GMD testing would be of two types. One type of testing would involve
131 increasingly robust Ground-Based Interceptor flight-testing in the Pacific region in
132 scenarios that are operationally realistic as possible. The other would type involve
133 validation of the operational concept through integrated ground test using GMD
134 components. These are the tests using Fort Greely and other locations analyzed in the

COMMENT
NUMBERMISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK

135 GMD Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment. These ground tests
136 do not involve missile flights or intercepts.

137
138 The Draft EIS, which is the subject of this hearing, evaluates the first type of
139 GMD testing, involving interceptor flight-testing. This interceptor flight-testing will be
140 the focus of our discussion tonight.

141
142 As you can see from this slide, the existing interceptor test capability includes the
143 use of the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, the Pacific Missile
144 Range Facility, and the Reagan Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands.
145 Current testing includes launching target missiles from Vandenberg Air Force Base, and
146 launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the Reagan Test Site, with intercepts
147 occurring over the broad ocean area. The ground-based radar prototype at the Reagan
148 Test Site is used to track, discriminate, and provide updates to the interceptor during
149 flight, while a radar on Oahu is used as a tracking sensor. For some tests, target missiles
150 are also launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex and viewed by the Early Warning
151 Radar at Beale Air Force Base. Current capability does exist to launch target missiles
152 from the Pacific Missile Range Facility as well. These scenarios present a very limited
153 capability to demonstrate the effectiveness of the GMD element because the Ground-
154 Based Interceptor can be launched only from the Reagan Test Site. This limits ability to
155 test the system in operationally realistic environment.

156
157 The extension of the existing GMD test range would increase the realism of GMD
158 testing by using multiple engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometries, distances,
159 speeds of targets, and interceptors to closely resemble an operational scenario involving
160 attack by one or more threat missiles. We are proposing to add dual target and Ground-
161 Based Interceptor launch capability at the Kodiak Launch Complex and/or Vandenberg
162 Air Force Base. Also proposed are mobile target launch capability and shipborne radars.
163 The proposed Extended Test Range would provide more operationally realistic flight-
164 testing, as President Bush and Congress have directed.

165
166 A Sea-based Test X-Band Radar, or SBX, is proposed to support the Extended
167 Test Range flight-testing. This SBX would be a multi-function radar that would perform
168 tracking, discrimination, and intercept assessment of incoming target missiles. The SBX
169 would be assembled at an existing shipyard on the United States Gulf Coast.

170
171 Three conceptual SBX performance regions have been identified to accomplish
172 effective radar coverage for flight-testing. The SBX would operate within the confines of
173 one of the three performance regions based on the needs of the particular flight test
174 scenario. Potential primary support bases have been identified based in part on their
175 proximity to these performance regions.

176
177 Approximately 10 to 12 days before GMD operational tests, the SBX would leave
178 the Primary Support Base to travel to its performance region in the Pacific Ocean.

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

VALDEZ, ALASKA

	COMMENT NUMBER		COMMENT NUMBER
<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK</p> <p>180 The SBX would be stationary at its primary support base between flight test 181 missions. The SBX would have a deep draft, which would restrict it from many harbors. 182 The SBX may dock to a deep draft pier if it is available between missions. If a pier is not 183 available, the SBX would most likely be moored three to ten miles off shore while at the 184 primary support base. Potential locations for the primary support base analyzed in the 185 Draft EIS were Port of Valdez and Adak Alaska; Naval Base Ventura County/San 186 Nicolas Island, near Oxnard California; Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii; Naval Station 187 Everett, Washington; Reagan Test Site, Republic of the Marshall Islands. Daily activities 188 provided by the support base might include logistics, re-supply, and maintenance and 189 repair. Radar operations in the vicinity of the Primary Support Base may include tracking 190 of satellites and calibration devices. Vessels from the primary support base would re- 191 supply the SBX. During transit between the primary support base and the test location, 192 periodic radar operation for satellite and calibration device tracking, including joint 193 satellite tracks with GMD sensors and other pre-mission activities may also occur. 194</p> <p>195 Activities analyzed in the Draft EIS, which may meet some of the enhanced test 196 objectives, include launching target and/or interceptor missiles for the Kodiak Launch 197 Complex, adding interceptor missile launches from Vandenberg Air Force Base, and 198 launching target missiles from mobile platforms over the broad ocean area. The target 199 and interceptor missiles could be launched in sets of two under some testing scenarios 200 from either the Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, or Vandenberg Air Force 201 Base. 202</p> <p>203 In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminals would be 204 constructed in close proximity to the proposed Ground-Based Interceptor launch sites and 205 expected intercept area. Existing launch sites and test resources would continue to be 206 used in enhanced test scenarios. Launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the Kodiak 207 Launch Complex may require up to two additional small mobile radars and telemetry 208 stations in South Central or Southwest Alaska for telemetry and flight safety. 209</p> <p>210 Existing ship-borne sensors would be used for mid-course tracking of the target 211 missile during Ground-Based Interceptor launches from both the Kodiak Launch 212 Complex and Vandenberg Air Force base. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would be 213 constructed and used in tests to perform tracking, discrimination, and assessment of 214 target missiles. 215</p> <p>216 The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for the GMD extended test range 217 testing. For Alternative 1, we would propose the following components: First, single and 218 dual Ground-Based Interceptor launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex, and the 219 Reagan Test Site; Second, single and dual target launches from the Kodiak Launch 220 Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base and the Reagan Test Site; Third, single target 221 launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and a mobile target launch platform. 222 Construction of two Ground-Based Interceptor silos, an additional target launch pad, and 223 associated support facilities would be needed at the Kodiak Launch Complex. We would 224 also construct an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the</p> <p>Alaska Court Transcribing 6108 MacKay St #101 Anchorage, AK 99518</p>		<p>MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK</p> <p>225 Kodiak Launch Complex and at a location in the Mid-Pacific. The SBX would be used in 226 tests for tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missiles. 227</p> <p>228 Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1, with the exception that Ground 229 Based Interceptor launches would be from Vandenberg Air Force Base instead of from 230 the Kodiak Launch Complex. The ground-Based Interceptor launch would require 231 construction on an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal and 232 modification of existing support facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base. 233</p> <p>234 Alternative 3 would combine activities proposed for Alternatives 1 and 2 and 235 would include Ground-Based Interceptor launches form both the Kodiak Launch 236 Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base, and construction of the required support 237 facilities. 238</p> <p>239 Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD Extended Test Range would not be 240 established and interceptor and target launch scenarios could not be tested under more 241 operationally realistic conditions. The SBX would not be developed. Testing at the 242 existed GMD test ranges using existing launch areas would continue. 243</p> <p>244 The decision to be made is whether to enhance the current GMD flight test 245 capability by selecting from the list of alternatives presented, including the no action 246 alternative. 247</p> <p>248 The Missile Defense Agency is still evaluating the feasibility, safety, and utility to 249 the GMD testing program of conducting a limited number of checkout Ground-Based 250 Interceptor flight tests for Fort Greely. The possibility of such flights is too speculative to 251 be analyzed at this time. The Missile Defense Agency will perform an EIS if and when it 252 proposes to conduct Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests form Fort Greely. 253</p> <p>254 The Federal Aviation Administration, or FAA which is a cooperating agency for 255 this Draft EIS, will also rely on the analysis to make its environmental determination for 256 a launch site operator license at the Kodiak Launch Complex. 257</p> <p>258 The FAA's alternatives to be evaluated include renewing the current launch site 259 operator license with no modification; issuing a license for the list of activities as 260 identified in Alternative 1; issue a license for the list of activities as identified in 261 Alternative 2; and the FAA's No Action Alternative, which would be to not issue a 262 license renewal for the Kodiak Launch Complex. 263</p> <p>264 At the conclusion of this environmental review process, the FAA will issue a 265 separate decision document to support its licensing determination. The FAA will draw its 266 own conclusions from the analysis presented in the Final EIS and relevant information 267 contained in the FAA's earlier Environmental Assessment of the Kodiak Launch 268 Complex, and will assume responsibility for its decision and any related mitigation</p> <p>Alaska Court Transcribing 6108 MacKay St #101 Anchorage, AK 99518</p>	

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

VALDEZ, ALASKA

COMMENT
NUMBERMISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK

269 measures. This concludes the program overview and now I would like to introduce Wes
270 Norris who will describe the environmental analysis process.

271
272 MR. NORRIS: My name is Wes Norris and I am supporting the U.S. Army
273 Space and Missile Defense Command in preparing the EIS on behalf of the Missile
274 Defense Agency.

275
276 As mentioned earlier the National Environmental Policy Act requires that federal
277 agencies consider the environmental consequences of their proposed actions in their
278 decision-making process. The Missile Defense Agency has decided to prepare an EIS
279 under the National Environmental Policy Act to analyze the environmental effects of
280 extending the current GMD Test Range.

281
282 As you may be aware, the first phase in the preparation of an EIS is to conduct
283 what is called scoping, to identify environmental and safety issues that should be and
284 addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping meetings were held in Kodiak, Anchorage,
285 Adak, and Valdez; Oxnard and Lompoc, California; Honolulu, Hawaii; and Seattle,
286 Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal and state agencies and Native
287 Alaskan groups were held to obtain their views concerning the proposed action, its
288 alternatives, and potential environmental effects. Following scoping, the next step was to
289 further refine the possible alternatives being considered for GMD Extended Range
290 testing. The Draft EIS was then prepared to address reasonable alternatives, including
291 the No-Action Alternative, reasonably foreseeable future actions, and information on
292 cumulative effects. The Draft EIS has been made available to federal and state agencies
293 and to the general public for review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this
294 comment period, public hearings are being held to receive public input. That brings us to
295 this hearing tonight.

296
297 All comments received will be reviewed and considered in preparing the Final
298 EIS. The Final EIS will then be made available to the public for a period of 30 days. No
299 sooner than 30 days after the release of the Final EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will
300 make public its decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Extended Test Range
301 activities.

302
303 The Missile Defense Agency identified 15 environmental resource areas that
304 normally require some level of analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on those
305 areas with the most potential for environmental impacts. Each resource area was
306 addressed at each location unless it was determined through initial analysis that the
307 proposed activities would not result in an environmental impact to that resource.

308
309 The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues associated with implementing
310 the Proposed Action or its alternatives. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed the
311 environmental issues associated with licenses or permits required to implement the
312 proposed action at each of the potential extended test range sites. As an example, the

COMMENT
NUMBERMISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK

313 FAA will use the Extended Test Range EIS to support its licensing decision regarding the
314 proposal to renew the launch sites operator's license for the Kodiak Launch Complex.

315
316 The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference several environmental analyses
317 associated with current Ballistic Missile Defense System tests assets that include the
318 Kodiak Launch Complex, the Reagan Test Site, the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and
319 Vandenberg Air Force Base. Also incorporated by reference is the analysis of
320 environmental impacts contained in the GMD Validation of Operation Concept
321 Environmental Assessment.

322
323 The Draft EIS also analyzed the potential for cumulative impacts from other
324 Department of Defense, Government, and commercial activities in areas where GMD
325 actions are proposed.

326
327 The potential environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIS are presented in
328 the next several slides. For your convenience, this information has been reproduced as a
329 fact sheet, which is available at the registration table. I would like to highlight a few
330 resource areas that may be important to you. As you will see, minimal impacts were
331 identified from the implementation of the proposed action because most of the proposed
332 actions are a continuation or similar to existing activities at a number of the proposed
333 locations.

334
335 At the Port of Valdez, in coordination with the FAA would minimize any impacts
336 to air traffic. Small quantities of potentially hazardous materials used during construction
337 activities would result in the generation of added wastes that would be accommodated in
338 accordance with existing protocol and regulations. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar
339 would follow U.S. Navy requirements that to the maximum extent practicable ships shall
340 retain hazardous waste aboard ship for shore disposal. In compliance with uniform
341 National Discharge Standards the Sea-Based X-Band Radar vessel would incorporate
342 marine pollution control devices, such as
343 keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residues and engaging in spill and
344 pollution prevention practices, in design or routine operation. Handling and disposal of
345 hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in accordance with State of Alaska,
346 Department of Transportation, and Department of Defense policies.

347
348 Implementation of SBX operational safety procedures, including establishment of
349 controlled areas, and limitations in the areas subject to illumination by the radar units,
350 would preclude any potential safety hazard to either the public or the workforce. An
351 Electromagnetic Radiation/Electromagnetic Interference survey and analysis would be
352 conducted as part of the spectrum certification and frequency allocation process. This
353 process will ensure that the operation of the radar is compatible with other users in the
354 area.

355
356 Coordination would also be required with the U.S. Coast Guard to lessen
357 requirements for Valdez Narrows channel closure and preclude potential delays of oil

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

VALDEZ, ALASKA

COMMENT
NUMBER

COMMENT
NUMBER

**MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK**

358 tankers and cruise ships using the area, as well as to establish any required security zone
359 at the mooring site.

360
361 As you can see, on this line the impacts for these resource areas at Adak are
362 similar to those I just described for the Port of Valdez.

363
364 This next slide shows the other sites proposed for primary support bases analyzed
365 in the Draft EIS and the resource areas that were determined to have a potential
366 environmental concern. Impacts at Naval Base Ventura County, California; Naval Station
367 Everett, Washington; and Pearl Harbor, Hawaii are expected to minimal.

368
369 At the Kodiak Launch Complex, air quality impacts would be minimal for short-
370 term increases in air emissions from construction activities as well as launches. The
371 launches would be part of the activities currently licensed for the site. Its is not likely that
372 the Proposed Action of up to five launches in conjunction with other currently planned or
373 anticipated launches at the Kodiak Launch Complex would exceed the previous analyzed
374 level of activity. Overall impacts to regional air are not expected to adverse and would
375 remain within National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards.

376
377 Likewise, the impacts to biological resources would be similar to those from on-
378 going activities. Wildlife monitoring at the Kodiak Launch Complex concluded there
379 could be temporary short-term effects on wildlife near the launch complex. We expect no
380 adverse impacts to threatened and endangered species.

381
382 As part of the Geology and Soils analysis at Kodiak, we looked at whether
383 facilities built at the Kodiak Launch Complex complied with current building code
384 requirements. In addition no adverse effects to soil chemistry are expected from missile
385 launch exhaust emissions.

386
387 With respect to Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes, the quantities
388 generated would not exceed the amount anticipated for on-going operations. The Kodiak
389 Launch Complex would manage these materials and waste under their current hazardous
390 waste management plan.

391
392 Under Health and Safety, the Propose Action will not increase the risk to workers
393 and the general public over current operations. Notices of launches will continue to be
394 announced in advance. Launch activities would be within the launch site operator's
395 license currently in place for the Kodiak Launch Complex.

396
397 Access to Fossil Beach and other nearby public areas would continue to limited
398 during hazardous operations and in the interests of national security, as has been done
399 previously at the Kodiak Launch Complex.

400
401 Socioeconomic impacts could be expected because of the potential lodging
402 shortage during the peak of tourist season if that occurs at the same time as a launch. To

Alaska Court Transcribing
6108 MacKay St. #101 Anchorage, AK 99518

9

**MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK**

403 reduce the potential for a lodging shortage, the Missile Defense Agency is considering
404 construction of an addition to the existing to Narrow Cape Lodge or an additional man-
405 camp.

406
407 With regard to subsistence, there would be a slight decrease in the amount of land
408 available for subsistence uses because of additional security fencing however, the areas
409 that are proposed for fencing are not significant subsistence use areas in the region.

410
411 The Pacific Missile Range Facility, the Reagan Test Site, and the Vandenberg Air
412 Force Base, like the Kodiak Launch Complex, all have on-going missile operations.
413 Impacts to air quality, hazardous materials and waste and health and safety, would be
414 minimal for continuation of existing launch activities

415
416 Likewise, the impacts to biological resources would be similar to those from on-
417 going activities. We expect no adverse impacts to threatened or endangered species.

418
419 In addition to tonight's hearing, written comments on the Draft EIS will continue
420 to be accepted until March 24, 2003, at the address shown on the slide. After the
421 comment period is over, we will consider all comments, as we conduct the analysis.
422 Again, equal consideration will be given to all comments, whether they are presented
423 here tonight, whether they are presented in writing, if we receive an e-mail, or a comment
424 that is received over the phone.

425
426 Once the Final EIS is complete, we will mail it to all of the individuals who
427 requested a copy. As it was mentioned earlier, if you are not on our mailing list you we
428 can get your name and address out at the registration table. I would like to now turn the
429 hearing back over to Mr. Fuller.

430
431 MR. FULLER: Thank you. If you would like to make verbal comments, you can
432 go ahead and complete the verbal comment card provided at the registration table if you
433 haven't already done so. Remember that no decision is being made tonight. The main
434 purpose for the government representatives' presence here tonight is to learn firsthand of
435 your concerns and suggestions.

436
437 We are ready to start the comment period. As I mentioned earlier, elected officials
438 will be given. I will give you four-minutes and when three minutes are over I will do a
439 one, and then I will go like this at four minutes, and if you can state your name for the
440 Court Reporter.

441
442 DON HAYES: My name is Don Hayes and I live here in Valdez. I just wanted to
443 take this chance to say how proud I am of our President for following in Reagan's
444 visionary leadership to establish this. And, if you decided to base to here in Valdez we
445 are proud to have you here. Thanks.

446
447 MR. FULLER: Thank you. Would anyone else like to speak tonight?

Alaska Court Transcribing
6108 MacKay St. #101 Anchorage, AK 99518

10

P-T-0022
1

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

VALDEZ, ALASKA

COMMENT
NUMBERCOMMENT
NUMBER

MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
PUBLIC HEARING 2/26/03 – VALDEZ, AK

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

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Jim Sykes	P-T-0001-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0001-2	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-T-0001-3	Safety and Health	ES	Health and Safety for GBI and target are discussed in table ES-2, page es-24, of the Draft EIS.
	P-T-0001-4	Biological Resources	4.11.3	See P-E-0032-2
	P-T-0001-5	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Greg Garcia - Alaskans for Peace and Justice	P-T-0002-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0002-2	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-T-0002-3	Policy		See P-E-0020-1
	P-T-0002-4	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-T-0002-5	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0002-6	Program		See P-E-0018-5
Steve Cleary - Citizens Opposed to Defense Experimentation Code	P-T-0003-1	Safety and Health	2.1.4.2 Appendix G	As indicated in section 2.1.4.2, the SBX can exceed the 300 V/m average power threshold at 12 kilometers (7.5 miles). The average power threshold is based upon reducing the time of exposure of aircraft avionics to high intensity radiated field environments in order to preclude shortening the life of the aircraft avionics. The concern is not interference, but a reduction in life of the aircraft avionics. Additional information on the potential effects of EMR on communications-electronics, including aircraft avionics, is provided as appendix G of the EIS. Mitigation measures such as the redundant software that would help minimize potential interference to aircraft systems are discussed in section 2.1.4 as well as in appendix G.

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Steve Cleary - Citizens Opposed to Defense Experimentation Code	P-T-0003-2	Safety and Health	2.1.7	GMD launches would not be from Fort Greely. As stated in section 2.1.7 and appendix C, each missile flight test event would occur over unpopulated areas or minimally populated areas to reduce potential risk to the general public. Each flight test would be modeled. The models incorporate a number of variables such as the missile mass, velocity, trajectory, altitude, and descriptions of the environments that may affect the missile in flight, such as surface and high altitude winds. Modeling that is done long ahead of the actual test would use averages, including average weather predictions. Additional modeling done on the day of test verifies safety under actual test conditions. Databases include data on real time local weather conditions, including wind direction and intensity, mission profile, launch vehicle specifics, and the surrounding population distribution. Given a mission profile, the risks will vary in time and space. Therefore, a launch trajectory optimization is performed by the range for each proposed launch, subject to risk minimization and mission objectives constraints. The debris impact probabilities and lethality are then estimated for each launch considering the geographic setting, normal jettisons, failure debris, and demographic data to define and modify launch hazard/clearance areas and destruct lines to confine and/or minimize potential public risk of casualty or property damage. Tests do not proceed unless the Range Safety Office determines that the general population, including ship traffic, would be in a safe position.
	P-T-0003-3	Program		See P-E-0020-16
Judy Mikels - Ventura County Supervisor	P-T-0004-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0004-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Brian Miller - Congressman Elton Gallegly	P-T-0005-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0005-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0005-3	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0005-4	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0005-5	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Charlotte Craven - City of Camarillo	P-T-0006-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Charlotte Craven - City of Camarillo	P-T-0006-2	Biological Resources	4.11.3	See P-E-0032-2
	P-T-0006-3	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Robert Lagomarsino - Former Member of U.S. Congress	P-T-0007-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0007-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0007-3	Airspace Use		Thank you for your comment.
	P-T-0007-4	Land Use		Thank you for your comment.
	P-T-0007-5	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Frank Schillo - Retired Ventura Co. Supervisor	P-T-0008-1	Airspace Use		See P-T-0007-3
	P-T-0008-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0008-3	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-T-0008-4	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Anthony Volante - Councilmember from City of Port Hueneme	P-T-0009-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0009-2	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-T-0009-3	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Kathy Long - Ventura County Supervisor	P-T-0010-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-T-0010-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0010-3	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0010-4	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0010-5	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Alex Herrera - City of San Buenaventura	P-T-0011-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0011-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Devon Chaffee - Nuclear Age Peace Foundation	P-T-0012-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0012-2	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-T-0012-3	Biological Resources	4.7.3	Comment noted. However, the radar beam would be in motion, making it extremely unlikely that a bird would be in the intense area of the beam and would remain there for any considerable length of time. The power density is also not expected to exceed levels that could impact birds.
	P-T-0012-4	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
	P-T-0012-5	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-T-0012-6	Biological Resources	4.7.3	See P-T-0012-3
	P-T-0012-7	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Bob Conroy	P-T-0012-8	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-T-0012-9	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-T-0013-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Wayne Davey - Rockwell Scientific Company	P-T-0013-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0013-3	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0014-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0014-2	Socioeconomics	4.8	Thank you for your comment.
	P-T-0014-3	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
David Faubion - Ventura Peace Coalition	P-T-0015-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Gordon Birr - The Beacon Foundation	P-T-0016-1	Program		The three circles indicate proposed operating areas.
	P-T-0016-2	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-T-0016-3	Policy		A copy of the Draft EIS has been sent to the Ray D. Prueter Library in Port Hueneme, and it has been added to the distribution list.
	P-T-0016-4	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-T-0016-5	Program	2.3.1.7	If NBVC Port Hueneme is selected as the PSB location for the SBX, the actual port is not wide enough to allow the SBX to have pier side operations. However, San Nicolas Island provides an excellent mooring location. Mooring would probably be on the leeward side of the island. Water depths there allow for mooring approximately 800 meters (2,625 feet) offshore.
	P-T-0016-6	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0016-7	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-T-0016-8	Program		See Impacts and Mitigation Summary in Document.
Bill Conneen	P-T-0017-1	Program	2.0	The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from the PMRF on the island of Kauai are current on-going activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned. For this reason, the scoping process and hearings were not held on Kauai but in Honolulu, which is closest to the location of the new proposed activities.
Jack Dodd	P-T-0018-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0018-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0018-3	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0018-4	Biological Resources	4.7.3	Comment noted. Most DoD installations tend to have large numbers of sensitive resources since they are aggressively managed and public access is generally controlled.

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Jack Dodd	P-T-0018-5	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0018-6	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Norman Eagle	P-T-0019-1	EIS Process		Multi-disciplinary team of experts with no conflict of interest.
	P-T-0019-2	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
Henry Norten	P-T-0020-1	Airspace Use	4.8.2 2.1.4.2	See P-E-0008-4
	P-T-0020-2	Biological Resources	4.7.2	Comment noted. No significant adverse long-term impacts to biological resources are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action.
Gloria Roman	P-T-0021-1	Hazardous Materials	4.7.4 4.8.4	See P-E-0208-6
	P-T-0021-2	Hazardous Materials	4.7.4 4.8.4	See P-E-0208-6
Don Hayes	P-T-0022-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Carolyn Heitman	P-T-0023-1	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-T-0023-2	Program		Test interceptors have been proposed for KLC. However, test launches are not planned for Fort Greely.
	P-T-0023-3	Policy		See P-E-0020-1
	P-T-0023-4	Program		A mobile telemetry unit and mobile C-band radar may be placed at King Salmon as discussed in chapter 2. The program does not currently plan on using the existing radars at King Salmon and Chiniak. These radar do not impact operations at KLC.
	P-T-0023-5	EIS Process		The GBI configuration proposed is the Orion 50SXLG.
	P-T-0023-6	Program		See P-T-0023-4
	P-T-0023-7	Safety and Health	2.3.1 4.1.7	See P-E-0020-34

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Carolyn Heitman	P-T-0023-8	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	Section 4.1.8.2.1 states that public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road.
Mike Sirofchuck	P-T-0024-1	Policy		The decision to produce an EIS, including analysis of proposed activities at KLC, was done in accordance with CEQ Regulations (40 CFR 1502.14(d)).
	P-T-0024-2	Biological Resources	4.1.3	Upland areas have been selected to the greatest extent practicable to minimize impacts to wetlands and the wildlife that depend upon them. Beaver is one of the species listed on page 3-7 as occurring at KLC.
	P-T-0024-3	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	As discussed in section 4.1.8.2.1, the Proposed Action would only temporarily restrict public access and fail to significantly impact any aspect of land utilization.
	P-T-0024-4	Socioeconomics	4.1.15	The additional personnel associated with the project would not all be involved in sportfishing, hiking, and hunting. In addition, those involved in these activities would go to other areas in addition to Narrow Cape. Section 4.1.15 has been revised to state that personnel would be restricted to KLC during working hours and significant impacts to subsistence hunting, recreational hunting, hiking, or other recreational activities or areas are not anticipated.
Brad Stevens	P-T-0025-1	Biological Resources	4.1.3	Additional sampling of aluminum and pH levels would be conducted in accordance with AADC guidelines.
	P-T-0025-2	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	The exact dates and length of closures have not been established at this time. The five MDA launches are included in the nine launches per year currently authorized at KLC. Section 4.1.8.2.1 on page 4-69 states that ESQDs at KLC would not impact transportation routes and public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road. In addition, there is no plan to close roads or limit access during construction.
	P-T-0025-3	Safety and Health	2.3.1 4.1.7	See P-E-0020-34
	P-T-0025-4	Socioeconomics	4.1.15	Text has been revised in section 4.1.15 to state that several documents were analyzed to determine the effects to subsistence caused by the program and that the program would only effect a small amount of the intertidal areas for up to a single day of closure approximately five times per year. This would result in minimal impacts to subsistence.
Wayne Stevens - Kodiak Chamber of Commerce	P-T-0026-1	Program	4.1.10	Coordination with local accommodations will be the priority method for accommodating personnel in support of the GMD effort. Construction of additional facilities at Narrow Cape would be secondary.

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Wayne Stevens - Kodiak Chamber of Commerce	P-T-0026-2	Socioeconomics	4.1.10	Text has been revised in section 4.1.10 to state that coordination with existing accommodations will be carried out to maximize their use while minimizing any potential long-term impacts. Construction of additional facilities at Narrow Cape is a secondary mitigation.
Mike Milligan	P-T-0027-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0027-2	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-T-0027-3	Program		See P-E-0020-5
	P-T-0027-4	Land Use	4.1.8.2.1	As acknowledged in section 4.1.8.2.1 on page 4-69, public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road.
Pam Foreman - Kodiak Island Convention & Visitors Bureau	P-T-0028-1	Socioeconomics	4.1.10	See P-T-0026-2
Gary Carver	P-T-0029-1	Geology and Soils	Appendix D	The calculations in appendix D were re-run using a seismic class B for the bedrock at KLC. However, even when the seismic class B is factored into the overall equation, the answer does not change.
	P-T-0029-2	Geology and Soils	Appendix D	The facilities at KLC proposed by MDA are test facilities and, as such, would not be classified as facilities used for critical defense reasons. Critical defense facilities are those that are required for post-earthquake recovery or those housing mission-essential functions that are absolutely critical to mission continuation of the activity. The proposed GMD test facilities at KLC would not meet either of these criteria and therefore the calculations would stand as presented in appendix D of the Draft EIS. As stated in the Draft EIS, all available information and current codes will be considered in the design of the GMD facilities.
John Mohr - Executive Director, Port of Everett	P-T-0030-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0209-2
	P-T-0030-2	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-T-0030-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0209-2

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Horst Petsold	P-T-0031-1	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-T-0031-2	Noise	4.8	The beam from the SBX would not remain stationary during operation for any period of time, thus the odds of interference from high power effects with any electronic equipment on the ground would be slight, 0.0001% of the time (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). The effects would not damage any electronic equipment and would last for less than 1 second, should this occur.
	P-T-0031-3	Utilities		As mentioned in section 2.1.4.3, electrical power requirements for the SBX platform if moored near a PSB would generally be accommodated by three of the on-board generators: one for daily ship functions and two for powering the radar, as needed. However, when mooring at Naval Station Everett Pier Alpha or Pier Bravo would be utilized. A utility hookup, similar to other vessels at Naval Station Everett, would be used for on board lighting and other basic needs. Utility levels would be typical of that for other ships and would be considered routine.
	P-T-0031-4	Program		See P-O-0099-3
John Flowers	P-T-0032-1	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-T-0032-2	Policy		See P-E-0020-1
	P-T-0032-3	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
Bob Jackson	P-T-0033-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
Morrie Trautman	P-T-0034-1	Program		The GMD ETR testing activities would likely occur over a period of approximately 10 years following a decision to proceed.
	P-T-0034-2	Safety and Health	4.8.5	See P-E-0208-7
Mark Nagel	P-T-0035-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.9	See P-E-0011-1
	P-T-0035-2	Program	2.0	See P-T-0017-1
	P-T-0035-3	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0209-2

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Mark Nagel	P-T-0035-4	Biological Resources	4.8.3	A discussion of power densities is provided in the health and safety section on pages 4-218 and 4-219. The power density is calculated to be 2.5 milliwatts per cubic centimeter at a distance of 150 meters (492 feet) for the fully populated radar and 85 meters (279 feet) for the 65 percent populated radar. MPELs, which define the maximum time-averaged RF power density allowed for uncontrolled human exposure and is independent of body size or tissue density being exposed, are capped at 5 milliwatts per cubic centimeter for frequencies greater than 1,500 MHz. OSHA has established a radiation protection guide of 10 milliwatts per cubic centimeter or electromagnetic energy of frequencies of 10 to 100 MHz.
	P-T-0035-5	Program		The SBX is a phased array radar. The SBX Project Office has no knowledge of any encoding activities, and no knowledge of the HARP array.
Dave Salsman	P-T-0036-1	Program	2.1.4	The dimensions of the SBX are provided in table 2.1.4-1.
Dale Moses	P-T-0037-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
Richard Windt	P-T-0038-1	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0209-2
Walter Selden	P-T-0039-1	Program		See P-E-0347-4
Daryl Williams - Tulalip Tribes	P-T-0040-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Sheila Baker	P-T-0041-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1
	P-T-0041-2	Safety and Health	4.1.6 4.1.8	Emergency response would be required in the event of a pre-launch or post-launch event which resulted in the partial destruction of a missile. Such an event could result in the rupture of a rocket engine and exposure of the solid or liquid fuel. In the event of such mishap, spillage of the propellants could occur. The incident would be handled as an explosive ordnance event, and remaining potentially hazardous materials would be regarded as hazardous waste for management purposes. Removal and disposal of nonhazardous and hazardous waste from the accident location would be in accordance with applicable state and federal requirements.
	P-T-0041-3	Program		See P-E-0006-1
MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition	P-T-0042-1	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-T-0042-2	Program		See P-E-0006-1

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition	P-T-0042-3	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-T-0042-4	Safety and Health	4.4.4 4.1.7 4.5.5 4.3.5	See P-E-0004-4
Elden Boothe - Vandenberg Action Coalition	P-T-0043-1	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-T-0043-2	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
James Carucci	P-T-0044-1	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-T-0044-2	EIS Process	2.3.2.1	The ETR's proposed activities do not include the placement of any new GBI silos at Vandenberg AFB. LF-21 and LF-23, currently used for Booster Verification testing, would be used for interceptor testing.
	P-T-0044-3	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-T-0044-4	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
Hobert Parker	P-T-0045-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Suzanne Marinelli	P-T-0046-1	Program		Decisions concerning the overall management of the GMD Test Program are outside the scope of this EIS.
	P-T-0046-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-T-0046-3	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.
Todd Morikawa - Fellowship of Reconciliation	P-T-0047-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-T-0047-2	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-T-0047-3	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
	P-T-0047-4	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
Doreen Redford	P-T-0048-1	Policy		See P-E-0032-3

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Kyle Kajihira - American Friends Service Committee	P-T-0049-1	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-T-0049-2	Policy		See P-E-0020-1
	P-T-0049-3	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-T-0049-4	Program		See P-E-0018-5
	P-T-0049-5	EIS Process		Ads were placed in both the Honolulu papers and The Environmental Bulletin.
	P-T-0049-6	EIS Process		See P-T-0046-3
	P-T-0049-7	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-T-0049-8	EIS Process	3.6	See P-E-0024-1
	P-T-0049-9	EIS Process	3.6	See P-E-0024-1
	P-T-0049-10	Program		The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from the PMRF on the island of Kauai are current ongoing activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned.
Fred Dodge	P-T-0050-1	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-T-0050-2	Airspace Use	4.6.2	See P-E-0319-17
	P-T-0050-3	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
	P-T-0050-4	Policy		See P-E-0032-3
William Aila	P-T-0051-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-T-0051-2	EIS Process	3.6	See P-E-0024-1

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
William Aila	P-T-0051-3	Program		It is acknowledged that Pearl Harbor is not deep enough to permit the SBX to enter the harbor. However, the harbor can host a resupply ship that would service the SBX. A mooring site off of Barbers Point has been proposed for the SBX.
	P-T-0051-4	EIS Process	3.6	See P-E-0024-1
	P-T-0051-5	Cultural Resources	4.6	As stated in section 4.6, cultural resources were not analyzed because there is minimal potential for impacts. While some mooring locations may have traditional importance, such as native fishing grounds, the SBX would occupy a very small area on a temporary basis. The remaining time the area would remain open with no security restrictions related to the program.
	P-T-0051-6	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-T-0051-7	EIS Process	3.6	See P-E-0024-1
Terri Keko'olani-Raymond - Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific	P-T-0052-1	EIS Process		Ads were placed in both papers.
	P-T-0052-2	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
	P-T-0052-3	EIS Process		Not affecting state of Hawaii lands, the SBX would be moored outside 4.8-kilometer (3-mile) limit.
	P-T-0052-4	Airspace Use	Appendix B	Under PPL 85-725, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the FAA is charged with the safe and efficient use of our nation's airspace and has established certain criteria and limits to its use. The method used to provide this service is the National Airspace System. This system is "...a common network of U.S. airspace; air navigation facilities, equipment and services, airports or landing areas; aeronautical charts, information and services; rules, regulations and procedures, technical information and manpower and material."
Peter Yee - Office of Hawaiian Affairs	P-T-0053-1	EIS Process		See P-E-0250-2
Karen Murray	P-T-0054-1	EIS Process	3.6	See P-E-0024-1
William Gosline - 'Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific	P-T-0055-1	Policy		See P-E-0026-1

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

Name	Comment #	Resource	EIS Section	Response Text
Kalama Niheu - Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific	P-T-0056-1	Policy		See P-E-0026-1
Gail Chism/Lowell	P-T-0057-1	Visual Aesthetics	4.8.8	See P-E-0026-3
	P-T-0057-2	Socioeconomics	4.8.6	See P-E-0013-2
	P-T-0057-3	EIS Process		The NEPA process allows for public input. All comments received on the Draft EIS are considered in preparing the Final EIS. The decision on whether to proceed with the Proposed Action or alternatives can not be made until 30 days after the Final EIS is released. Comments received on the Final EIS will also be considered by the decision maker.
	P-T-0057-4	Safety and Health	2.1.4.6	See P-E-0230-1
Justin Ruhge	P-T-0058-1	Program		See P-E-0006-1