8.1.3 PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT DOCUMENTS—DRAFT EIS

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

Public Hearing Comments

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

Response to Public Hearing Comments

Table 8.1.3-2 presents the responses to substantive comments to the Draft EIS that were received in public hearing transcript form. Responses to specific comments can be found by locating the corresponding commenter ID number and sequential comment number identifiers.
### Table 8.1.3-1: Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Public Hearing Documents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentor and Affiliation</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Sykes</td>
<td>P-T-0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Garcia - Alaskans for Peace and Justice</td>
<td>P-T-0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Cleary - Citizens Opposed to Defense Experimentation Code</td>
<td>P-T-0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Mikels - Ventura County Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Miller - Congressman Elton Gallegly</td>
<td>P-T-0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Craven - City of Camarillo</td>
<td>P-T-0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lagomarsino - Former Member of U.S. Congress</td>
<td>P-T-0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Schillo - Retired Ventura Co. Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Volante - Councilmember from City of Port Hueneme</td>
<td>P-T-0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Long - Ventura County Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Herrera - City of San Buenaventura</td>
<td>P-T-0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Chaffee - Nuclear Age Peace Foundation</td>
<td>P-T-0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Conroy</td>
<td>P-T-0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Davey - Rockwell Scientific Company</td>
<td>P-T-0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Faubion - Ventura Peace Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Birr - The Beacon Foundation</td>
<td>P-T-0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Conneen</td>
<td>P-T-0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Dodd</td>
<td>P-T-0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Eagle</td>
<td>P-T-0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Norten</td>
<td>P-T-0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Roman</td>
<td>P-T-0021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hayes</td>
<td>P-T-0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Heitman</td>
<td>P-T-0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sirofchuck</td>
<td>P-T-0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Stevens</td>
<td>P-T-0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Stevens - Kodiak Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>P-T-0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Milligan</td>
<td>P-T-0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Foreman - Kodiak Island Convention &amp; Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>P-T-0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Carver</td>
<td>P-T-0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mohr - Executive Director, Port of Everett</td>
<td>P-T-0030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst Petsold</td>
<td>P-T-0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flowers</td>
<td>P-T-0032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jackson</td>
<td>P-T-0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrie Trautman</td>
<td>P-T-0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nagel</td>
<td>P-T-0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Salsman</td>
<td>P-T-0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Moses</td>
<td>P-T-0037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Windt</td>
<td>P-T-0038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Selden</td>
<td>P-T-0039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentor and Affiliation</td>
<td>ID Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Williams - Tulalip Tribes</td>
<td>P-T-0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Baker</td>
<td>P-T-0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elden Boothe - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Carucci</td>
<td>P-T-0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobert Parker</td>
<td>P-T-0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Marinelli</td>
<td>P-T-0046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Morikawa - Fellowship of Reconciliation</td>
<td>P-T-0047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen Redford</td>
<td>P-T-0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Kajihiro - American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>P-T-0049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Dodge</td>
<td>P-T-0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Aila</td>
<td>P-T-0051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Keko'olani-Raymond - Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Yee - Office of Hawaiian Affairs</td>
<td>P-T-0053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Murray</td>
<td>P-T-0054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gosline - 'Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalama Niheu - Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Chism/Lowell</td>
<td>P-T-0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Ruhge</td>
<td>P-T-0058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENCE
EXTENDED TEST RANGE
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMANDER BEAN: Good evening. My name is Commander Robert Bean, 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 in the Department of Defense agency responsible for developing and testing a Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the following charts, I will briefly describe the GMD Extended Test Range, provide an overview of the GMD and how it works, and address the decisions to be made. But before I do, I would like to describe the overall concept for the Ballistic Missile Defense System under development and explain the different segments of the system.

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

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

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

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

The conceptual GMD element would consist of the components shown on the 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 missiles; the Defense Support Program or Space-Based Infrared System; the Battle Management Command and Control, which is the central communication and control point; and finally, the In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal, which transmits commands to the Ground-Based Interceptor while the interceptor is in flight.

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

The GMD testing would be of two types. One type of testing would involve increasingly robust Ground-Based Interceptor flight testing in the Pacific region in scenarios that are as operationally realistic as possible. The other type would involve validation of the operational concept through integrated ground tests using GMD components. These are the tests 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 our ability to test the system in an operationally realistic environment.

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

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

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

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

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

The SRX would be stationed at its primary support base between flight test missions. The SRX would have a deep
draft, which would restrict it from many harbors. The SHN may dock to a deep-draft pier if it is available between missions. If a pier is not available, the SHN 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 SHN. 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 OMD sensors and other pre-mission activities may also occur.

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

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

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

The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for the OMD 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 sites, an additional target launch pad, and associated support facilities would be needed at the Kodiak Launch Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the Kodiak Launch Complex and at a location in the mid-Pacific. The SBX would be used in tests for tracking, discrimination, and assessment of target missiles.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 from continuation of existing launch activities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. ELLIOTT: Horst Petsold and then John Flowers.

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

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

MS. ELLIOTT: John Flowers followed by Bob Jackson.

MR. FLOWERS: John Flowers. I’m an attorney in Everett. I’ve practiced law in Washington since 1984, and in California I practiced there since 1966. I’m here tonight to speak for my adult children and my 12 grandchildren, many of whom are too young to understand what’s happening, but would be extremely upset with their grandfather if they knew he had an opportunity to speak out against those 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 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
lead 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 annexed in
your analysis over the coming months -- what if this system
works perfectly? What are the consequences of that? We have
a long history of developing weapon systems and sharing them
with, quote, allies like Osama Bin Laden, 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

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

MS. ELLIOT: Rob Jackson and then Horrie Trueman.

Mr. JACKSON: My name is Rob 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 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," and
quote. To whoever wrote this part of the statement, it may
not seem like adding the SMX facility would have a
significant impact since there are already many ships here, but that is wrong. Because of its size and extraordinary design, this floating platform would have a huge visual impact. Besides its actual presence, the SEK facility would be a powerful symbol. It is a $900 million component in a proposed anti-ballistic missile system that many of us believe should not be built. This is our community. This is where my wife, my neighbors, and I have chosen to live. Many of us are volunteering our time and labor to make this a more desirable community. We already have our fair share of military resources in Everett. I propose that you choose the no-action alternative. If you decide otherwise, I ask that you choose another location. Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Morris Trautman followed by Mark Nagel.

MR. TRAUTMAN: My name is Morris 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 --

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

MS. ELLIOTT: Mark Nagel followed by David Salmon.

MR. NAGEL: My name is Mark Nagel, resident of Everett, Washington. What I saw in here, I guess, I kind of come
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 race. How much of the race is above water and is exposed? Is that the measurement that we should be looking for? With regards to measurement, the fellow before me, is there going to be any sort of independent measurements? Can we really trust our government to give us accurate numbers on the emissions that may be radiating from this unit? I would demand that there would be independent testing for various aspects of this. I know that complex systems mean complex failures. Bigger systems mean bigger failures. Are we really prepared for a big failure? It will happen. I was a little bothered by the statement that there are seven public hearings being made. There’s not seven in Everett, people. There’s one. There’s one. So don’t take that number to mean anything other than just one hearing here. I have a couple technical questions that can probably go on the record. They would probably bore everybody here. I guess the operative location is out in the ocean. I’m still, I guess, not sure exactly the various operations of this unit, where, whether this will be towed out and then turned on or it will be operating while it’s in the bay. Also, likewise I used to sail out in the bay. I’m concerned about obstruction to our normal recreation. That’s what Everett is pushing itself for is a recreational community. What I want to know is what will be the peak and average power levels and on what frequencies? You say that it’s safe. Well, there is an 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.

MS. ELLIOTT: David Salzmann followed by Dale Morse.

MR. SALZMAN: My name is Dave Salzmann. My question is one of trust. I trusted tonight I would come here and receive
some information so I could understand the potential problem that this might create in my community. I've got nothing so far, folks. Frankly, I'm sorry about that. You show me a picture. The first thing I see here is an example with no frame of reference to Everett or anything else for that matter. Is that as big as Ket 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 bought 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 dooms 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哼哼, and having for the next six months and denying the fact that it was the aircraft carrier. A matter of trust. If we can't trust you folks to tell us what's happening when it's happening, give us assistance in the technical solution of problems, then we don't want you here. Okay? Is that understood? We don't want you here unless you face up to the real problems and be upfront with us. I guess that's what I would like to say tonight. This could be a problem. It might not be a problem. We probably need this. I've got a next door neighbor who is on the Lincoln tonight flying drones over God knows where from the deck of that aircraft carrier. He isn't bom with his family. I've got some sympathy there, but you people when you're working in a community like this and bring this kind of facility in, let's at least be upfront after the fact when you're operational so we can solve problems as they come up. Okay? Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Dale Hers and then Richard Winot.

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

MR. ELLIOTT: Richard Winsit followed by Gail Chinn/Loevell.

MR. WINDS: Good evening, My name is Richard Windsit. I’m on the Everett Board of Fair 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 Key Lake in, Vandenburg, and Redstone
Arsenal. I'm familiar with the need for some of these things, and yet I cannot think of a worse place than Everett to put this. It's a large metropolitan area, and you don't place things like this in a large metropolitan area. You place them in Valdez. Almost all the other points that you plan on locating this are better. Jetty Island is a beautiful beach. It's just like an ocean beach. You get out there, and you're completely away from everything. Beautiful. We send boats across there all summer long so our citizens can go 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 sailboats coming out there Sunday. I have been stopped in my boat going by the naval base. What is the area of restricted flow around this when it's out there? Is it really going to interfere with pleasure boating in the city? I just think it's poor planning to put this in Everett. I hope you do not consider Everett the base for this. Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Gail Chies/Sowells.

MS. CHIES/SOWELLS: First of all, I want to thank everybody for coming here tonight because I'm an average citizen living in an above-average city, and I think that our voices of the average citizen needs to be heard. I'm a 57-year resident of Snohomish County, and I have been actively involved in my community and the city of Everett for a number of years. I just learned about this Monday, so my questions aren't really fine-tuned. But the question of livability and what that means to me does not mean that. We have taken our fair share. The Navy is here. They've done a good job of integrating into the community, but when the EIS was done before they came, 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 noise 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
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zone and how far that would be. Is it going to be different than what the ships are now? I ask you to take a no-action position and to choose -- if you do decide to go ahead with this, to take it out of Washington state. Thank you.

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

MR. SELDEN: My name is Walter Selden, and I live in Everett. My first observation is if this is under full strength, this thing should be put far away from us. That would be testing. If you want to test it under full strength, you can't do that here. I guess how do you do it in a 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 run 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 thing is, without being completely flippant, it seems when I saw that picture I thought of the moon. My last word

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

MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Daryl Williams. I live in Marysville, Washington. I work for the Tulalip Tribes in their Governmental Affairs Office. I'm not going to go into any detailed comments right now because just we found out about this two days ago and haven't had anything to review yet. First of all, I would like to say that we think the Navy has been a good neighbor for us here in Everett. When the base was being developed, we were involved in negotiations for the 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
tribe to discuss the issues. With that, I thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Is there anyone else? Thank you for your
courtesy tonight, thank you for your interest, and thank you
for your participation. Good night.
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1  And with that, we will begin with Commander Dee's
2  presentation.
3  MR. AILA: Can I ask you a question, sir? I have
4  a question regarding your presentation.
5  HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): I'm sorry.
6  As far as the ground rules for the meeting tonight?
7  MR. AILA: Question.
8  HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): Yes, what
9  is your question?
10  MR. AILA: Well, two questions. First, is
11  this -- my understanding is this is a postponing?
12  HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): No, that is
13  incorrect. The meeting was already held on this at the time
14  of the notice of intent. This is a public hearing on the
15  Draft ESIA. That's a later stage of a National
16  Environmental Policy Act process.
17  MR. AILA: So we're past -- We're past postponing?
18  HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): Correct.
19  Was there a second question?
20  MR. AILA: Was a meeting held on Cahill?
21  HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): For postponing?
22  MR. AILA: Yes.
23  HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): David?
24  MR. AILA: Yes.
25  HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): Yes.
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1  MR. AILA: Do you know when that was?
2  MR. HASEL: It was --
3  HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): Can you use
4  the microphone.
5  MR. HASEL: -- September, as it turned out.
6  COMMANDER DEE: November?
7  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you remember when it
8  (inaudible)?
9  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)
10  MR. AILA: September?
11  MR. HASEL: Yes. September '82. It was held
12  at the Stock Exchange, which is very close to here.
13  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.
14  MR. AILA: Second question.
15  HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michelson): 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. Michelson): You know
21  what, the problem with what we've done 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. Those sound like questions
24  of clarification that maybe we can deal with.
25  MR. AILA: They should be -- they should be
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Each segment of the missile defense system would include several elements which are different ways of shooting down the threat missile during that phase of flight. All the elements are designed to work together as each element is developed. At the same time, each element can provide an effective stand-alone defense for a specific type of threat.

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

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

We normally abbreviate that as ID -- abbreviate that as IDT. That transmits commands to the Ground-based Interceptor while the interceptors in flight.

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

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

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

The Draft EIS that's the subject of this hearing evaluates the first type of GMD testing which does include...
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Air Force Base.

The In-Flight Interceptor Communication System

Data Terminals would be constructed in close proximity to the proposed ground-based interceptor launch sites and expected intercept areas. Existing launch sites and test resources would continue to be used in the enhanced test scenarios. Launching ground-based interceptors from the Kodiak Launch Complex may require up to two additional small mobile radars and telemetry stations in South Central or Southeast Alaska for telemetry and flight safety.

Existing shipborne radars would be used for midcourse tracking of a 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 OMD Extended Test Range testing. For Alternative 1, we proposed 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 launches from the Kodiak -- target launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and the Reagan Test Site; third, single target launches from the Pacific...
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therefore, we expect no adverse impacts to threatened
or endangered species.

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

In addition to tonight's hearing, written
comments on the draft EIS will continue to be accepted
until March 26th, 2003, at the address shown on this slide.

After the comment period is over, we will consider all
comments as we conduct our analysis. Again, I'd like to
stress, equal consideration will be given to all comments
whether they're presented here tonight, e-mailed, or
submitted by regular mail to us.

And once the draft EIS is completed, we will mail
it to all the individuals who requested a copy. And if
you're not on our mailing list, you can request a copy by
writing to the street address of the individual given in
the handout or by filling out a card at the registration
table tonight.

I'd like to -- now I'd like to turn the hearing
back over to Mr. Michaelson.
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What is your name?

Mi. KEOLOLAI: *Hap (HON) keeo'olani.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

What's the question?

Mi. KEOLOLAI: My question is: Do you have an interpreter? You're in Hawaii.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): We are.

Mi. KEOLOLAI: For you, for you, you know, you need to have somebody that will be able to interpret.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): We were.

Mi. KEOLOLAI: Have you folks brought an interpreter?

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay, we're going to answer that question.

Mi. KEOLOLAI: Okay.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): And interpreter was not brought. We are recording this on a tape, and if anyone speaks in Hawaiian, we will be able to translate it from that. But we do not have a translator here. Okay?

So I'm ready to start calling the names. First are Doreen Bedford, Kyle Kekikaua, Fred Dodson, Sam Nanakoa, and Ted Harima. Would you please come up and sit in your seats up front here.

And Doreen Bedford, you are first.
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they said there was no document there. There are no
hearings on Kauai. This is the only hearing. The fact
that you have only two --

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Excuse me.

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

MR. KAJIHARA: Okay. Let me just finish this --
this point, if I could --

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

MR. KAJIHARA: -- about the public participation.

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

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.

MR. KAJIHARA: So I would like to request that a
30-day extension be given to the comment period so that we
can notify people that there is this process underway and
that people can make their comments known.

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

MR. KAJIHARA: And that's part one of my
testimony. Thank you.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): All right.
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1. I am going to the rest of my time to fix what you've broken and offer a pulse.

2. "Fugotki" in Hawaiian.

3. And I would point out that it's pretty close to my four minutes now, so I'll stop back. The rule was to make things pono once again, because it wasn't pono.

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

5. So I'll come back.

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

7. Next -- next speaker is Terry Kekoa-Raymond.

8. MR. KEOGHBAN-RAYMOND: Aloha kekiki.


10. MR. KEOGHBAN-RAYMOND: "(Hawaiian speaking.)"

11. I'm going to make my comments short. First of all, this whole process is very intimidating, as Bill said.

12. So I want to underscore how much pono this process is for our kind of people. Okay?

13. Another comment I would like to make is that I would really like to know what effects you made to do your out reach to the community to bring them here for real and for you to listen to their -- to their ma'a's. You don't have that many people here. How come? And yet this thing is so big, and it will have such a huge impact on our people here in "Kea'au, which is the Pacific, the North Pacific.

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

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

16. And, by the way, the pacific cage facility, as I
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1. state your name.
2. MI. MURRAY: Karen Murray.
3. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you very much.
4. MI. KEOC'OOLAI-RAYMOND: There's so many levels
5. to this thing, you know. But what it basically comes down
6. for us is that this -- the military -- the American -- the
7. United States military has done more damage to Hawaii than
8. any terrorist, than anything that happened at Pearl Harbor.
9. There are -- when -- at a time when kupuna are
10. telling us, oh, there was so much sea life. There was so
11. much -- like, you could get octopus from Pearl Harbor, you
12. know. At a time when there is so many -- such high
13. incidences of deformity in the fish embryos -- two heads,
14. heat spines -- showing up.
15. And then you have the other level. I mean, from
16. a cultural level, why are we supposed to trust the American
17. culture that does so much damage to its own people?
18. They -- they feed -- after seeing what happened with mad
19. cow disease in England, they go ahead and do the same
20. thing. They do the same thing to create cow disease, and
21. they didn't care because of the bottom line. They didn't
22. care.
23. Now, look, they take a wonderful food, like --
24. like salmon, and they can't even do that right.
I'm the director of nationalism and native rights from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

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

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

Thank you.

Moderator (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.

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

Is there anyone who has not yet spoken here tonight who would like to do so? If not, if it's all right with you, I'll call all the names again, and if you'd like to come up to speak a second time, please do so.
HONOLULU, HAWAII
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1. All of the libraries on Kauai. It's a little bit of a island.
2. It's only 35 miles across as is the shape. However, it's a very rural community, and getting from one end of the island to the other to read a document that isn't currently there at all is very difficult for people. So please make all of your records available at all of the public libraries on Kauai.
3. Thank you.
4. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.
5. Todd Morikawa.
6. Please speak at a rate that she can —
7. MR. MOKARNA: Okay. I'll speak slower this time. Thanks for giving me a second chance.
8. First, I want to stress what I had said earlier.
9. I want to reiterate that we ought to listen to the world opinion and specifically the communities that are affected -- not only on this issue, but I believe universally on any issue that affects people -- that we should listen to how they feel and how they're affected by it, rather than power impositions from the top, decisions from some executive branch or a privileged elite government.
10. Therefore, as Dr. Lincoln, they said by us and for the people. That is one that truly Democratic.
11. And I want to repeat again that this opposition in this moment is -- is growing. Although you don't see
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40

1. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you.
2. MR. KAAIIO: Oh, and I also have been 600 heces
3. opposed to any military expansion, including expansion of minic biotic testing on Kauai, I would like to enter that into the record.
4. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Okay.
5. MR. KAAIIO: Mahalo.
6. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): You can give those to us. Thank you. Thats.
7. Again, it's calling the names a second time in case anyone would like to come up and add to their original comments.
8. Fred Dodge. Suzanne Marcelli. Oh, Fred?
10. Marcelli.
11. MR. MARCELLI: Hi, I just have another procedural concern.
12. I think that expanding the comment period for an additional 30 days would be -- in the long run, it would save you a lot of time and money, and I recommend it for other reasons besides those two.
13. In addition, I would request that sets of all of the documents that are relevant to this program be deposited not just in the library at 11Kow, Kauai, but in
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1. That would make a pretty good lawsuit to stop the whole thing if you didn't do that. So he mentioned that. You guys better catch on to that one.

2. With regards to other cultural resources, just because there's no pile of rocks out there doesn't mean that the proposed areas is not a cultural resource or would not have impact on cultural resources because if the area is chosen and the sorting is established there, there's sure to be a security zone around this vessel, for lack of a better word.

3. And depending on where you put the vessel, the security zone would exclude myself and my fellow fishermen from Waimea and from Eva and Paulea from access to an area where we've had access to, uh, Fox, you know, countless generations -- all the guys that are behind me -- my kupuna.

4. It also doesn't take into account the impact on historical cultural -- prehistorical -- well, prehistorical is a better -- a bad way to say it -- all historical cultural resources from the -- from the view of

5. (**Futubu), an Oahu chief whose Kalesa was his favorite fishing grounds. And that would put him in about the 15th century, which would impact Hawaiian cultural resources by preventing people from fishing that ground who have genealogical ties to that ground. So it's not just a...
HONOLULU, HAWAII

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

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 90-day extension, as mentioned by other
5. speakers. If you want the truth and you want the input,
6. what's 90 more days.
7. Have a meeting on Hawaii because there are
8. guys -- outside of this SE, 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 SE 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, pono 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 mispronounce 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?
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1. Thank you.
2. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Micaleon): I have heard a
3. couple of new cards turned in to me of people who would
4. like to speak, so I'm trying to decide here whether to --
5. since we only have three more of the cards that were going
6. to speak a second time, let's go ahead and do those, and
7. then we'll take the new speakers.
8. Do the next person that would have a second
9. chance is Terry Park 'Olani-Raymond.
10. MR. KAU 'OAKAI-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 us 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 Kumu Ipu 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
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MR. NISHIJIMA: Good morning.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thanks. If you'd just start by giving us your name and then go ahead.

MR. NISHIJIMA: My name is William Nishijima.

(Clone): I'm a member of obama [D08], uh, and nuclear-free and independent Pacific.

From my understanding, what it looks like you folks are trying to do is further U.S. domination of the Pacific area. As things have come out recently in the -- in the so-called war on terrorism, I don't see how what you folks are trying to implement is going to make any of us any safer. We're talking about people -- we're talking about a military machine that is consuming the resources of the next person on the list. And you guys want more and more, more domination, more resources so that -- so that the whole of the U.S. military and the interest behind it can -- can continue a stranglehold on the planet.

I'm totally against this -- opposed to this. It doesn't -- I don't see how it's going to make any of us any safer.

That -- that's about all I have to say.

HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson): Thank you very much for coming down.

Kalama Hibbs.

MR. NISHIJIMA: (Hawaiian speaking.)

My ancestors come from the island of Kauai. Even though I live on Oahu, I am very close to the people who live there.

I understand my genealogy. I understand the connections that my ohana is particular has to Kauai, in particular, west side. And I know some of my own ohana who has worked with the Pacific Missile Range Facility for many, many years.

But I come here speaking as part of my ohana, the Hawaiian ohana. And a significant portion of us are sincerely outraged by these proposals of expanding the Pacific Missile Range Facility and all of the military outreaches. We consider it, like the tentacles of a koa going to strangle the people of the world. And I am very embarrassed to go and sit among my pacific cousins and face them with the understanding that the eyes of the koa -- the head of this stranglehold comes from our own hands.

I have just come the other -- night before from the Marines saying they want to expand out to the windward side. You guys want to expand. You guys want to keep on building, growing, pushing your tentacles out there will this protect you against boxes cutters?

What you guys are doing is you're further...
HONOLULU, HAWAII
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1. the amount of gas that we use. We recycle our clothes on a
day-to-day basis between the generations. And we do not go
into another person's land and ("makakai" and say. In the
name of my freedom, in the name of my desires, I am going
to oppress you. In the name of my freedom, I will take away
your. In the name of my wealth, I will take away your
resources. In the name of fighting the war on terrorism, I
will terrorize you.

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

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

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

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

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

13. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson). Okay. Thank
you, Kamala.

14. MR. NISHI: -- when the eventful result will
happen.

15. HEARING MODERATOR (Mr. Michaelson). Thank you.

16. MR. AZUMI: Did you have anything you wanted to add?

17. MR. NISHI: Okay.

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

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

20. So --

21. MR. NISHI: (Inaudible.)

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

23. I can't hear anything unless it's on this. Is this -- is
in a procedural question? Yes, I'd like to answer any
HONOLULU, HAWAII
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they will. If it turns out it's a speculative-type
doubt or something that needs to be resolved with other
technical aspects before it would appear in the Final EIS,
then they may have to decline to try and answer that
question.
So who would like to ask the first question?
(Mr. Reason, court reporter was instructed to go
off the record.)
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**GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE**
**EXTENDED TEST RANGE**
**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Monday, February 24, 2003
6:00 - 9:00 p.m.
Kodiak High School Commons

(On record)

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

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

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

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

Looking at the agenda for tonight, after I finish the introduction, Colonel Kevin Norgard, the director of the Site Activation Command for GMD in Alaska, will describe the GMD flight test activities. Then Mr. David 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.

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 you can improve the analysis of the potential environmental impacts before the document is finalized and before a decision is made on whether or not to proceed with the proposed action.

Now a few administrative points on making comments tonight. If you're already signed up to speak, that's great. I have four cards so far. If you're 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 here for upcoming speakers so we can move through the process efficiently, and I'll let you know when it's time to come up.

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

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

You may also submit written comments, and there are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in

Public Hearing
02-24-03, Kodiak, AK
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written comments that you brought with you tonight, either to me or to the registration table. Second, you may use the written comment sheets that look like this that are available at the registration table, and you can write down any comments and turn them in tonight. Third, you may mail written comments to the name and address that appear on the comment sheet and also on the handout. And, last, you may e-mail comments to the address listed on the handout.

If you do choose to mail in comments, please note that a 50-30-40
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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 communications control point; and, finally, the In-Flight Interceptor Communication 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 those 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 testing 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 Cuba is used to track the sensor. For some tests, target missiles are also launched from the Kodiak Launch Complex and viewed by the Early Warning Radar at Satts 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 hazards. 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 XB), is proposed to support the Extended Test Range flight testing. This XB would be a multi-functional radar that would perform tracking, discrimination, and intercept assessment of incoming threat missiles and receive and incoming target missiles. The XB would be assembled at an existing shipyard on the United States Gulf Coast.
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 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 during 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, being analyzed in the Draft EIS are the Port of Valdez and Adak, Alaska; Naval Base Ventura County/San Nicolas Island near Point Mugu, California; Naval Station Everett in Washington; the Reagan Test Site, Hawaii; and Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Daily activities provided by the support base might include logistics, repair, and maintenance of the SBX. Activities might include tracking and calibration devices. Vessels from the primary support base would supply the SBX. During transit between the primary support base and the test location, periodic radar operations for satellite tracking and calibration of device tracking, including joint satellite tracking with GMD TPSs 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 K-1 Launch Complex, adding interceptor missiles to VAB, 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 Stennis Space Center, 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 expanded test areas. Existing launch sites and test ranges would continue to be used in enhanced test scenarios. Launching Ground-Based Interceptors from the K-1 Launch Complex may require use of additional small mobile radars and telemetry stations in North Central or Southeast 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 K-1 Launch Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base. This sensor would be used to track and assess the target missile.

The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives for the GMD extended test range testing. For Alternative 1, we would propose the following components: First, single and dual Ground-based Interceptor launches from the K-1 Launch Complex and the Reagan Test Site; second, single and dual target launches from the K-1 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 sites, an additional target launch pad, and associated support facilities would be needed at the K-1 Launch Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the K-1 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
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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 K-1 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 K-1 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 operability 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 conduct Ground-Based Interceptor flight tests from Fort Greely.

The Federal Aviation Administration, or FAA, which is a cooperating agency for this Final EIS, will rely on this analysis to make its environmental determination for a launch site operator's license at the K-1 Launch Complex. The FAA's alternatives to be evaluated include retaining the current launch site operator's license with no modifications; issuing a license for the list of activities 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 K-1 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 K-1 Space 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 Impact Statement.

USAID/ALASKA REPRESENTATIVE MR. HASLEY: Good evening. I am David Hasley and I am with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. 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, Anchorage, Adak, and Valdez, Alaska, as well as in Anchorage and Lompoc, California, Honolulu, Hawaii, and Seattle, Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal and
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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 we 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, the 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 threatened or endangered species.

In addition to tonight's hearing, written comments on the Draft EIS will 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, 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 address shown on the slide. That concludes the environmental analysis portion, and I'll turn it back over to Mr. Michelson 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 taling your comments. If you would 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 out, I'd appreciate it. And remember, no decisions are 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.

**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 who've either completed the card or who've spoken to us tonight, 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 who've indicated you'd like to make comments tonight. We have a reserved area 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.
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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 understand in observing this limit.

To aid you in knowing when your four minutes are up, I have a simple method for indicating times. After these 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 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 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 Stromback, Hugh 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 __ middle make 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 do. One of my concerns was from the 100% EA for the KLC. There's been some great changes. One of them now is 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 idea had it.

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 13 miles out can be a hazard to aircraft. I want to know what the impacts will be on 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 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...
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 in your deployed area.

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 most sites unless the treaty is dropped.

I also...the other radar, 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 cannot be...I mean, was left out of this Draft EIS. If you're going to be launching missiles, that...a very important radar to have listed here.

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. I said one location 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 filled 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're still writing.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Carolyn, when you said it...didn't specify the interceptor, were you talking about the presentation or this document itself?

MS. HEITMAN: No, in the Draft EIS.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

MS. HEITMAN: It showed that there were five launch vehicles, some of which were included in the 1996 EA.

MR. MICHAELSON: I see.

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 to three 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 those years you've been telling us no liquid fuel, no liquid fuel, no liquid fuel, MDA, everybody, no liquid fuel. Now we see, guess what, liquid fuel is going to be stored at the XLC and oxidizers. Those are highly flammable. I can't imagine the public going through the explosive. You have a quantity explosive, safety distance of 1,000 feet.

MR. MICHAELSON: Right.

MS. HEITMAN: There's no way we can access Narrow Cape or Fossil Beach without going through that safety zone area.

MR. MICHAELSON: So that's an area you'd like to see clarified, okay.

MS. HEITMAN: I would like to see it clarified.
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 or no need for this process is largely based on the information that is either incorrect, inappropriate, incomplete, or of dubious nature. And I’d like to point out some examples of that.

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

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

There are many places in this document referring to where access would be restricted, other people have spoken to that. I’d like to say that I think ADEC 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 just about anything under the sun, including launches, construction of roads, rocket transport storage, and security-related activities, whatever those are.

Carolyn pointed out the fact that the fuels are intended to be stored there 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 to close the road or closing access or would require people to come from the 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.

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 an 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 reviewed that information and learned that in a typical year, 3,000 pounds of subsistence resources are taken from intertidal areas alone.

And there aren’t very many of those on the road system that people have access to as Mike pointed out. So it’s hard to believe that none of that came from the Narrows. 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.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Wayne Stevens. Comments after him if you would please come sit in the reserved area here are Mike Milligan, Pam Foreman, and Dr. Gary Curver. And again if you’d begin with your name.

MR. STEVENS: Good evening. My name is Wayne Stevens. I’m the Executive Director of the Kodiak Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for being here this evening and holding this public hearing. Just speak quickly to your socioeconomic impact portion of your study and remind you to make sure that you fully utilize and maximize utilization of all resources here available in this community before you build additional housing or lodgings. We do have a burgeoning number of bed and breakfasts. We have substantial hotel accommodations, support services, and before you build separate, distant, and individual facilities here in the Narrows, we’d like to ensure that those resources here on the road system in the community are utilized to the maximum. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Mike Milligan.

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 back to a system which I feel is more liveable. I would challenge people that are opposed to missile defense to 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 stopped deploying to the first and ballistic missile system last October. From my way of thinking, the world would not be safer if Israel were to deploy the system that they just deployed.

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. 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... of kill technology. I don’t see that limiting the document. I don’t think 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 receive 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.

I would also like to see a commitment in the document to use solid fuel rockets. You’ve heard some concerns about liquid fuels. Now, what I take from the document in reference to those liquid fuels is that there are propellants, hydrazine in particular, for the satellites. I can accept that. We’re talking about, you know, maybe 150 gallons of extremely dangerous but highly explosive and very serious materials different than liquid, liquid rocket engines. I would like to see a commitment in the statement saying we at this time have no intention to use liquid fuel rockets.

I appreciate 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 not 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 use of these assets. And I think that needs to be addressed.

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

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Pam Foreman.

MS. FOREMAN: Hi, my name is Pam Foreman and I’m with the Kodiak Island Convention and Visitors Bureau. My comment is also in regard to the possible construction of additional facilities at the Narrows. We’d like to see the community here as an opportunity to maximize the use of...
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 strain to try to get additional people in. But I encourage you to maximize the use of these facilities first.

Mr. Michaelson: Okay. The last speaker I have a card from so far is Dr. Gary Carver. Why don’t you pull that up there. Thanks.

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 DBW, I noted that the sections on geologic hazards I think rather adequately but I also very generally identify the nature of the seismic hazards in the Nenana area.

However, I am concerned about one of the points made in your slide presentation under geology where you allege that the current facilities are not constructed and designed according to the present codes. This is based on the material that’s presented in Appendix B of the Draft DBW, and is based on a comparison between the 1994 UBC that was used at the time of the design and construction of the present facilities with the present codes that have been adopted in Alaska, the 2000 IBC.

Of concern to me are the input parameters into the calculations for the IBC numbers. The first of these is the site class which the consultant at ASCO (I think) used a site class A which is a very firm rock site class. It’s based on the shear wave velocity of the rock.

I phoned the ASCO people and talked with the people that prepared the sheets that are presented in Appendix B 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, Nenana is undertold by very soft sediments with relatively lower seismic shear wave velocities, and I think that the seismic class A is inappropriate, probably a seismic class B would be required.

The consequence of this is a different multiplier or parameter that goes into the calculations. Secondly, is a seismic 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.

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 hazard section of this document, you correctly identify several faults which are capable of surface fault rupture at the site. 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.

Kodiak, Alaska

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

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

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

(GF record)
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1 LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2003
2 6:30 P.M.
3 ---oo---
4
5 (SLIDE NO. 1 - PUBLIC HEARING TITLE PAGE)
6 MT. ELLIOTT: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
7 Thank you for coming tonight. I am Julia Elliott, and I am
8 with the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. I
9 have been asked by the Missile Defense Agency to serve as
10 the moderator for tonight's hearing. This is one of seven
11 Public Hearings being held on the Ground-Based Midcourse
12 Defense Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact
13 Statement. During tonight's hearing, we will refer to the
14 Ground-Based Midcourse Defense as GMD, and we will refer to
15 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement as the Draft EIS.
16 This public hearing is being held in accordance
17 with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act and
18 implementing regulations. The act requires federal agencies
19 to consider the potential environmental impacts of their
20 activities in the decision-making process.
21 The purpose of tonight's hearing is to provide you
22 with information on the GMD Program and proposed GMD
23 Extended Test Range activities. We will also summarize the
24 findings presented in the Draft EIS and solicit your
25 comments on the Draft EIS.
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1. Target launchers from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and
2. Mobile target launch platform. Construction of two
3. Ground-based interceptor sites, an additional target launch
4. Pad and associated support facilities would be needed at the
5. Kodiak Launch Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight
6. Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the
7. Kodiak Launch Complex, and at a location in the
8. Mid-Pacific. The SSM would be used in tests for tracking,
10. (SLIDE NO. 16 – PROPOSED ACTION – ALTERNATIVE 2)
11. Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1,
12. With the exception that Ground-Based Interceptor launchers
13. Would be from Vandenberg Air Force Base instead of from the
14. Kodiak Launch Complex. The Ground-Based Interceptor launch
15. Would require construction of an In-Flight Interceptor
16. Communications System Data Terminal and modification of
17. Existing support facilities at Vandenberg Air Force Base.
18. (SLIDE NO. 17 – PROPOSED ACTION – ALTERNATIVE 3)
19. Alternative 3 would combine activities proposed
20. For Alternatives 1 and 2, and would include ground-based
21. Interceptor launchers from both the Kodiak Launch Complex and
22. Vandenberg Air Force Base, and construction of the required
23. Support facilities.
24. (SLIDE NO. 18 – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)
25. Under the No Action Alternative, the GMD Extended
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1 the Program Manager for the preparation of the EIS on behalf
2 of the Missile Defense Agency.
3 (SLIDE NO. 21 - DRAFT EIS PROCESS)
4 As you may be aware, the first phase in the
5 preparation of an EIS is to conduct what is called scoping.
6 to identify environmental and safety issues that should be
7 addressed in the Draft EIS. Public scoping meetings were
8 held in Kodiak, Anchorage, Adak and Valdez Alaska, Oxnard,
9 and Lompoc, California; Honolulu, Hawaii; and Seattle,
10 Washington. Other informal scoping sessions with federal
11 and state agencies were held to obtain your views concerning
12 the proposed action, its alternatives and the potential
13 environmental effects within their area of expertise, or
14 which are of particular concern to them. Following scoping,
15 the next step was to further refine the possible
16 alternatives being considered for the Full Extended Range
17 Testing. The Draft EIS was then prepared to address
18 reasonable alternatives, including the No Action
19 Alternative, reasonably foreseeable future actions, and
20 information on cumulative effects. The Draft EIS has been
21 made available to federal and state agencies and to the
22 general public for review and comment for a period of 45
23 days. During this comment period, public hearings are being
24 held to receive public input. That brings us to this
25 hearing tonight.

1 (SLIDE NO. 22 - FINAL EIS PROCESS)
2 All of the comments received will be reviewed and
3 considered in preparing the final EIS. The final EIS will
4 then be made available to the public for a period of 30
5 days. No sooner than 30 days after the release of the final
6 EIS, the Missile Defense Agency will make public its
7 decision on whether to proceed with the GMD Extended Test
8 Range activities.
9 (SLIDE NO. 23 - ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS CONSIDERED)
10 The Missile Defense Agency identified 15
11 environmental areas that normally require some
12 level of analysis in an EIS. The Draft EIS has focused on
13 those areas with the most potential for environmental
14 impacts. Each resource area was -- was addressed at each
15 location unless it was determined through initial analysis
16 that the proposed activities would not result in an
17 environmental impact to that resource.
18 (SLIDE NO. 24 - SCOPE OF THE DRAFT EIS)
19 The Draft EIS analyzed the environmental issues
20 associated with implementing the proposed action or its
21 alternative. In addition, the Draft EIS analyzed the
22 environmental issues associated with license or permit
23 required to implement the proposed action at each of the
24 potential extended test ranges sites.
25 The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference

10

20
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 in the analysis of
6 environmental impacts contained in the OMB Validation of
7 Operational Concept Environmental Assessment.
8
9 The Draft EIS also analyzes the potential for
10 cumulative impacts from other Department of Defense
11 Government, and commercial activities in areas where OMB
12 actions are proposed.
13
14 (SLIDE NO. 25 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS -
15 VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE)
16
17 The potential environmental impacts identified in
18 the Draft EIS are presented in the next several slides. For
19 your convenience, this information has been reproduced in a
20 fact sheet, which is available at the registration table for
21 your review. I would like to highlight a few resource areas
22 that maybe important to you. As you can see, minimal
23 impacts were identified from the implementation of the
24 proposed action. Most of the impacts are minimal, because
25 the proposed actions are a continuation of existing
26 activities at the various locations.
27
28 At Vandenberg Air Force Base, air quality impacts
29 would be minimal from short-term increases in air emissions
30
31 from construction activities and launcher. The launcher
32 would be a part of activities currently occurring at the
33 base. Overall impacts to regional air quality are not
34 expected to be adverse and would remain within National and
35 state Ambient Air Quality Standards.
36
37 Likewise, impacts to biological resources would be
38 similar to those from ongoing activities. We concluded
39 there could be temporary short-term effects on wildlife near
40 the launch complex. We expect no adverse impacts to
41 threatened or endangered species.
42
43 Modification to -- modification and construction
44 activities at Vandenberg Air Force Base would result in
45 negligible adverse impacts to cultural resources. If during
46 the course of any ground-disturbing activity, cultural
47 resources are found, the activity in the area would cease,
48 and the proper authorities would be notified. Subsequent
49 actions would follow the guidance provided to comply with
50 Historic Preservation Laws.
51
52 (SLIDE NO. 26 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
53 - continued - VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE)
54
55 With respect to Hazardous Materials and Hazardous
56 Waste, they would be handled using normal Vandenberg Air
57 Force Base management procedures and would be well within
58 their capacity to manage those quantities and kinds of
59 wastes.
60
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1. Under Health and Safety, the Proposed Action will not increase the risk to workers and the general public of current operations. Notices of launches will continue to be announced in advance. Launch activities would be within the current level of activities.

2. Minimal impacts of land use would occur as a result of site preparation for new construction. All of the proposed activities would be in accordance with Coastal Zone Consistency requirements.

(SLIDE NO. 27 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - continued- KODIAK LAUNCH COMPLEX, FRP and FTC)

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

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

5. In particular, at the Kodiak Launch Complex, socioeconomic impacts could be expected because of the potential lodging shortage during tourist season due to launch activities. To reduce the potential for -- for a

lodging shortage, the Missile Defense Agency is considering the construction of an addition to the Narrow Cape Lodge and/or construction of an additional campground.

6. (SLIDE NO. 28 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - continued- NAVAL BASE VENTURA COUNTY, NAVAL STATION EVERETT, ADAK, VALDIVES, AND PEARL HARBOR)

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

8. The small quantities of potentially hazardous materials used during construction activities would result in generation of added waste that would be handled by Naval Base Ventura County under their normal waste management procedures. The Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would follow U.S. Navy requirements that, to the maximum extent practical, ships shall retain hazardous waste aboard ship for shore disposal. In compliance with Uniform National Discharge standards, the Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar vessel would incorporate marine pollution control devices, such as keeping decks clear of debris, cleaning spills and residue.
and engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices, in
design or routine operation. Handling and disposal of
hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in
accordance with the State of California, Department of
Transportation and Department of Defense policies and
procedures. Implementation of SHK operational safety
procedures, including establishment of control areas, and
limitations in the areas subject to illumination by radar
units, would preclude any potential safety hazard to either
the public or workforce.

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

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

( SLIDE NO. 29 - PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND ADDRESS )
In addition to tonight’s hearing, written comments
on the Draft EIS will continue to be accepted until March
24th, 2003. at the address shown on the slide. After the

1 comment period is over, we will consider all comments as we
2 conduct the analysis. Again, equal consideration will be
3 given to all comments, whether they are presented here
4 tonight, e-mailed, or submitted by regular mail to us.
5 Once the final EIS is complete, we will mail it to
6 all the individuals who requested a copy. If you are not on
7 our mailing list, you can request a copy by writing to the
8 street address or e-mail address given in the handout, or by
9 filling out a card at the registration table.
10 I will now turn the hearing back over to
11 Ms. Elliott.

MS. ELLIOTT: We will now break for a 5-minute recess,
and then we will begin taking your comments.

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

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

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

(RECESS TAKEN.)

MS. ELLIOTT: We are ready to start calling out the
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1 name 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 time. After
25 three minutes I will raise my index finger, indicating that
26 you have one minute left. This -- this should help you find
27 a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. At the end of
28 four minutes, I will raise my closed hand indicating it is
29 time to finish your comments. So it is important to look up
30 from your paper occasionally to see if you are being given a
31 signal.
32 I have one other request that need to be enforced
33 for the sake of the court reporters that is, you must
34 withhold any expressions, either against or in favor of the
35 speaker until the speaker is finished. Otherwise, there's
36 no way that the court reporter can get all of the comments.
37 So while you maybe agreeing with the speaker by clapping or
38 speaking out, you are probably making certain we are not
39 capturing the comments on the record. Please hold all of
40 your expressions until the speaker is finished. Thank you
41 in advance for your cooperation.
42 We also greatly appreciate your cooperation and
43 understanding in observing the four minute limit. Also keep
44 in mind that oral comments are only one way to share your
45 thoughts and concerns regarding the Draft EIS. You can also
46 hand in written comments tonight, e-mail them, or submit
47 them by regular mail by March 24, 2002.
48 As I mentioned, written comments are given the
49 same consideration as oral comments offered here tonight.
50 With that in mind, we will begin.
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Our first speaker is Sheila Baker, and Sheila will be followed by MacGregor Eddy, Elden Bud Booth, James Carucci, and Robert Parker.

Those people would come and sit in the front row up here. Thank you.

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

MS. BAKER: Hello, my name is Sheila Baker, and I'm from San Luis Obispo County, and I would like to thank you for offering this opportunity for us to come and also say no thank you for this whole system. I'm against this system. There are several reasons, expensive, very, very expensive, and I think at a time when our counties and our state and our country is really suffering financial burdens, it's ridiculous.

Regarding the environment, it kind of hurts my heart to hear that San Nicholas Island is being involved in this. It's a beautiful place. The ocean around it is beautiful.

There was a -- there have been a couple of rocket explosions, missile explosions. One of them was, I believe, was the fifth KAS, that when it exploded down, they had to close a couple of beaches. Remembering the Columbia explosion, and that's a tragedy, it was hydrogen and dinitrogen tetroxide that was a worry as far as the toxic debris. There are hyperbolical that are found in each and every launch, and monopropellants (phonetic spelling) is a concern not only here, but everywhere that rockets and missiles, propellants are made. Colorado River is deeply injured by it. Tungsten (phonetic spelling) is something that is part of rocket launch -- excuse me -- part of rocket materials and it's found -- found in naval air station and also the children who have -- who have had cancer and the area around it, the citizens and their urine, as well as in Sacramento area, and so there's just a load of problems.

I think Boeing is being cited for problems with their Delta by Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District. There's an invest excel program, that is supposed to lower the toxic emissions in the air from 50 tons to 40 tons per year; that's, that's totally unacceptable.

There is nothing good about this program. I would say the No Action Alternative, but stop testing immediately. Make this program go away, it's an awful program. Thanks.

MacGregor Eddy.

///

///
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1 MACGREGOR EDDY,

2 offered public commentary on the ONS Extended Test Range
3 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:
4
5 MS. EDGY: Hello, my name is MacGregor Eddy, I'm a
6 registered nurse, and I'm particularly interested in the
7 health and safety consequences of any public program using
8 our tax dollars.
9
10 There are three things that I am think are unsaid behind
11 what is being presented here today. The first is, is that
12 this program is necessary because the initial program was a
13 colossal and publicly embarrassing waste of money and --
14 internationally and nationally, and there is no guarantee
15 that the second one will not be that. Certainly it will be
16 a colossal amount of money.
17
18 So as to what we get for it, we need to take a look.
19 What are we -- are we spending our money on? I pick up
20 this newspaper, it's every newspaper in California right now
21 is talking about, for lack of eight billion dollars, which
22 is a miniscule part of what's being spent here, gang
23 prevention programs in L.A., fire programs, parks and
24 recreation, all being cut. So that's the first thing is
25 the money.
26
27 The second thing is that the main environmental
28 justification in the program that is used the most often is

P-T-0042

1 that there will be no impact because what damage being done
2 to the environment is already being done by currently
3 existing programs and launches, therefore there will be no
4 increase. From an environmental point of view, on a fragile
5 planet, where we, the human beings, are the endangered
6 species, I don't think that is an adequate or complete
7 response.
8
9 The third concern that I have about this program
10 is the health and safety of all of us -- on the planet.
11 We don't have interests that are different from the rest of
12 the people that we share this globe with. And the heavens,
13 the skies above us, are what will we all look up to to dream
14 for the future, and they should not fall of reconnoissance,
15 surveillance, targeting, lasers, and weaponry. The sky
16 belongs to us all, so -- just as the land belongs to us
17 all.
18
19 So I wanted to say, the 3 points I want to make is
20 number 1, this is a colossal amount of money, it's a huge
21 amount of money and very small parts of it, this amount of
22 money, would make big differences in the health and safety
23 of all of us.
24
25 And number 2, that the environment is already
26 being damaged by massive military spending that does not
27 protect us from the dangers of, for example, box cutters.
28 Has no protection from such dangers and then the third
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And then the third concern that I have is that the example we set for the rest of the world as the world's wealthiest nation and the world's, now, only superpower, the victors in the cold war, the example that we set for the priorities for poorer nations to spend their wealth on weapons rather than the health and well being and the future of all the children.

So someone once said about the initial space program, that it's set that we set foot on the moon, it's that we set eye on the earth. That we looked at the earth and realized that this is our planet and we're all responsible for it.

So would like to say that the best action would not only be no expansion of this Missile Defense Program, but to stop the currently operating ones. That's what would be environmentally sensitive.

Thank you very much for your time.

EE. ELLIOTT: Elden Bud Boothe.

ELDEN BOOthe:

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

Mr. BOOTH: My name is Elden Boothe. I view this EIS as an exercise in futility. The military industrial complex will get whatever money to do with whatever they want from the supine congress that is in control of our country.

how this system is designed, they say, to protect us from a nonexistent threat, from a nonexistent enemy.

Therefore, it can never be proven to be a failure, since it will never be used. The cold war MAD system that will we have, Mutual Assured Destruction, has served us well.

Now, we very carefully point out, our leaders very carefully point out, that this system is not designed to protect us from Russia and China, the only two countries that could shoot a nuclear tip missile at this country. But they say, those are our friends, so, therefore, we don't -- we don't design this system to protect from them.

It's a win-win situation for the Military Industrial Complex, because since it will never be used, it can never be proven that it does not work. Although, leading scientists have said it can be overcome in very many different ways if any country was desired to attack us, that will never happen.
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But down the road, there is something that truly
does bother me. That is the upcoming Star Wars Program as
pointed out by the Space Command’s Vision for 2020, in which
Earth’s circling satellites with high intensity lasers,
fueled by nuclear reactors, encircling the globe, will be
able to destroy anything on earth. If that -- if that was
to come to pass -- and incidentally, that is -- the term for
that is Visions For 2020. That’s not vision 2020 that’s
the year 2020. And if that -- if that was to come to pass,
cour control of the earth would be complete, but in the
process, we could in fact be destroying the earth.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Elliot: James Carucci.

James Carucci,

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

Mr. Carucci: The regulations for implementing NEPA are
found in 40 CFR -- section 1501.1 says, about
scoping, says that an agency shall review their scoping. If
-- I want to read the quote correctly.

"If substantial changes are made later in the
proposed action, or if significant new circumstances or
information arises, which bear on the proposal or its
impacts."

Clearly President Bush’s announcements to involve
Vandenberg in the placement of the weapons system has a
connection to this study and to the Extended Range. Not
stopping now and re-scoping is just not smart, as well as, I
think, against the regulations. I would strongly urge Space
Command, the Army, the contractors, to rethink their
position on this and re-scope. There’s a connection between
the two.

40 CFR 1501.8 defines effects as, “ecological,
aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social or health,
whether direct, indirect, or cumulative.”

Now in the Extended Test Range, which then brings
the placement of four or five G -- Ground-Based Interceptor
silos to Vandenberg, how is that not an indirect impact,
having the test range first and the full system later?

Earlier, Commander Does, is it? Said, quote,
“targets are already being launched at Vandenberg.”

unquote. Soon you’ll be able to say OBI is already being
Launched from Vandenberg, unquote.

It seems to me there’s a plan to make this EIS
proxy, or a preview, prequel document to the placement of
the weapons system. Vandenberg has not had active weapons
since the Atlas was stood down around 1965. So from ’58 to
’65, we had nuclear weapons at Vandenberg. The first
nuclear weapons stood alert at Vandenberg. Now you're bringing us active weapons. Don't call them defensive.

weapons, they're active. You make a choice to launch them.

It seems, again, that whether this effect is direct or indirect, there's clearly a connection between the Extended Test Range and the four GMI weapons to be implanted at Vandenberg. I would urge the Army and the Air Force to rethink this EIS and to bring it all together in one document. Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Robert Parker.

ROBERT PARKER, offered public commentary on the GMI Extended Test Range Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:

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

But I have doubts about the credibility and the integrity of the military official, the different agencies that might be involved in this. I can tell you from personal experience that the Air Force, several or many of the people there, from the Commander of Air Force Space Command on down, would prefer to obfuscate the tree to tell a lie than stand on the ground and say the truth.

And in the 1960's, near the Dugway Proving Grounds, or down in there, 4,000 sheep dropped over dead, and the Army denied responsibility. We all know what happened about Pearl Harbor, how Admiral Kimmel and General Short were made scapegoats.

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

MS. ELLIOTT: Justin Ruhe.
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1  JUSTIN RUBIO:
2  offered public commentary on the GMD Extended Test Range
3  Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:
4
5  MR. RUBIO: Yes, Justin Rubio, 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  deterrent 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

1  other situations whether it's applied here smartly 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 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 EIR, and I will not deter
21  in any way your plans to get this system developed. Thank
22  you.
23  MR. 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?
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1 LOVIN BRONSON.
2 offered public testimony on the Draft CWD Extended Test
3 Range Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as follows:
4
5 Mr. BRONSON: My name is Lorin Bronson and I live in
6 Lompoc. North Korea can make us now. We have a moral
7 obligation to defend ourselves. You opponents are the same
8 people who were wrong about communism and our policy in
9 Southeast Asia. You were at that time, and still are,
10 unwilling to accept responsibility for helping murder
11 2,000,000 Cambodians.
12 As for the environment, free countries have the
13 best environment. It's the dictatorships that have the
14 worst environment.
15 Ms. ELLIOTT: Sir?
16 Mr. BRONSON: Yes.
17 Ms. ELLIOTT: May I request you to fill out this card
18 for me, please. Thank you.
19 Mr. FARGER: I have a question for you. How can you --
20 hey, sir --
21 Mr. BRONSON: You're out of order.
22 Mr. FARGER: I am not.
23 Mr. BRONSON: Yes, you are.
24 Ms. ELLIOTT: Yes, sir. Is there anyone else who have
25 not spoken that --
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1. OXNARD, CALIFORNIA: MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2003
2. 6:30 P.M.
3. ---000---
4. 5. (SLIDE NO. 1 - PUBLIC HEARING TITLE PAGE)
6. 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.

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

17. 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.
(SLIDE NO. 2 - AGENDA)

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

The last item on the agenda, the public comment
portion, is really the most important. Remember that
the Draft EIS is just that — a draft. This is your
opportunity to tell the GMD Project Office how it can
improve its analysis of potential environmental impacts
before the document is finalized and before a decision
is made on whether or not to proceed with the proposed
action.
(SLIDE NO. 3 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS)

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

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

If you are uncomfortable with public speaking,
you may also provide written comments by telephone.
There is a toll-free telephone number indicated on the
handout that you may use for recording those comments.
(SLIDE NO. 4 - ADMINISTRATIVE POINTS - continued)

You may also submit written comments. There
are four ways to do that. First, you may hand in
written comments that you brought with you tonight,

Second, you may use the written comment sheets that are
available at the registration table to write down any
comments that you wish to make and turn them in
tonight. Third, you may mail written comments to the
name and address that appear on the comment sheet. Or,
last of all, you may e-mail comments to the address
listed on the handout for tonight's hearing.

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

If you choose to mail in comments, please note
that they must be postmarked by March 26, 2002, to be
considered in the Final EIS.

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

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

And with that, we will begin with Commander
Dees' presentation.

(SLIDE NO. 6 - GMD PROGRAM OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE)

COMM. DEES: Good evening. My name is

Commander Robert Dees, and I'm a technical adviser for
the GMD X-Band Radar Project Office. The Missile
Defense Agency, formerly known as the Ballistic Missile
Defense Organization, is the Department of Defense
agency responsible for developing and testing a
Ballistic Missile Defense System. In the following
discussions, I'll briefly describe the GMD Extended Test
Range, provide an overview of the GMD, and how it works,
and address the decisions to be made. Before I do, I
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1. Flight safety.
2. Existing airborne sensors would be used for
3. mid-course tracking of the target missile during
4. Ground-Based Interceptor Launches from both the Kodiak
5. Launch Complex and Vandenberg Air Force Base. The
6. Sea-Based Test X-Band Radar would be constructed and
used in tests to perform tracking, discrimination, and
assessment of target missiles.

(SLIDE NO. 15 - PROPOSED ACTION - ALTERNATIVE 1)

The Draft EIS analyzed two alternatives for
the GMSS extended test range testing. For Alternative 1
we would propose the following components: First,
single and dual launched ground-based Interceptor
Launches from the Kodiak Launch Complex and the Reagan
Test Site, second, single and dual target launches from
the Kodiak Launch Complex, Vandenberg Air Force Base,
and the Reagan Test Site; and third, single target
Launches from the Pacific Missile Range Facility and a
mobile target launch platform.

Construction of two ground-based Interceptor
silos and an additional target launch pad and associated
support facilities would be needed at the Kodiak Launch
Complex. We would also construct an In-Flight
Interceptor Communications System Data Terminal at the
Kodiak Launch Complex and at a location in the

primary support base and the test location, periodic
radar operation for satellite and calibration device
tracking including joint satellite tracking with ONR
sensors and other pre-mission activities may also
occur.

(SLIDE NO. 14 - PROPOSED TEST ACTIVITIES)

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

In-Flight Interceptor Communications System
Data Terminals would be constructed in close proximity
to the proposed Ground-Based Interceptor launch sites
and existing intercept area. Existing launch pads 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
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that federal and state agencies and to the general public for review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this comment period, public hearings are being held to receive public input. That brings us to this hearing tonight.

(SLIDE NO. 22 - FINAL EIS PROCESS)

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

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

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

The Draft EIS has incorporated by reference several existing environmental analyses associated with current Ballistic Missile Defense System test assets that include 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 GMDS Validation of Operational Concept Environmental Assessment.

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

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

The potential environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIS are presented in the next several slides. For your convenience, this information has been reproduced as a fact sheet, which is available at the registration table, for your review. I would like to highlight a few resource areas that may be important to...
engaging in spill and pollution prevention practices in design or routine operation. Handling and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be in accordance with the State of California, Department of Transportation, and Department of Defense policies and procedures.

Implementation of SRX operational safety procedures, including the 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 work forces.

(SLIDE NO. 26 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - NAVAL STATION EVERETT, ADAK, VALDEZ, AND PEARL HARBOR)

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

(SLIDE NO. 27 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - KODIAK LAUNCH COMPLEX, PEARL HARBOR AND VANDENBERG AFB)

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 will be minimal from continuation of launch activities.

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

In particular, at the Kodiak Launch Complex, socio-economic impacts could be expected because of the potential lodging shortage during 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 or construction of an additional man camp.

In closing, please keep in mind that our goal is to provide the decision makers with accurate information on the environmental consequences of this proposal. To do this, we are soliciting comments on the proposed EIS Environmental Impact Statement. This feedback will support informed decision making.

(SLIDE NO. 28 - PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND ADDRESS)

In addition to tonight's hearing, written comments on the Draft EIS will continue to be accepted until March 24, 2000, at the address shown on the slide. After the comment period is over, we will consider all the comments as we conduct the analysis.
Again, equal consideration will be given to all 
comments, whether they are presented here tonight, 
e-mailed, or submitted by regular mail to us.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Brief recess.)

MS. ELLIOTT: We’re ready to begin. 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 first six seats up here, and those are the 
six seats over here to my left. I would appreciate it 
if those elected officials who plan on speaking would 
begin making their way up here and occupying those 
seats. We have in order Judy Nikels, Brian Miller, 
Charlotte Craves, Robert Lagomarsino, Frank Schillo, 
Anthony Valles, Kathy Long, and Alex Herrera.

Is that correct?

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

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

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

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

So with that our first speaker, Judy Mikels.

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

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

Are we on? I don't think so.

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

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

Welcome to Ventura County. I'm really here.

My name is Judy Mikels. I'm a Ventura County supervisor. I currently serve as chair of the board.
and I'm also co-chair of Regional Defense Partnership
21st Century, which is a base support group, and I'm
merely here to tell you how supportive we are of our
Navy partners, how happy we are to have Naval Base
Ventura County and its employees here.

We have been briefed on the Sea-Based X-Band
Radar Test platform. We would look forward to having it
here, and we would certainly welcome the personnel to
our county who would be involved in this very important
defense testing. You are always welcome here. I am
available at any time. I have left my card for any
technical comments. We'd be happy to do that.

We've reviewed -- I have reviewed at least the
executive summary of the EIR. I will admit that I will
never read the full EIR. I can't do that because you
never read all of those things. I don't understand
them. But it looks like to me that you have done the
right and looked in the right corners, turned over the
right rocks, and the information that at least I have
seen in the draft I am very comfortable with. And I
thank you for being here this evening and giving not
only myself but all of the citizenry of this area an
opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR.

Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Brian Miller.

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

MR. MILLER: Thank you again for the
opportunity to comment. My name is Brian Miller. I am
the district chief of staff for Congressman Hults
Gallegly. The congressman regrets not being here
tonight, but would like to add his strong support for
the siting of the Missile Defense Agency's Sea-Based
X-Band Radar in San Nicolas Island. He too submitted a
letter at your earlier scoping meeting for the written
comment.

San Nicolas Island, which is located 60 miles
off the coast of Point Mugu and in part of Point Mugu's
36,000-square-mile sea test range, would be an ideal
location for the X-Band for two reasons.

First, the range can be expanded north to Big
Sur, south to the U.S.-Mexican border, and west into the
Pacific Ocean, to include 129,000 square miles which
would be ample room for testing. Additionally, San
Nicolas Island has a 10,000-square-foot runway and
offers an unobstructed area over which the Navy and many
DoD activities currently test their weapon systems.

Second, the island is supported by an array of
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mainland facilities located at Naval Base Ventura County. These include a naval-operated port, airlift capabilities, Laguna Peak which rises 1,500 feet above the ocean and hosts an instrumented extended line-of-site coverage over the sea range and San Nicolas Island, all of which is fiber-optically connected to a wide variety of laboratories and command centers. The Navy, Congress, and U.S. taxpayers have contributed greatly to the unique capabilities that currently exist at Point Magu, and these assets could be easily leveraged to provide facilities required for the extended test range without duplicating expensive infrastructure.

Thank you.

MS. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

Charlotte Craven.

Ms. Craven: Thank you for the opportunity to speak here tonight. My name is Charlotte Craven. I'm mayor of the city of Camarillo, California, and I'm vice chairman of the Regional Defense Partnership for the 21st Century. I'm here to speak in favor of the approval of the EIS to extend the GMD Test Range for several reasons. The missile activity is just a continuation of ongoing activities. The local portion would be 60 miles offshore at San Nicolas Island. The radars would be off the surface of the water away from marine life, and the study found no new environmental issues. So I'm here to state community support mainly for the Extended Test Range using the San Nicolas Island facility as appropriate in the testing.

ROBERT LAGOMARINO

Robert Lagomarsino.

ROBERT LAGOMARINO: Thank you. My name is Robert Lagomarsino, and I am a former member of the U.S. House of Representatives for more 19 years. Prior to that I served 12 years in the California State Senate, and before that I was on the City Council and mayor for the City of Ojai.

I want to endorse and strongly go with the
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ANTHONY VONANTE

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

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

I came before you on October 22, 2002,
supporting the placing of the Sea-Based X-Band Radar
component of the Extended Test Range Project at San
Nicolas Island. I came before you this evening to tell
you that my city strongly supports the placing of this
project at San Nicolas Island. I will also have a
letter requesting unanimous support from the City
Council strongly urging your support of locating SXB on
San Nicolas Island and Naval Base Ventura County as the
primary support base.

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

Ms. ELLIOTT: Thank you.

KATHY LONG

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

MR. LONG: Thank you and good evening and thank
you for providing this opportunity in this community for
a public hearing to take place on this important
contribution to the community. I am too a member of the
RDA 21. My name is Kathy Long, Ventura County
Supervisor, the Port of Hueneme, part of the Naval
Base Ventura County, in part of my district. And the
letter I have provided tonight is to provide for the
t pulver record the support for the operation of GMD
testing activities at Port Hueneme.
In reviewing the scope of the EIS, it would appear that the draft document sufficiently covers the intent of the project. Naval Base Ventura County located on Port Hueneme is uniquely suited and positioned to provide an outstanding site free of excessive encroachment and compatible with existing programs and capable of expanding facility and personnel vital to the project. The base has space, range, and resource options at the disposal of this proposed project. The deep water port is both essential and available to this project. The large ocean range with the extended San Nicolas Island base of operations 60 miles from close public encroachment make the site well-suited to significant defense testing with minimal negative impact.

NMVC has been a leader in environmental stewardship of San Nicolas Island and has a track record of accommodation among its military partners that provides the necessary expanded operations required for this project. The robust testing and analysis considered part of this project must be undertaken under the safest conditions possible. Port Hueneme’s open sea range with proximity to air and naval command is powerful and guarantees the least risky test environment.

The County of Ventura stands ready to work in partnership with our military partners and those engaged in the continued environmental impact study. We appreciate you being here this evening.

MS. ELIOTT: Thank you.

Alex Herreria.

ALEX HERRERIA

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

MS. HERRERIA: Good evening. My name is Alex Herreria, and I'm with the City of San Buenaventura, and I'm here to show the City of San Buenaventura's support for this project as expressed by the mayor's two previous letters that are already part of the record. Also, I'm here to represent Councilmember Neil Andrews and his support for this project. We asked that I read a statement for the record.

"As a city council member from the City of San Buenaventura, I have every confidence based on the materials provided to date in the Draft EIS that this project could be developed in and offshore of the County of Ventura with minimal unmitigable environmental
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intelligent from the NDA standpoint. As you know, it’s
the largest instrumented testing training range in the
world. I think the opportunity to site your radar there
would be a good selection.

The County of Ventura strongly supports the
Navy -- it has for many years -- at all three bases,
Fort Rucker, Point Magu, and the Air National Guard
Base.

I have reviewed the EIS. I see no downside
from the standpoint of the NDA and I, therefore,
encourage the selection of that site.

Thank you.

Ms. Elliott: Following the next one will be
David Faustino.

Wayne Davey

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

Mr. Davey: Hello. My name is Wayne Davey. I
am currently vice president and chief financial officer
at Rockwell Scientific Company. Rockwell Scientific is
a privately owned company located in Thousand Oaks and
Camarillo. I am here tonight speaking on behalf of my
company Rockwell Scientific. I am also speaking tonight
as a business supporter of having the Sea-Based X-Band
Radar System at Naval Base Ventura County.

This program is a strategic opportunity for our
region and Department of Defense, Naval Base Ventura
County, and San Nicolas Island in the most logical
location for this program, based on our region’s
existing infrastructure and accessibility.

This program is also strongly supported by the
business community in this region. The company I
represent, Rockwell Scientific, is one of many examples
of the supporters. Rockwell Scientific has been based
in this region for over 40 years. We are a nationally
recognized research and development company doing work
for the U.S. Government, numerous defense contractors,
several long-term strategic customers, and many
commercial customers. Our full-time and contract head
count totals in excess of 500 well-paying jobs. We have
approximately 140 Ph.D. scientists on our staff, and
many of them will be working on this program.

We also play a major role in designing imaging
sensors for several national missile defense programs,
and so we’re really aware of this program. Rockwell
Scientific will also design and develop several
high-speed electronics and power components which will
be used in the Sea-Based X-Band Radar System. Many
Oxnard, California

1. Other local and regional companies are also well positioned to support this major program being based in Naval Base Ventura County. It is our belief that all of the health, environmental, and safety issues associated with this program will be adequately addressed.

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

   Thank you.

   David Faubion

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

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

   Thank you.

   MS. ELIOTI: Thank you.

   Gordon Burt and then William Connors.

   Gordon Burt

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

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

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

   Back to the process, when I received the mailing for tonight's meeting here, it came by Priority Mail, and it cost you guys $4.98 to mail it. I think a first-class stamp would have been just as appropriate.
And also, as far as the process is concerned, I notice that the only library in the area that has the EIS on file is here at the Oxnard library. The City of Port Hueneme, its library or any of the other Ventura County libraries did not receive a copy. I checked with them, and they were not on the mailing list, and I think you should include at least the City of Port Hueneme's public library on the final EIS so everyone in the area will have a chance to review it, primarily since they're the closest neighbor to the Port Hueneme Harbor, and I believe they should be apprised as anyone else in the area, especially since now within the Naval Base Ventura County and Port Hueneme you have it listed as the primary support base and mooring for the sea-based radar.

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

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

And when you talk about the mitigation summary, you usually refer to you're going to track and drain these issues prior to setup and what you should do to mitigate these prior to setup. You know, just don't track and consist on them. They should be mitigated totally.

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

Thank you.
BILL CONNEEN

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

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

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

JACK DODG

offered public commentary on the EEDT Draft EIS as follows:

MR. DODG: Ms. Elliott, Commander Dunn, Ms. Mitchell, how are you doing? Good evening and welcome to Ventura County. My name is Jack Dodd, and I'm a private citizen that lives in the city of Camarillo. I'm here tonight to express my support for the EEDT Draft EIS and specifically the basing of the X-Band Radar at San Nicolas Island. I know that perhaps there's been some confusion in maybe
Additionally, operating on the sea range
2 leverages the existing operational linkages with
3 Vandenberg Air Force Base which is part of the extended
test range in proposing both target launches and missile
interceptors. It benefits from both the -- from the
logistics connectivity with both the Port of Hueneme
through surface craft and the airfield at Point Mugu,
both of which are owned and controlled by the Navy and
and can provide you dedicated service should you decide to
base the X-band Radar at San Nick.

As you’ve seen from the meeting tonight,
5 including all the elected officials and both current and
6 former and their representatives, there’s a widespread
7 support in Ventura County for all the military
8 activities, specifically taking their time to come here
9 tonight to express their support for having the X-band
10 Radar at San Nick. You certainly will be welcome here,
11 and if you have any questions for us, certainly let us
12 know, and we’ll be happy to answer them, but we’re
13 hopeful that in your decisions, we know you have a lot
14 of data to look at, all the locations that are around
15 the Pacific, but we hope you’ll be favorably impressed
16 both with population, the geography, and the technical
17 capabilities of Ventura County in general, and Naval
18 Base Ventura County in particular, and San Nicolas

OXNARD, CALIFORNIA

some of the materials or presentations, but the folks
that I’ve talked to that have been studying this
understand that you’re talking about putting the X-band
Radar at San Nicolas Island, not in the city of or the
port of Port Hueneme, and that makes a difference in
environmental effects and the scenery off the coast of
Port Hueneme. We understand that.

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

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

Thank you.

Ms. Elliott: That is all of the comment cards that I have. Is there anyone who has not spoken and would like to speak?

Norman Eagle

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

Mr. Eagle: My name is Norman Eagle. I'm a resident of Oxnard, and I was a naval engineering officer in World War II.

I tried to read through the two volumes of the impact statement that was deposited here in the library, and I could not get very far with it, frankly. The technical requirements are way, way above my head right now, and I am concerned that we are getting evaluations of the impact statement from individuals who don't have the proper qualifications to make judgments on it. I think the statement speaks for itself. It's two volumes that I saw, and I believe that there are two other volumes somewhere. I may be wrong about that.

But it's obvious that there were thousands of man-hours that went into the studies that now comprise this impact statement. I'm concerned about the process of making an impact evaluation, impact statement because we have — what we have is a Defense Department project that is being put forward by the Defense Department. We have an agency within the same Defense Department doing the impact evaluations.

I think that there is a conflict of interest there, quite obvious. What residents of this area require is an independent assessment, an independent evaluation. We need to have experts unbiased, unbiased, that is, not paid by the Defense Department, not paid by any specific interest group, but an objective public evaluation unit. Other than that, what we're going to have is Ken lay appointing an evaluation or auditing committee for Kern Corporation.

Thank you.

Ms. Elliott: Also, sir, will you please fill out a card. We'll don't have one here. Get one from the registration table, and someone's going to get one for you.

Thank you.

Anyone else?
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Remember you have till March 24, 2003 to submit your comments on the Draft EIS and as we stated before there are many ways to do that. We will conclude tonight’s meeting.

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

Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>EIS Section</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Cleary - Citizens Opposed to Defense Experimentation Code</td>
<td>P-T-0003-2</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
<td>GMD launches would not be from Fort Greely. As stated in section 2.1.7 and appendix C, each missile flight test event would occur over unpopulated 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Mikels - Ventura County Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0004-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Miller - Congressman Elton Gallegly</td>
<td>P-T-0005-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0005-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0005-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0005-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0005-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Craven - City of Camarillo</td>
<td>P-T-0006-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Craven - City of Camarillo</td>
<td>P-T-0006-2</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.11.3</td>
<td>See P-E-0032-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0006-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lagomarsino - Former Member of U.S. Congress</td>
<td>P-T-0007-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0007-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0007-3</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0007-4</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0007-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Schillo - Retired Ventura Co. Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0008-1</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-T-0007-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0008-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0008-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0008-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Volante - Councilmember from City of Port Hueneme</td>
<td>P-T-0009-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0009-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0009-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Long - Ventura County Supervisor</td>
<td>P-T-0010-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0010-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0010-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0010-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0010-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Herrera - City of San Buenaventura</td>
<td>P-T-0011-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0011-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Chaffee - Nuclear Age Peace Foundation</td>
<td>P-T-0012-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-3</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.7.3</td>
<td>Comment noted. However, the radar beam would be in motion, making it extremely unlikely that a bird would be in the intense area of the beam and would remain there for any considerable length of time. The power density is also not expected to exceed levels that could impact birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-4</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td>4.8.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0008-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-5</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-6</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.7.3</td>
<td>See P-T-0012-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-7</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-8</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0012-9</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Conroy</td>
<td>P-T-0013-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0013-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0013-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Davey - Rockwell Scientific Company</td>
<td>P-T-0014-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0014-2</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0014-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Faubion - Ventura Peace Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0015-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Birr - The Beacon Foundation</td>
<td>P-T-0016-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>The three circles indicate proposed operating areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>A copy of the Draft EIS has been sent to the Ray D. Prueter Library in Port Hueneme, and it has been added to the distribution list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-4</td>
<td>Visual Aesthetics</td>
<td>4.8.9</td>
<td>See P-E-0011-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.3.1.7</td>
<td>If NBVC Port Hueneme is selected as the PSB location for the SBX, the actual port is not wide enough to allow the SBX to have pier side operations. However, San Nicolas Island provides an excellent mooring location. Mooring would probably be on the leeward side of the island. Water depths there allow for mooring approximately 800 meters (2,625 feet) offshore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-6</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0016-7</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0005-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.5.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6.5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8.5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Conneen</td>
<td>P-T-0017-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from the PMRF on the island of Kauai are current on-going activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned. For this reason, the scoping process and hearings were not held on Kauai but in Honolulu, which is closest to the location of the new proposed activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Dodd</td>
<td>P-T-0018-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0018-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0018-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0018-4</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.7.3</td>
<td>Comment noted. Most DoD installations tend to have large numbers of sensitive resources since they are aggressively managed and public access is generally controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Dodd</td>
<td>P-T-0018-5</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0018-6</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Eagle</td>
<td>P-T-0019-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team of experts with no conflict of interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0019-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Norten</td>
<td>P-T-0020-1</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td>4.8.2 2.1.4.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0008-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0020-2</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.7.2</td>
<td>Comment noted. No significant adverse long-term impacts to biological resources are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Roman</td>
<td>P-T-0021-1</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>4.7.4 4.8.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0208-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0021-2</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>4.7.4 4.8.4</td>
<td>See P-E-0208-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hayes</td>
<td>P-T-0022-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Heitman</td>
<td>P-T-0023-1</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4 2.1.8</td>
<td>See P-E-0005-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test interceptors have been proposed for KLC. However, test launches are not planned for Fort Greely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0020-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>A mobile telemetry unit and mobile C-band radar may be placed at King Salmon as discussed in chapter 2. The program does not currently plan on using the existing radars at King Salmon and Chiniak. These radar do not impact operations at KLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-5</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>The GBI configuration proposed is the Orion 50SXLG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-6</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-T-0023-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0023-7</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.3.1 4.1.7</td>
<td>See P-E-0020-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Heitman</td>
<td>P-T-0023-8</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>4.1.8.2.1</td>
<td>Section 4.1.8.2.1 states that public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sirofchuck</td>
<td>P-T-0024-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>The decision to produce an EIS, including analysis of proposed activities at KLC, was done in accordance with CEQ Regulations (40 CFR 1502.14(d)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0024-2</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Upland areas have been selected to the greatest extent practicable to minimize impacts to wetlands and the wildlife that depend upon them. Beaver is one of the species listed on page 3-7 as occurring at KLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0024-3</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>4.1.8.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>As discussed in section 4.1.8.2.1, the Proposed Action would only temporarily restrict public access and fail to significantly impact any aspect of land utilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0024-4</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>The additional personnel associated with the project would not all be involved in sportfishing, hiking, and hunting. In addition, those involved in these activities would go to other areas in addition to Narrow Cape. Section 4.1.15 has been revised to state that personnel would be restricted to KLC during working hours and significant impacts to subsistence hunting, recreational hunting, hiking, or other recreational activities or areas are not anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Stevens</td>
<td>P-T-0025-1</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Additional sampling of aluminum and pH levels would be conducted in accordance with AADC guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0025-2</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>4.1.8.2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The exact dates and length of closures have not been established at this time. The five MDA launches are included in the nine launches per year currently authorized at KLC. Section 4.1.8.2.1 on page 4-69 states that ESQDs at KLC would not impact transportation routes and public access would only be temporarily restricted for safety reasons, on the day of launch, or for a short period of time when missiles are moved within the KLC along the public road. In addition, there is no plan to close roads or limit access during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0025-3</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>4.1.7</td>
<td>See P-E-0020-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T-0025-4</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Text has been revised in section 4.1.15 to state that several documents were analyzed to determine the effects to subsistence caused by the program and that the program would only effect a small amount of the intertidal areas for up to a single day of closure approximately five times per year. This would result in minimal impacts to subsistence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Stevens - Kodiak Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>P-T-0026-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>4.1.10</td>
<td>Coordination with local accommodations will be the priority method for accommodating personnel in support of the GMD effort. Construction of additional facilities at Narrow Cape would be secondary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Stevens - Kodiak Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>P-T-0026-2</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.1.10</td>
<td>Text has been revised in section 4.1.10 to state that coordination with existing accommodations will be carried out to maximize their use while minimizing any potential long-term impacts. Construction of additional facilities at Narrow Cape is a secondary mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Milligan</td>
<td>P-T-0027-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0027-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0027-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0020-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Foreman - Kodiak Island Convention &amp; Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>P-T-0028-1</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.1.10</td>
<td>See P-T-0026-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Carver</td>
<td>P-T-0029-1</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>The calculations in appendix D were re-run using a seismic class B for the bedrock at KLC. However, even when the seismic class B is factored into the overall equation, the answer does not change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0029-2</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>The facilities at KLC proposed by MDA are test facilities and, as such, would not be classified as facilities used for critical defense reasons. Critical defense facilities are those that are required for post-earthquake recovery or those housing mission-essential functions that are absolutely critical to mission continuation of the activity. The proposed GMD test facilities at KLC would not meet either of these criteria and therefore the calculations would stand as presented in appendix D of the Draft EIS. As stated in the Draft EIS, all available information and current codes will be considered in the design of the GMD facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mohr - Executive Director, Port of Everett</td>
<td>P-T-0030-1</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0209-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | 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>| | P-T-0030-3 | Socioeconomics | 4.8.6 | See P-E-0209-2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>EIS Section</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horst Petsold</td>
<td>P-T-0031-1</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4, 2.1.8, 4.3.5.2.5, 4.6.5.2, 4.8.5.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0005-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0031-2</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>The beam from the SBX would not remain stationary during operation for any period of time, thus the odds of interference from high power effects with any electronic equipment on the ground would be slight, 0.0001% of the time (roughly 1/10 of a second per day). The effects would not damage any electronic equipment and would last for less than 1 second, should this occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0031-3</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>As mentioned in section 2.1.4.3, electrical power requirements for the SBX platform if moored near a PSB would generally be accommodated by three of the on-board generators: one for daily ship functions and two for powering the radar, as needed. However, when mooring at Naval Station Everett Pier Alpha or Pier Bravo would be utilized. A utility hookup, similar to other vessels at Naval Station Everett, would be used for on board lighting and other basic needs. Utility levels would be typical of that for other ships and would be considered routine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flowers</td>
<td>P-T-0032-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0032-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0020-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0032-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jackson</td>
<td>P-T-0033-1</td>
<td>Visual Aesthetics</td>
<td>4.8.9</td>
<td>See P-E-0011-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrie Trautman</td>
<td>P-T-0034-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>4.8.5</td>
<td>The GMD ETR testing activities would likely occur over a period of approximately 10 years following a decision to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0034-2</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>4.8.5</td>
<td>See P-E-0208-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nagel</td>
<td>P-T-0035-1</td>
<td>Visual Aesthetics</td>
<td>4.8.9</td>
<td>See P-E-0011-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0035-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>See P-T-0017-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0035-3</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0209-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>EIS Section</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nagel</td>
<td>P-T-0035-4</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>4.8.3</td>
<td>A discussion of power densities is provided in the health and safety section on pages 4-218 and 4-219. The power density is calculated to be 2.5 milliwatts per cubic centimeter at a distance of 150 meters (492 feet) for the fully populated radar and 85 meters (279 feet) for the 65 percent populated radar. MPELs, which define the maximum time-averaged RF power density allowed for uncontrolled human exposure and is independent of body size or tissue density being exposed, are capped at 5 milliwatts per cubic centimeter for frequencies greater than 1,500 MHz. OSHA has established a radiation protection guide of 10 milliwatts per cubic centimeter or electromagnetic energy of frequencies of 10 to 100 MHz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Salsman</td>
<td>P-T-0036-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>The SBX is a phased array radar. The SBX Project Office has no knowledge of any encoding activities, and no knowledge of the HARP array.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Moses</td>
<td>P-T-0037-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>The dimensions of the SBX are provided in table 2.1.4-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Windt</td>
<td>P-T-0038-1</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Selden</td>
<td>P-T-0039-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0347-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Williams - Tulalip Tribes</td>
<td>P-T-0040-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Baker</td>
<td>P-T-0041-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pub 4.1.6</td>
<td>P-T-0041-2</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>4.1.6 4.1.8</td>
<td>Emergency response would be required in the event of a pre-launch or post-launch event which resulted in the partial destruction of a missile. Such an event could result in the rupture of a rocket engine and exposure of the solid or liquid fuel. In the event of such mishap, spillage of the propellants could occur. The incident would be handled as an explosive ordnance event, and remaining potentially hazardous materials would be regarded as hazardous waste for management purposes. Removal and disposal of nonhazardous and hazardous waste from the accident location would be in accordance with applicable state and federal requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0042-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0042-2</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.1.3-2: Responses to Public Hearing Comments (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>EIS Section</th>
<th>Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor Eddy - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0042-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0042-4</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>4.4.4, 4.1.7, 4.5.5, 4.3.5</td>
<td>See P-E-0004-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elden Boothe - Vandenberg Action Coalition</td>
<td>P-T-0043-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0043-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Carucci</td>
<td>P-T-0044-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0044-2</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>2.3.2.1</td>
<td>The ETR's proposed activities do not include the placement of any new GBI silos at Vandenberg AFB. LF-21 and LF-23, currently used for Booster Verification testing, would be used for interceptor testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0044-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0044-4</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobert Parker</td>
<td>P-T-0045-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Marinelli</td>
<td>P-T-0046-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions concerning the overall management of the GMD Test Program are outside the scope of this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0046-2</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0046-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Draft EIS has been sent to the Hanapepe Public Library, Kapaa Public Library, Koloa Public and School Library, Lihue Public Library, Princeville Public Library, and Waimea Public Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Morikawa - Fellowship of Reconciliation</td>
<td>P-T-0047-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0047-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0047-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0047-4</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen Redford</td>
<td>P-T-0048-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Kajihiro - American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>P-T-0049-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0049-2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>See P-E-0020-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0049-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0049-4</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>See P-E-0018-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0049-5</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>Ads were placed in both the Honolulu papers and The Environmental Bulletin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0049-6</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>See P-T-0046-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0049-7</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0049-8</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0049-9</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0049-10</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>The only new activity proposed for Hawaii as part of the GMD program is the PSB for the SBX at Pearl Harbor and mooring of the SBX off of Barbers Point. The target missile launches described in the draft EIS from the PMRF on the island of Kauai are current ongoing activities that have been analyzed in previous environmental documentation. For the GMD program, no additional target missile launches would be conducted from PMRF beyond those already planned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Dodge</td>
<td>P-T-0050-1</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4 2.1.8 4.2.5 4.3.5.2.5 4.6.5.2 4.8.5.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0005-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0050-2</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td>4.6.2</td>
<td>See P-E-0319-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0050-3</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0050-4</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>See P-E-0032-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Aila</td>
<td>P-T-0051-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0051-2</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Aila</td>
<td>P-T-0051-3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is acknowledged that Pearl Harbor is not deep enough to permit the SBX to enter the harbor. However, the harbor can host a resupply ship that would service the SBX. A mooring site off of Barbers Point has been proposed for the SBX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0051-4</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0051-5</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>As stated in section 4.6, cultural resources were not analyzed because there is minimal potential for impacts. While some mooring locations may have traditional importance, such as native fishing grounds, the SBX would occupy a very small area on a temporary basis. The remaining time the area would remain open with no security restrictions related to the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0051-6</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0051-7</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Keko'olani-Raymond - Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0052-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ads were placed in both papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0052-2</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0052-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not affecting state of Hawaii lands, the SBX would be moored outside 4.8-kilometer (3-mile) limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0052-4</td>
<td>Airspace Use</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>Under PPL 85-725, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the FAA is charged with the safe and efficient use of our nation's airspace and has established certain criteria and limits to its use. The method used to provide this service is the National Airspace System. This system is &quot;...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.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Yee - Office of Hawaiian Affairs</td>
<td>P-T-0053-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0250-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Murray</td>
<td>P-T-0054-1</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0024-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gosline - 'Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0055-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>EIS Section</td>
<td>Response Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalama Niheu - Ohana Kou / Nuclear Freedom and Independent Pacific</td>
<td>P-T-0056-1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0026-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Chism/Lowell</td>
<td>P-T-0057-1</td>
<td>Visual Aesthetics</td>
<td>4.8.8</td>
<td>See P-E-0026-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0057-2</td>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>4.8.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0013-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0057-3</td>
<td>EIS Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>The NEPA process allows for public input. All comments received on the Draft EIS are considered in preparing the Final EIS. The decision on whether to proceed with the Proposed Action or alternatives can not be made until 30 days after the Final EIS is released. Comments received on the Final EIS will also be considered by the decision maker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-T-0057-4</td>
<td>Safety and Health</td>
<td>2.1.4.6</td>
<td>See P-E-0230-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Ruhge</td>
<td>P-T-0058-1</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>See P-E-0006-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>