
Appendix E: Public Participation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX E PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.....E-1

E.1 PROJECT WEBSITE.....E-1

E.2 GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PERIODE-1

E.2.1 TRIBAL NOTIFICATION LETTERS E-1

E.2.2 PUBLIC SCOPING NOTIFICATION E-3

E.2.2.1 Scoping Notification Letters..... E-3

E.2.2.2 Postcard Mailers E-7

E.2.2.3 Press Releases E-7

E.2.2.4 Notification Flier E-8

E.2.2.5 Newspaper Display Advertisements E-8

E.2.3 SCOPING MEETINGS..... E-9

E.2.4 PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS E-9

E.2.4.1 Marine Mammals..... E-11

E.2.4.2 Sound in the Water/Sonar E-11

E.2.4.3 Underwater Explosions E-11

E.2.4.4 Mitigation..... E-11

E.2.4.5 Study Area/Size E-11

E.2.4.6 Fish E-12

E.2.4.7 Marine Habitats E-12

E.2.4.8 National Environmental Policy Act Process/Public Participation E-12

E.2.4.9 Navy Activities/Proposed Action E-12

E.2.4.10 Sea Turtles..... E-12

E.2.4.11 Birds E-12

E.2.4.12 Water Quality..... E-13

E.2.4.13 Socioeconomics/Commercial and Recreational Fishing E-13

E.2.4.14 Cumulative Impacts E-13

E.2.4.15 Public Health and Safety E-13

E.2.4.16 Other E-13

E.2.4.17 Research..... E-14

E.2.4.18 Air Quality E-14

E.2.4.19 Marine Debris E-14

E.2.4.20 Terrestrial Resources E-14

E.2.4.21 Noise E-14

E.2.4.22 Cultural Resources/Native American Concerns..... E-14

E.2.4.23 Access..... E-14

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE E-1: PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY E-10

LIST OF FIGURES

There are no figures in this section.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

APPENDIX E PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

This appendix includes information about the public's participation in the development of the Northwest Training and Testing Activities (NWT) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas EIS (OEIS).

E.1 PROJECT WEBSITE

A public website was established specifically for this project, <http://www.NWTTEIS.com/>. This website address was published in the *Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Overseas Impact Statement* (Notice of Intent) and has subsequently been re-printed in all newspaper advertisements, agency letters, and public postcards. The Scoping Meeting Fact Sheets and various other materials will be available on the project website throughout the course of the project.

E.2 GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE SCOPING PERIOD

The public scoping period began with the issuance of the Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* on 27 February 2012. This notice included a project description and scoping meeting dates and locations. The scoping period lasted 60 days, concluding on 27 April 2012. Sections E.2.1 and E.2.2 describe the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy's (Navy's) notification efforts during scoping. The scoping period allowed a variety of opportunities for the public to comment on the scope of the EIS/OEIS.

E.2.1 TRIBAL NOTIFICATION LETTERS

Tribal notification letters were distributed on 23 February 2012, to 46 federally recognized tribes and tribal groups. Recipients included:

Washington

Chinook Indian Nation
Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation
Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Hoh Indian Tribe of the Hoh Indian Reservation
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe
Lummi Tribe of the Lummi Reservation
Makah Indian Tribe of the Makah Indian Reservation
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the Muckleshoot Reservation
Nisqually Indian Tribe of the Nisqually Reservation
Nooksack Indian Tribe of Washington
Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Point No Point Treaty Council
Port Gamble Indian Community of Port Gamble Reservation
Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation
Quileute Tribe of the Quileute Reservation
Quinault Indian Nation
Samish Indian Tribe
Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe of Washington
Shoalwater Bay Tribe of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation
Skagit River System Cooperative
Skokomish Indian Tribe of the Skokomish Reservation

Snoqualmie Tribe
Squaxin Island Tribe of the Squaxin Island Reservation
Stillaguamish Tribe of Washington
Suquamish Indian Tribe of the Port Madison Reservation
Swinomish Indians of the Swinomish Reservation
Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation
Upper Skagit Indian Tribe

Oregon

Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation
Coquille Tribe of Oregon
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians of Oregon
Klamath Tribes

California

Cahto Indian Tribe of the Laytonville Rancheria
Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria
Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians
Elk Valley Rancheria
Hoopa Valley Tribe
Hopland Band of Pomo Indians of the Hopland Rancheria
Karuk Tribe
Pinoleville Pomo Nation
Potter Valley Tribe
Redwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California
Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California
Round Valley Indian Tribes of the Round Valley Reservation
Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians of California
Sherwood Valley Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California
Smith River Rancheria
Tolowa Nation
Wiyot Tribe
Yurok Tribe of the Yurok Reservation

Alaska

Cape Fox Corporation
Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska
Ketchikan Indian Community
Metlakatla Indian Community, Annette Island Reserve
Organized Village of Saxman
Sealaska

E.2.2 PUBLIC SCOPING NOTIFICATION

The Navy made significant efforts at notifying the public to ensure maximum public participation during the scoping process. A summary of these efforts follows.

E.2.2.1 Scoping Notification Letters

Notice of Intent/Notice of Scoping Meeting letters were distributed on 29 February 2012, to 748 federal, state, and local elected officials and government agencies. Recipients included:

Federal

U.S. Senators (Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska) and Staff
U.S. Representatives (Washington Districts 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9; Oregon Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; California Districts 1 and 2; and Alaska At-Large District) and Staff
Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory
Federal Aviation Administration
 Washington, D.C., Headquarters
 Western Pacific Region
Marine Mammal Commission
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
 Washington, D.C., Headquarters
 Seattle District
U.S. Department of Commerce
 Washington, D.C., Headquarters
 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
 National Marine Fisheries Service
 Northwest Fisheries Science Center
 Maryland Offices
 Office of Habitat Conservation
 Washington Habitat Branch
 Office of Protected Resources
 Northwest Region
 National Marine Protected Areas Center
 Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
 Pacific Fishery Management Council
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
 U.S. Coast Guard
 District 13
 District 17
 Office of Operating and Environmental Standards
 U.S. Army National Guard
 Oregon Division
U.S. Department of the Interior
 Bureau of Indian Affairs
 Northwest Regional Office
 Bureau of Land Management
 Coos Bay District Office
 Oregon/Washington State Office
 Spokane District Office

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement
 Pacific Outer Continental Shelf Region
 Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement
 Pacific Outer Continental Shelf Region
 Office of Regulation
 National Park Service
 Olympic National Park
 Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
 Portland Region
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance Division
 Region X (Seattle)
 Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit
 Washington, D.C., Headquarters
 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 Pacific Regional Office
 Washington Maritime Wildlife Refuge Complex
 Western Washington Office
 U.S. Forest Service
 Pacific Northwest Region Office
 U.S. Geological Survey
 Alaska Science Center
 Northwest Area Office
 Pacific Northwest Region Office
 Southwest Area Office
 Western Fisheries Research Center

State of Washington

Office of the Governor
 State Senators (Districts 1, 2, 7, 10, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 38, 39, and 44) and Staff
 State Representatives (Districts 1, 2, 7, 10, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 38, 39, and 44)
 and Staff
 Coastal Advisory Body on Ocean Policy
 Puget Sound Partnership
 Department of Agriculture
 Policy and Communications Department
 Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
 Department of Ecology
 Southwest Regional Office
 Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Region 6
 Department of Natural Resources
 Fish and Wildlife Commission
 Parks and Recreation Commission

State of Oregon

Office of the Governor
 State Senators (Districts 1, 5, 16, 28, and 29) and Staff

State Representatives (1, 9, 10, 31, 32, 57) and Staff
Department of Fish and Wildlife
Department of Forestry
Department of Land Conservation and Development
Department of Parks and Recreation
Department of State Lands
Military Department
Department of Environmental Quality
 Water Quality Division
Water Resources Department
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

State of California

Office of the Governor
State Senators (Districts 1, 2, and 4) and Staff
State Assembly Members (District 1) and Staff
California Coastal Commission
 San Francisco Headquarters
 North Coast District Office
Department of Fish and Game
Environmental Protection Agency
Resources Agency
Department of Toxic Substances Control

State of Alaska

Office of the Governor
State Senators (Districts A, B, and C) and Staff
State Representatives (Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) and Staff
Alaska Marine Highway
Department of Natural Resources
 Division of Forestry
 Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys
 Division of Mining, Land and Water
 Division of Oil and Gas
 Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation
 Office of History and Archaeology
 Public Information Center
Department of Commerce
 Community and Economic Development
 Division of Community and Regional Affairs
Department of Environmental Conservation
 Division of Administrative Services
 Division of Air Quality
 Division of Environmental Health
 Division of Spill and Prevention Response
 Division of Water
Department of Fish and Game
 Commercial Fisheries Division

Division of Wildlife Conservation
Habitat Division
Sport Fish Division
Sportfishing
Subsistence Division
Wildlife Conservation Division
Department of Military and Veterans Affairs
Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
Division of Ports and Harbors
Juneau Office
Statewide Aviation Office
Regulatory Commission of Alaska

Local – Washington

City of Aberdeen
City of Bremerton
City of Everett
City of Hoquiam
City of Oak Harbor
City of Ocean Shores
City of Port Townsend
City of Poulsbo
City of Tacoma
City of Westport
County of Clallam
County of Ferry
County Grays Harbor
County of Island
County of Jefferson
County of Kitsap
County of Pacific
County of Pierce
County of San Juan
County of Snohomish
Friday Harbor Airport

Local – Oregon

City of Astoria
City of Bandon
City of Bay City
City of Brookings
City of Cannon Beach
City of Coos Bay
City of Depoe Bay
City of Garibaldi
City of Gearhart
City of Gold Beach
City of Lakeside

City of Lincoln
City of Manzanita
City of Nehalem
City of Newport
City of North Bend
City of Port Orford
City of Reedsport
City of Rockaway Beach
City of Seaside
City of Tillamook
City of Waldport
City of Warrenton
City of Wheeler
City of Yachats
County of Clatsop
County of Coos
County of Curry
County of Lane
County of Lincoln
County of Tillamook
Depoe Bay Nearshore Action Team
Port Orford Watershed Council

Local – California

City of Arcata
City of Crescent
City of Eureka
City of Fort Bragg
City of Point Arena
City of Trinidad
County of Del Norte
County of Humboldt
County of Mendocino
Humboldt County Democratic Central Committee

Local – Alaska

City of Ketchikan
Ketchikan Gateway Borough

E.2.2.2 Postcard Mailers

On 28 February 2012, postcards were mailed to 1,925 organizations and individuals on the NWTT project mailing list, which was compiled, validated, and updated from previous Navy NEPA projects in the Northwest. Postcards included the scoping meeting dates, locations, and times.

E.2.2.3 Press Releases

Three press releases were distributed by the Navy Region Northwest Public Affairs Office to media outlets, elected officials and other potentially interested parties. The news releases were distributed on

27 February 2012, 5 March 2012, and 15 March 2012, respectively, and announced the intent to prepare an EIS/OEIS and provided notice of the open house information sessions. The press releases included information about the Proposed Action and its purpose and need; open house information session locations, dates, and times; and project website and comment submittal information.

E.2.2.4 Notification Flier

A notification flier was distributed to 37 locations in Washington, 18 locations in Oregon, 26 locations in Northern California, and 7 locations in Alaska to be posted in areas frequented by the local community. The flier provided information on the Proposed Action, open house information session locations, dates and times, project website and information on comment submittal. The fliers were mailed on 8 March 2012 and follow-up phone calls were made to ensure posting.

E.2.2.5 Newspaper Display Advertisements

Advertisements were made to announce the scoping meetings in the following counties, cities and newspapers on the dates indicated below:

Kitsap County, Statewide <i>The Seattle Times</i> Monday, Feb. 27, 2012 Tuesday, Feb. 28, 2012 Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 7, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 14, 2012 Thursday, Mar. 15, 2012 Friday, Mar. 16, 2012	Snohomish County <i>The Everett Herald</i> Monday, Feb. 27, 2012 Tuesday, Feb. 28, 2012 Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012 Tuesday, Mar. 6, 2012 Tuesday, Mar. 13, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 14, 2012 Thursday, Mar. 15, 2012	Island County <i>Whidbey News-Times</i> Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012 Saturday, Mar. 3, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 7, 2012 Saturday, Mar. 10, 2012
Kitsap County <i>The Kitsap Sun</i> Monday, Feb. 27, 2012 Tuesday, Feb. 28, 2012 Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012 Thursday, Mar. 8, 2012 Tuesday, Mar. 13, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 14, 2012 Thursday, Mar. 15, 2012	Clallam/Jefferson County <i>Peninsula Daily News</i> Monday, Feb. 27, 2012 Tuesday, Feb. 28, 2012 Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012 Monday, Mar. 5, 2012 Monday, Mar. 12, 2012 Tuesday, Mar. 13, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 14, 2012	Jefferson County <i>Port Townsend and Jefferson County Leader</i> Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 7, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 14, 2012
Grays Harbor County <i>The Daily World</i> Tuesday, Feb. 28, 2012 Thursday, Mar. 1, 2012 Friday, Mar. 2, 2012 Thursday, Mar. 8, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 14, 2012 Thursday, Mar. 15, 2012 Friday, Mar. 16, 2012	Statewide, OR <i>The Oregonian</i> Monday, Feb. 27, 2012 Tuesday, Feb. 28, 2012 Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012 Monday, Mar. 12, 2012 Sunday, Mar. 18, 2012 Monday, Mar. 19, 2012 Tuesday, Mar. 20, 2012	Tillamook, OR <i>Tillamook Headlight-Herald</i> Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 7, 2012 Wednesday, Mar. 14, 2012

Newport, OR
Newport News-Times
 Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012
 Friday, Mar. 2, 2012
 Wednesday, Mar. 7, 2012
 Friday, Mar. 9, 2012
 Wednesday, Mar. 14, 2012
 Friday, Mar. 16, 2012

Eureka, CA
Eureka Times-Standard
 Tuesday, Feb. 28, 2012
 Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012
 Thursday, Mar. 1, 2012
 Wednesday, Mar. 14, 2012
 Tuesday, Mar. 20, 2012
 Wednesday, Mar. 21, 2012
 Thursday, Mar. 22, 2012

Fort Bragg, CA
Fort Bragg Advocate-News
 Thursday, Mar. 1, 2012
 Thursday, Mar. 8, 2012
 Thursday, Mar. 15, 2012
 Thursday, Mar. 22, 2012

Juneau, AK
The Juneau Empire
 Monday, Feb. 27, 2012
 Tuesday, Feb. 28, 2012
 Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012
 Tuesday, Mar. 20, 2012
 Sunday, Mar. 25, 2012
 Monday, Mar. 26, 2012
 Tuesday, Mar. 27, 2012

Ketchikan, AK
Ketchikan Daily News
 Monday, Feb. 27, 2012
 Tuesday, Feb. 28, 2012
 Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012
 Tuesday, Mar. 20, 2012
 Saturday, Mar. 24, 2012
 Monday, Mar. 26, 2012
 Tuesday, Mar. 27, 2012

E.2.3 SCOPING MEETINGS

Nine scoping meetings were held on March 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 27 in the cities of Oak Harbor, WA; Quilcene, WA; Silverdale, WA; Aberdeen, WA; Tillamook, OR; Newport, OR; Eureka, CA; Fort Bragg, CA; and Ketchikan, AK, respectively. At each scoping meeting, staffers at the welcome station greeted guests and encouraged them to sign in to be added to the project mailing list to receive future notifications. In total, 238 people signed in at the welcome table. The meetings were held in an open house format, presenting informational posters and written information, with Navy staff and project experts available to answer participants' questions. Additionally, a digital voice recorder was available to record participants' oral comments. The interaction during the information sessions was productive and helpful to the Navy.

What is a scoping meeting?

The scoping period determines the extent of the EIS in terms of significant issues. Scoping meetings allow the face-to-face exchange of information and ideas to ensure relevant topics are identified and properly studied and that the Draft EIS is thorough and balanced.

E.2.4 PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS

Scoping participants submitted comments in five ways:

- Oral statements at the public meetings (as recorded by the digital voice recorder)
- Written comments at the public meetings
- Written letters (received any time during the public comment period)
- Electronic mail (received any time during the public comment period)
- Comments submitted directly on the project website (received any time during the public comment period)

In total, the Navy received comments from 316 individuals and groups. Because many of the comments addressed more than one issue, 1,054 total comments resulted. Table E-1 provides a breakdown of areas of concern based on comments received during scoping. The summary following Table E-1 provides an overview of comments and is organized by area of concern.

Table E-1: Public Scoping Comment Summary

Area of Concern	Count	Percent of Total
Marine Mammals	225	21.3%
Sound in the Water/Sonar	173	16.4%
Underwater Explosions	71	6.7%
Mitigation	59	5.6%
Study Area/Size	57	5.4%
Fish	56	5.3%
Marine Habitats	45	4.3%
National Environmental Policy Act Process/Public Participation	42	4.0%
Navy Activities/Proposed Action	38	3.6%
Sea Turtles	35	3.3%
Birds	30	2.8%
Water Quality	29	2.8%
Socioeconomics/Commercial and Recreational Fishing	29	2.8%
Cumulative Impacts	25	2.4%
Public Health and Safety	24	2.3%
Other	23	2.2%
Research	20	1.9%
Air Quality	18	1.7%
Marine Debris	15	1.4%
Terrestrial Resources	15	1.4%
Noise	11	1.0%
Cultural Resources/Native American Concerns	9	0.9%
Access	5	0.5%
TOTAL	1,054	100.0%

E.2.4.1 Marine Mammals

A significant number of participants requested the Navy train and test in areas devoid of marine life. Comments expressed a general concern about the Navy's training and testing activities, which include sonar and explosives, and how these activities can harm or kill marine mammals. Many comments requested the need for improved and more effective marine mammal protection measures, particularly since many whale species are declining. Other comments addressed the migration routes of marine mammals and the need for Navy to avoid these to ensure the success of marine species. Comments requested the Navy address hot spots and other methods to actively protect marine mammals.

E.2.4.2 Sound in the Water/Sonar

Comments in this category expressed concern about the use of sonar in biologically diverse areas of the Pacific Northwest, questioned the need for sonar, and requested the Navy stop using sonar in its training and testing activities. Comments questioned the proposed increased use of sonar in Puget Sound and Dabob Bay. Many comments questioned the current research available on the effects of sonar on marine species, and stated that lack of information should force sonar activities to a halt until better research is conducted. Many comments felt current models are inadequate and misrepresent expected take levels. Comments also questioned marine species hearing thresholds of underwater sound at various ranges and cited specific examples where sonar has harmed marine life.

E.2.4.3 Underwater Explosions

Many comments referenced the negative impacts underwater explosives have on marine life. Comments also expressed concerns for public safety. Comments addressed toxic and radioactive materials leached from munitions, bombs and other explosives, and the water contamination that is a result of underwater explosions. Comments referenced L-112, and other marine mammal deaths, and the belief that Navy explosives were the cause. Many comments requested the Navy cease using explosives in such a biologically diverse area.

E.2.4.4 Mitigation

A significant number of participants expressed concerns about current mitigation measures and the inadequate reliance on lookouts to spot marine species. Comments stated that current passive sonar technology should be improved and more sophisticated technology should be designed to more effectively identify and track marine species. Comments stated that the Navy should focus on avoidance of hot spots and migration routes, and even create greater buffer zones away from the coastline. Mitigation measures for aircraft flight paths to minimize routes over residential areas were also suggested. Many comments expressed the need for the Navy to coordinate with other federal, state, and local agencies to develop more effective mitigation measures.

E.2.4.5 Study Area/Size

Most comments regarding the Study Area addressed the need for training and testing in the Pacific Northwest, expressed concern for the lack of designations on the Study Area Map, such as Marine Protected Areas, and questioned the legitimacy of having such a large Study Area. Many comments expressed concern about "the expansion" of training ranges in the Pacific Northwest or requested the Navy train and test farther away from the coastline to create a larger buffer zone for coastal species. Many comments requested the Navy train and test outside the Pacific Northwest in areas with less species diversity. Other comments expressed concern that Puget Sound and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary are part of the Study Area.

E.2.4.6 Fish

There were several comments about how training and testing activities would impact the albacore, groundfish, salmon, shellfish, and halibut fisheries and subsequent effects on prey. Comments questioned the effects underwater sound from sonar, pile driving, and explosives have on fish and the research that has been put in place to make these determinations. Many comments addressed the need to train elsewhere to reduce harm on fish species that are needed for tourism, recreational, and commercial purposes.

E.2.4.7 Marine Habitats

Comments in this category expressed concern about the impacts Navy training and testing may have on the many marine habitats in the Pacific Northwest that are home to a diversity of species. Comments addressed the need for alternatives and mitigation to focus on habitat management. Protection of breeding habitats was a common theme. Comments specifically addressed the importance of Puget Sound as a feeding ground for many marine species.

E.2.4.8 National Environmental Policy Act Process/Public Participation

A significant number of participants requested a comment period extension, as suggested by the Natural Resources Defense Council, due to perceived poor meeting attendance. Other comments expressed concern with the meeting format, the information provided, and Navy representation by contractors. Some comments, however, expressed appreciation for the information provided and for the subject matter experts present at the open house information sessions. Some comments felt the timing for public meetings was inappropriate because of the lack of information on the cause of death for L-112. Some comments inquired about the cost of meetings, missing documentation on the project website, the website commenting tool, and the locations for the future public hearings.

E.2.4.9 Navy Activities/Proposed Action

Many participants in the comment process wanted detailed documentation of, and reasons for, the types (including types of vessels and aircraft), frequencies and locations of Navy activities conducted in the Pacific Northwest. Many comments expressed opposition to the U.S. military or did not support an increase in Navy training and testing activities. Comments expressed concern about Navy activities that use sonar and explosives, and questioned the need for such activities since there is no imminent threat. Comments also requested the Navy develop new alternatives that have minimal environmental impact. Participants also requested alterations to flight paths and notifications of flight activity.

E.2.4.10 Sea Turtles

There were several comments regarding the impacts sonar and explosives would have on sea turtles and sea turtle habitat. Comments addressed direct impacts that could result when sea turtles are exposed to sound over a certain decibel. Other comments questioned the impacts on sea turtles during training and testing with unmanned systems. Comments generally requested the Navy train and test in areas devoid of marine life, especially outside of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary.

E.2.4.11 Birds

Natural resource issues mentioned were the impacts training and testing, including the use of sonar, explosives and pile driving, have on birds, particularly threatened and endangered diving bird species, such as the marbled murrelet and short-tailed albatross. Comments in this category specifically addressed the alarming decrease in shorebird and seabird populations in Washington State and

requested recent studies from outside the Navy on these reduced bird populations. Comments also questioned methods of observation and avoidance measures in place. Other comments addressed how toxic materials can impact bird species, stated a lack of attention is given to birds since marine mammals are the more popular species, and requested the Navy be sensitive to the habits and migratory patterns of the birds around Whidbey Island.

E.2.4.12 Water Quality

Concerns in this area were about identifying water bodies likely to be impacted by the project, the nature of the potential impacts and the specific discharges and pollutants likely to impact those waters. Additional comments discussed past exemptions the Navy received allowing excessive pollution of waterways. Water contamination was a prominent topic throughout all comments in this category.

E.2.4.13 Socioeconomics/Commercial and Recreational Fishing

Comments in this category stated how recreational access is vital to the economic base of the Pacific Northwest coastal communities. Several comments questioned the impacts on the tuna, halibut, salmon and shellfish fisheries and groundfish habitat, and requested review of Navy activities for compatibility with commercial and recreational fishery seasons. One recommendation was for the Navy to include notification of exercises on the NOAA weather forecast so that the small boat tuna fleet could have increased awareness. Other comments questioned how Navy activities would impact tourism, which some considered driven by whale watchers, and whether or not fisherman would be reimbursed for economic losses as a result of reduced catches.

E.2.4.14 Cumulative Impacts

Comments on cumulative impacts requested the Navy consider all ocean impacts, such as waste from the tsunami in Japan, oil spills, garbage and discarded fishing nets, when assessing Navy activities. Comments directed the Navy to meaningfully evaluate cumulative impacts on marine species (both in and outside the project area) from underwater noise, sonar and other stressors, including climate change and ocean acidification. Other comments requested the Navy analyze the cumulative impacts from combined and individual Canadian and Navy sonar usage.

E.2.4.15 Public Health and Safety

Comments pertaining to public health and safety requested the Navy engage in direct dialogue with the trawling community and co-develop a mutually acceptable warning system that will alert trawlers when submarines are operating in the same area. Other comments specifically addressed the impacts aircraft flight paths have on residents by disrupting sleep patterns. Additional comments expressed concern about toxic chemicals used in Navy range complexes, including the impact these toxic chemicals have on air and water that residents are exposed to, and the safety risks imposed on residents with the use of drones, weapons, aircraft, sonar, and ships in the Pacific Northwest coastline. Comments requested the Navy clean up hazardous spills and ordnance on all Navy ranges and provide details on the proper disposal of all toxic wastes, hazardous materials, and other waste.

E.2.4.16 Other

This category of comments addressed issues or concerns that were beyond the scope of the NWTT EIS/OEIS. Comments addressed the use of white phosphorus and depleted uranium, inquired about domestic disaster training and coordinating with the Canadian Navy, requested the use of local products to reduce the Navy's environmental footprint, suggested that the actual decision-makers interact with the public, or expressed support for national security.

E.2.4.17 Research

Comments in this category requested the Navy spend more money on researching the physical and behavioral effects sonar and pile driving have on marine mammals. Other comments addressed the need to invest money in technology that better identifies the presence of sea life, and questioned if existing technology has been adequately tested, such as unmanned vehicles, and the true effects these technologies have on sensitive areas. Comments requested the Navy also research and address barosinusitis in whales and dolphins, to better understand species migration patterns, which may lead to altering training routes to reduce impacts, and to continue researching the cause of the recent whale casualty (L-112) in the area.

E.2.4.18 Air Quality

Concerns in this area were the impacts activities would have on air quality, and ultimately, climate change. Comments expressed concerns with the Navy receiving exemptions, which leads to more air pollution, and the Navy's use of aerosols and other toxic airborne chemicals.

E.2.4.19 Marine Debris

Several comments discussed the impacts marine debris, not just from Navy activities, have on the marine environment. Debris references were regarding tsunami debris, old spills, fishing nets, garbage and remnants from explosive materials. Comments also focused on the cleanup of any hazardous materials and spills.

E.2.4.20 Terrestrial Resources

Comments in this category expressed general concerns about how training and testing activities may affect the natural, terrestrial environment and the species that make the land their habitat, especially migratory birds and other wildlife. Comments spoke to the biological balance these species are a part of in the Northwest area.

E.2.4.21 Noise

Several comments about aircraft noise from landings, takeoffs, and flight routes were received. The comments requested adjustments to flight operations to minimize noise and proposed a public website that would inform community members of flight schedules and other Navy activities that may increase noise levels. Other comments expressed concern with evening aircraft activities, and how other noise-intensive activities, such as pile driving and explosions, impact marine species in the Study Area.

E.2.4.22 Cultural Resources/Native American Concerns

Comments in this category requested information on the tribal consultation and coordination process and referenced the need for thorough and comprehensive cultural surveys of potentially affected areas. Additional comments expressed concern with military training and testing occurring on tribal lands and the impacts on tribal resources.

E.2.4.23 Access

Concerns in this area are in regard to year-round access to recreational areas and increased access restrictions on Dabob Bay.